Edge Hill University

“They’re in every breath we take”: Emotions and emotion management in the everyday ‘doing’ of netball coach educators’ work.

by

Claire Maskrey

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of Edge Hill University for the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy

December 2021

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my supervisors Dr Lee Nelson and Professor Paul Potrac for their guidance, encouragement, insightful discussions and ultimately driving of a hard bargain. Without their continual questioning, occasional prompting and unwavering enthusiasm, my journey to complete this study would not have been achieved. Thank you also to Professor Andy Smith for your timely reading and comments that assisted in the completion of this work. To the coach educators who shared their emotions and experiences, I am truly grateful for your contribution and honesty. Thank you.

To my family, the love, support and gift of time that you have all provided has enabled me to realise and achieve my goal in the completion of this study. To my Mum and Dad, you have provided a background of unconditional support throughout all my educational endeavours, a desire to learn and a stubbornness to complete anything I put my mind to. To my husband Simon for his support, limitless patience, and love in my pursuit and completion of this thesis. Finally, to my two amazing boys, Barnaby and Albert, who although not present at the start of this journey, have provided numerous light-hearted moments and all-round motivation along the way. I thank each and every one of you. Indeed, it would be amiss to end without acknowledging the fear, frustration, joy, pride and emotion management that made this thesis about emotion in more ways than one.

Abstract

The attention paid to emotion in coaching has gathered impetus in recent years but empirical research in the coaching literature continues to be limited. The role of emotion in coach education remains notably absent and we currently know very little about the emotional experiences, practices and decisions of coach educators. This thesis begins to address this gap in knowledge by providing original and significant insights into the role of emotion in netball coach educators' pedagogical practices when delivering coach education courses. Data were collected through diaries, in-depth semi-structured interviews with four coach educators, and my own autoethnography accounts. An iterative analysis of data was undertaken in a process of collection, analysis and representation comprised of etic and emic readings. Symbolic interactionist and poststructural theorisations were principally drawn from the work of Hochschild (1983), Thoits (1986; 2004; 2011), Bolton (2005) and Zembylas (2005) in the understanding and sensemaking of coach educators' emotional experiences. My analysis highlighted coach educators' emotional displays were influenced by four overarching rules relating to happiness, fear, disappointment and anger and that emotion display rules are learnt through mechanisms of wider experiences. In line with the learnt emotion display rules, it also revealed that coach educators enacted a range of intra- and inter-emotion management techniques. Finally, the findings highlighted the multiple motives that drive the engagement in emotional management and the associated costs and benefits of its enactment. The findings highlight the centrality of emotion to coach educators' pedagogical practice and interactions and raises the need to consider the place and potential integration of emotion in the preparation and training of coach educators.

Key terms: Emotion; coach educator; display rules; emotion management; emotion learning; motives; costs; benefits.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements……………………………………………………………………..i

Abstract………………………………………………………………………………..ii

Table of Contents……………………………………………………………………iii

Chapter 1: Introduction……………………………………………………………..1

1.1. The triggering of emotional considerations……………………………1

1.2. Seeking supervisors………………………………………………………...2

1.3. Academic background……………………………………………………...3

1.4. Aim of the study……………………………………………………………...7

Chapter 2: Review of literature……………………………………………………9

2.1. Introduction…………………………………………………………………..9

2.2. Positivist investigations of coach education…..………………………9

2.3. Poststructuralist investigations of coach education………………...16

2.4. Interpretivist investigations of coach education……………............21

2.5. A call for an emotional understanding of coach education…………35

2.5.1. Emotional experiences, identities and social relationships…...**36**

*2.5.2. The hiding and showing of emotions……………………….……***42**

2.5.3. Emotion management techniques….……………………….…...**46**

2.5.4. The costs and benefits of emotion work………………….……...**51**

Chapter 3: Methodology…………………………………………………………...55

3.1. Aims and structure of the chapter………………………………………55

***3.2. Paradigmatic choices: An interpretive approach*……………………55**

***3.3. The participants*…………………………………………………………59**

3.3.1 Selection of participants…………………………………………..**59**

3.3.2. The participants' background………………………………….…**61**

***3.4. Methodological approach one: Fieldwork*…………………...........62**

3.4.1. Diaries: A rationale………………………………………………..**65**

3.4.2. Collecting diary data……………………………………….…...**69**

3.4.3. Qualitative interviews: A rationale……………………….……**71**

3.4.4. Collecting interview data……………………………………..….**75**

***3.5. Methodological approach two: Autoethnography*……………………80**

3.5.1. Autoethnography: A rationale……………………………………**80**

3.5.2. Constructing my autoethnography………………………………**84**

***3.6. Iterative data analysis*…………………………………………............88**

***3.7. Reflexivity and researcher positionality*………………………………..92**

***3.8. Theoretical frameworks*………………………………………………...94**

***3.9. Judging qualitative research*…………………………………………..97**

Chapter 4: Emotion rules……………………………………………………...101

***4.1. Introduction*……………………………………………………………..101**

***4.2. Emotion display rules of coach educators*…………………………...101**

4.2.1. Rule 1: Convey happiness to coach learners…………………**102**

4.2.2. Rule 2: Do not display fear to coach learners…………………**106**

4.2.3. Rule 3: Disappointment can only be shown to coach learners in very limited circumstances……………………………………………..**111**

4.2.4. Rule 4: Frustration perhaps, but displays of anger towards coach learners are prohibited…………………………………….…………...**115**

Chapter 5: How coach educators learnt the display rules……………………….124

5.1. Introduction………………………………………………………………...**124**

5.2. Emotional socialisation…………………………………………………**124**

5.3. Service-based contexts…………………………………………………**134**

Chapter 6: Coach educators' self-management of emotions……….............138

6.1. Introduction………………………………………………………………...**138**

6.2. Surface acting: Hiding true emotions…………………………………**138**

6.2.1. Confident, calm and in control to hide fear and anxiety………**139**

6.2.2. Hiding anger by smiling……………………………………….....**141**

6.3. Emotional neutrality: Remaining diplomatic, calm and neutral in the face of possible conflict……………………………………………………………….**146**

6.4. Deep acting: Feeling and expressing required emotions…………**148**

6.5. There's more to emotion management than surface and deep acting………………………………………………………………………….**151**

6.6. Going beyond the expected emotional display……………………...**157**

6.7. There's no acting here: Authentic emotion management…………**161**

6.8. Emotion management as dynamic and interactional………………**163**

Chapter 7: They don't just manage their own emotion but others' emotions too ……………………………………………………………………………………..167

7.1. Introduction………………………………………………………………...**167**

7.2. ***Managing coach learners' emotions***…………………………………...**167**

***7.3. Managing coach educators' emotions*……………………...........175**

Chapter 8: Motivations, benefits and costs of emotion management…………180

***8.1. Introduction*………………………………………………………..180**

***8.2. There's more than one reason for emotion management*…………180**

8.2.1. Emotion management to get the learners through the course………………………………………………………….**...181**

8.2.2. Living up to the role and gaining trust in the learners' eyes……………………………………………………………**...186**

8.2.3. Acting professionally (individually and collectively) in the perceptions of the learners……………………………………………**.191**

8.2.4. Prioritising the learner through the use of emotion management……………………………………………………………**195**

8.2.5. Emotion management for self-benefit and personal gain……**196**

***8.3. Costs of engaging in emotion management* …………………………201**

Chapter 9: Conclusion…………………………………………………..............211

***9.1. Summary of findings and contribution to coaching knowledge*….211**

***9.2. Suggestions for future research*……………………………………….217**

***9.3. Generalisability and practical application of findings*……………...220**

References…………………………………………………………………………223

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. The triggering of emotional considerations…

Watching the newly qualified coach learners gather their coaching files and weave their way between desks towards the classroom door, Helen paused, “That was such a useful two days. I’ve learnt loads to take back to the club.” I smiled and nodded, Helen continued enthusiastically: “Thank you for all your ideas and input. I’m so happy I’ve passed!” I smiled harder to hide the growing annoyance at my core and hold back what was running through my mind. I really wanted to say: “it’s a pity that your face and effort didn’t show this enthusiasm, that you were mainly silent while I was questioning, running practical tasks and asking for volunteers for the last seven hours.” I knew I shouldn’t, I knew I couldn’t, and the words remained unspoken. As Helen left the room, Emma the other coach educator commented: “Wow where did that come from, I thought she had hated every minute!” I grinned, this time effortlessly: “I’m glad it wasn’t just me then.” The shared acknowledgment distracting me from my annoyance.

As I packed away the flip charts and course materials, the annoyance I felt at Helen for her lack of participation in the course left me with a hint of guilt. It wasn’t the first time I had hidden my annoyance. Not only that weekend, but on other occasions across courses. The more consideration I gave to the emotions I experienced in my encounters and interactions as I worked as a coach educator, the more I realised I often managed my emotions. As I reflected, I thought about the situations when I exaggerated my excitement or controlled my anger by purposefully showing or hiding certain emotions to try and engage and encourage learners to take part in the course and do my job as a coach educator. At other times I altered my emotions to make sure they fell in line with what I thought the coach learners expected from me. That was not to say that my emotions were always calculated, the buzz and excitement I displayed from seeing coaches develop and improve, from sharing ideas, through working with other coach educators, all made me want to sign up for the next course and do it all again. With my inquisitiveness spiked, I wanted to know more…

1.2. Seeking supervisors

Two weeks later I sat in the University reception, watching the doors wondering if the next person walking up to the building was coming to meet me. A man in sports kit headed towards the doors. I stood up and smiled as my heart raced a little and I fought to ignore the faltering feeling of doubt and questioning in my head as to whether I should be here as I was greeted by Professor Paul Potrac. I shook hands and introduced myself. As we headed across campus towards the university coffee shop, I chatted about my background and roles and interests as we walked. I silently scolded myself. You have chosen to do this. “It will be fine” I told myself, in a bid to calm myself and stop the doubts in my head and hoped that Paul would not notice how nervous I was. In the coffee shop I met Dr Lee Nelson and he, Paul and I sat down at a table.

Prof. Paul Potrac: Thank you for getting in touch, Claire. This is a good chance to see what your thoughts are and see if there is any link between your research interests and ours.

Dr Lee Nelson: So, Claire, what is it that has led you to here?

Me: Well, I’m not completely sure, but I’ve worked as a coach educator for the last five years and I am becoming increasingly interested in the experiences of the coach learner, but more so my own experiences as a coach educator in the delivery of courses. I think this would be a relevant and worthwhile area to focus upon and work towards a PhD in.

Dr Lee Nelson: That sounds interesting. What have you noticed?

Me: Well, for instance, my own experiences of different emotions that are part of when I deliver a coach education course, in one day I can be happy, angry, fearful, all whilst working with the coach learners. Also, there is very little research on coach education and even less regarding emotion, so I thought it would be an interesting area to explore and learn more about, particularly as I already am involved as a coach educator.

Prof. Paul Potrac: It is an area that we are beginning to pay more attention to, so I think it would be worthwhile trying to map out what you

think you want to look at and seeing what you can get down on paper and we can take it from there.

Dr Lee Nelson: Yes, there are a number of directions I could envision this taking, but it will need to be led by your interests. Give it some thought and then we can arrange to meet again.

Me: Thank you, I'll give it some thought and send over some more focused ideas after looking further into the literature…

1.3. Academic background

With coach education considered to hold the potential to raise the standard of coaching practice (Lyle, 2002; Allison, Abraham and Cale, 2016), significant financial contribution by the UK government to the re-development of coach education programmes (Lyle, 2007) has increased the importance of coach education and positioned it at the "cornerstone of the professionalisation agenda (of coaches and coaching)" (Taylor and Garratt, 2010: 114). It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that coach education has received an increasing level of attention from scholars and governing bodies of sport (Cassidy, Potrac and McKenzie, 2006; Cushion, 2007; Chesterfield, Potrac and Jones, 2010; Nelson, Cushion and Potrac, 2013; Cassidy, Jones and Potrac, 2016; Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019).

The literature to date has largely focused on evaluating the effectiveness of coach education. The empirical studies that have considered formal coach education programmes beyond a cognitive level paint a critical picture, with the espoused content, delivery and assessment approaches shown to deviate substantially from the realities of coaching practice, thus limiting the impact of coach education (Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2003; 2004; Chesterfield, Potrac and Jones, 2010; Purdy and Jones, 2011; Piggott, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2014; Lewis, Roberts and Andrews, 2018). Whilst progress in understanding the perceptions and experiences of coach learners and the impact of coach education is clear from the body of research in this

area (Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2003; Chesterfield, Potrac and Jones, 2010; Nelson, Cushion and Potrac, 2013; Stodter and Cushion, 2014; Lewis, Roberts and Andrews, 2018), little remains known about coach educators' experiences and practices (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019; Callary and Gearity, 2019a, 2019b, 2020; Watts, Cushion and Cale, 2021).

To enhance the delivery and impact of coach education provision, scholars have developed a range of theoretically informed approaches. These approaches have included mentoring (Cushion, Armour and Jones, 2003), reflective practice (Knowles et al., 2001; Knowles, Borrie and Telfer, 2005; Hall and Gray, 2016; Voldby and Klein-Døssing, 2020; Stodter, Cope and Townsend, 2021), problem-based learning (Jones and Turner, 2006), competency-based programmes (Demers, Woodburn and Savard, 2006) and communities of practice (Culver and Trudel, 2006; Jones, Morgan and Harris, 2012; Stoszkowski and Collins, 2014). Despite this progress, there is clearly a need to better understand the experiences and relationships of coach educators to help inform the future development of coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). There is a need to know more about the complexities of coach education and how they are "embedded within powerful psychological, social, cultural and political forces" (Callary and Gearity, 2020: 2). To achieve this, a critical sociology of practice needs to be developed to provide rich insight and understanding of the ambiguities and complexities of coach education (Jones and Wallace, 2005; Jones, 2007; Potrac, Jones and Nelson, 2014; Callary and Gearity, 2020).

Increasingly scholars have disputed the absence of relationships and the unrealistically sanitised, linear, detached, apolitical and unemotional conveyance of coaching and coach education (Potrac, Jones and Nelson, 2014). This adds to previous recommendations for "researchers and educators to explore and construct representations of coaching that are rich in emotion" (Potrac and Marshall, 2011: 66).

Scholars have postulated that the practices of coaching and coach education as emotional endeavours need to be recognised and understood and subsequently require consideration in sport practitioners' daily work (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac et al., 2013; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Coach education, like coaching, is an inherently relational, ambiguous and social activity (Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2004; Jones and Wallace, 2006; Jones et al., 2011b) involving a multitude of interactions with various people (e.g., coach learners, coach educators, internal and external verifiers, workforce managers) which cannot be simply devoid of emotion (Denzin, 1984; Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac et al., 2013; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Conveying coach education as a rationalistic activity where emotions and cognitions can be simplistically separated is not perhaps reflective of the realities of this context (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac et al., 2013). Inevitably, emotion influences the choices that are available to an individual and the decisions they make (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Nelson et al., 2013), but currently very little is known about how this plays out in coach education contexts.

A growing body of research has made progress in offering insights into the emotional and political nature of coaching (eg., Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Potrac et al., 2017). This has revealed, firstly, that coaches experience various emotions in their daily interaction with key stakeholders in fulfilment of their coaching role (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Matinelli, Day and Lowry, 2017; Potrac et al., 2017). Secondly, emotion management strategies are deployed to selectively hide or show emotions in alignment with situational expectations (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Matinelli, Day and Lowry, 2017; Potrac, et al., 2017). Thirdly, upholding emotional displays has a potential for negative impact on coaches (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). Despite these findings offering valuable insights, there remains a paucity of inquiry surrounding the emotional

aspects of coaches' work which requires extending before a comprehensive understanding and appreciation of the emotional nature of sports coaching can be claimed. This understanding of emotional dimensions in sports coaching is yet to be extended to coach education, with little attention paid to the emotional nature and practice of coach education (Jones, 2009; Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac et al., 2013; Potrac and Smith, 2014; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). One notable exception is the work of Allanson, Potrac and Nelson (2019) who found that coach educators enacted emotional labour to maintain and advance their respective positions. While this study provided a fascinating initial insight into the emotional nature of coach educators' everyday practice and the emotional struggles and management involved in interactions with key stakeholders, there remains little reality grounded inquiry into the working lives of coach educators which has the potential to contribute to a greater understanding of emotional practice (Nelson et al., 2013).

The literature in other occupations, most relatedly teaching, has started to demonstrate the inherent emotional nature of work, including understanding emotion rules (e.g., Winograd, 2003; Cowie, 2003; Zembylas, 2005b; Isenbarger and Zembylas, 2006; Yin and Lee, 2012; Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018), the deployment of emotion management strategies (Ogbonna and Harris, 2004; Hebson, Earnshaw and Marchington, 2007; Chowdhry, 2014; Taylor, 2020), and the potential impacts of emotional labour and emotion management (Hargreaves, 2000; Sutton, 2005; Isenbarger and Zembylas, 2006). These areas of emotional experiences, practices and understanding are yet to be adequately explored within coaching and coach education. Clearly, the field of coaching has much still to learn and consultation of the emotional research conducted in other occupational settings may offer a starting point from which to develop further lines of inquiry. Exploring the emotional aspects of coach education can provide insight into how emotions are triggered and shaped by socio-historical contexts, other people, socialisation experiences and

individual biographies (Nelson et al., 2013). It can also provide a greater critical insight into the emotional practices of coach educators in their daily work by exploring, as Potrac et al., (2013) suggest, the politicised nature of emotions as well as the influence of socialisation experiences on emotions. Ultimately, “if we are to better prepare coaches [and coach educators] for the complex, day-to-day realities of practice we need to better understand the role of emotions” (Nelson et al., 2013: 470). Indeed, it is perhaps time for researchers and educators to explore and construct representations of coach education that are rich in emotion (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac et al., 2017) and shed greater insight into the emotions, emotional norms and emotional management that is part of the daily practice of working as a coach educator.

1.4. Aim of the study

The aim of this study is to explore coach educators’ understandings of the emotional features of their work. Particular attention is given to the emotional rules that coach educators perceive guide their pedagogical interactions with coach learners and coach educators and how they come to learn them. There is much to be learnt also about how coach educators manage their own and others’ emotions for strategic ends, why they do so, and the associated costs and benefits. Towards this end, interpretive diaries, interviews, and autoethnographic accounts were used to explore the following research questions:

1. What emotional rules did the coach educators believe they were expected to conform to when pedagogically interacting with their coach learners?
2. How did the coach educators develop their understanding of these emotional rules?
3. What intra-emotion management strategies did the coach educators enact while working with their coach learners and other coach educators?

4. What inter-emotion management strategies did the coach educators enact while working with their coach learners and other coach educators?
5. What were the motives, benefits and impacts of emotion management enactment for coach educators?

Chapter 2: Review of literature

2.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide a critical review of existing research on coach education, emotions in sports coaching and sport environments, and emotion in wider occupational settings. Initially, the review considers the literature addressing coach education and is organised into three sections by paradigmatic approach. The positivist studies are presented first, followed by poststructuralist and interpretivist investigations. An overview of the paradigm, the existing coach education research to date alongside a critical analysis of the associated paradigmatic and methodological approaches will be considered for each. The second part of the literature review will address four issues: (1). emotions experienced in the interactions and fulfilment of roles at work; (2). emotions rules that inform the hiding and sharing of emotion; (3). emotion management techniques employed in daily work roles; (4). the costs and benefits associated with undertaking emotion work. Each section will consider the empirical studies that pay attention to emotion within the context of coaching and coach-related work before examining the research in education and other occupational settings.

2.2. Positivist investigations of coach education

Traditionally associated with biological and psychological disciplines in the natural sciences, positivist research in the social sciences mainly stems from the field of behavioural psychology (Mallett and Tinning, 2014), a pattern evident in the field of sports coaching (Lyle and Cushion, 2017; Cushion, 2019) and coach education. There is a notable body of positivist coach education research that investigates the effectiveness of cognitive-behaviourist based coach education programmes (e.g., Smith, Smoll and Curtis, 1979; Smith, Smoll and Barnett, 1995; Conroy and Coatsworth, 2004; Coatsworth and Conroy, 2006; Smith, Smoll and Cumming, 2007).

Scholars undertaking research aligned to the positivist approach have employed observations of coaching behaviours (e.g., Smith, Smoll & Curtis, 1979; Macdonald et al., 2020) and measured both players perceptions of coaches (e.g., Smith, Smoll & Barnett, 1995; Conroy & Coatsworth, 2004; Macdonald et al., 2020) and coaches own perceptions (e.g., Malete & Feltz, 2000; Campbell & Sullivan, 2005; Moen, Olsen and Bjørkøy, 2020) to establish the impact and effectiveness of courses. These approaches are informed by the researcher's paradigmatic choices and ontological and epistemological assumptions that underpin positivism (Sparkes, 1992).

Ontologically speaking positivism adopts a realist ontology (Guba and Lincoln, 2008), supporting the belief that there is a single reality of the social world which exists outside of the mind and independently of the individual (Crotty, 2003; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Sparkes, 1992). Here, the researcher examines the social world from the perspective that reality is out there to be studied and understood (Guba and Lincoln, 2008; Howell, 2013), observed and measured (Mallett and Tinning, 2014). Epistemologically, positivism implies that "the goal of research is to produce objective knowledge; that is, understanding that is impartial and unbiased, based on a view from 'the outside', without personal involvement or vested interest on the part of the researcher" (Willig, 2001: 3). This epistemological notion of objectivism is reflected in positivism's philosophical stance that enquiry should be value and interest free through separation of the external world and the researcher, encapsulating the dualistic belief that the knower and what is known remain totally independent of each other (Sparkes, 1992; Howell, 2013).

Positivism pursues a nomothetic approach, seeking to verify hypotheses, facts and general laws (Howell, 2013) that can ideally be applied to all cases to make future predictions (Potrac, Jones and Nelson, 2014; Wrench, Punyanunt-Carter and Ward, 2015) and typically employs self-report, observation and quantitative methods (Sparkes, 1992; North, 2017). Following the manipulation of variables, positivist

researchers, it is claimed, can obtain formal and precise quantitative measurements which are subjected to statistical analyses to rigorously test formulated hypotheses (Guba and Lincoln, 2008; Markula and Silk, 2011; Byrne, 2017). By adopting an experimental methodology, the researcher attempts to retain control over both external variables and researcher bias (Sparkes, 1992; Guba and Lincoln, 2008).

The early empirical coach education research aligned with the positivistic paradigm centred around exploring the impact of Smith, Smoll and Curtis's (1979) cognitive-behavioural coach training programme which adopted modelling, role-play and self-monitoring to emphasise the use of desirable, and discourage the use of non-desirable, behaviours. It adopted an experimental design to measure the effectiveness and impact of the training programmes via observation of overt coach behaviour of little-league baseball coaches and self-report forms of players' perceptions, attitudes and self-esteem (Smith, Smoll and Curtis, 1979). The statistical analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in observed coaching behaviours, irrespective of the coaches receiving training (Smith, Smoll and Curtis, 1979). The baseball players' perceptions of coaching behaviour indicated significant differences, with the experimental group coaches more frequently providing reinforcement, mistake-contingent encouragement and general technique instruction, and less frequently engaging in non-reinforcement, punishment and punitive technical instruction, than the players of the control group coaches. The players of the trained coaches also evaluated their liking for the coach and teammates more positively and post-season self-esteem scores significantly increased for children who played for trained coaches compared to no significant change in the control group (Smith, Smoll and Curtis, 1979). The changes were attributed by Smith, Smoll and Curtis (1979) to the pre-season coach effectiveness training programme but they also acknowledged the limitations of this claim given the large number of combined variables, relatively

small coach sample and blurred training components. This may be partly due to the difficulty of controlling variables in the complex social context of coaching.

From Smith Smoll and Curtis's (1979) original study the Coach Effectiveness Training (CET; Smoll and Smith, 1993) programme evolved and continuing along positivistic lines asserted numerous positive impacts of CET, including increased social support and skill development (Smith, Smoll and Barnett, 1995), reduced dropout (Barnett, Smoll and Smith, 1992), and increased desirable behaviours, interaction and support by coaches (Smoll et al., 1993). Further independent observations of overt coaching behaviour by Conroy and Coatsworth (2004) largely echoed Smith, Smoll and Curtis's (1979) findings, with CET trained swimming coaches providing more reinforcement but also less encouragement. The principles of CET, with their emphasis on positive behaviour and creation of mastery-involving motivational climates, were adopted by the Mastery Approach to Coaching (Smith, Smoll and Cumming, 2007) training programme. This reported higher perceptions of mastery-climate coaching behaviours of the players of trained coaches when compared to the control group of non-trained coaches (Smith, Smoll and Cumming, 2007). Other studies have also revealed short-term increased frequency of observed positive youth development coaching behaviours following engagement in positive youth development (PYD) focused coach education (MacDonald et al., 2020). The impact of CET was also measured through self-report tools and revealed increased self-esteem for players of trained baseball coaches (Smoll et al., 1993), but contrasting results were found in Coatsworth and Conroy's (2006) randomised experimental study of 7- to 18-year-old swimmers where no significant effect of coach training on self-esteem scores were reported. Lower sport specific anxiety levels for players of CET (Smith, Smoll and Barnett, 1995) and MAC (Smith, Smoll and Cumming, 2007) trained coaches compared to players of control group coaches were also evident. By contrast implementation of a positive youth development (PYD)

coach education intervention revealed non-significant statistical differences in athlete perceptions of trained and untrained coaches regarding coach-athlete relationships and positive youth developmental experiences in questionnaire-based measurement before, during and following the programme (MacDonald et al., 2020).

Further positivistic research has focused upon the impact of coach education courses on coaches with quasi-experimental studies exploring the effect of a Programme for Athletic Coaches Education (PACE; Seefeldt and Brown, 1990) (Malete and Feltz, 2000) and the Canadian National Coaching Certificate Programme (NCCP) Level One Theory course (Campbell and Sullivan, 2005). Both studies revealed a significant increase in perceived coaching efficacy for the trained coaches (Malete and Feltz, 2000; Campbell and Sullivan, 2005). In the continued scientific investigation of the impact of coach education, Moen, Olsen and Bjørkøy (2020) experimental design with control group comparison investigated the effects of a Norwegian one-year coach education programme structured around a formal mentoring programme. The programme was based on athlete-centred values and the social process of coaching, including how to communicate to empower the athlete and use the athletes' own experiences in the development process. Statistical analysis of self-report questionnaires measuring coaches' perceptions of their performances as coaches and coach-athlete working alliances revealed statistically significant positive effects on coaches' perceptions of their own performance and impact of coach-athlete working relationships. A consideration of coach education provision across national governing bodies, local educational authority or wider organisational bodies with coaches who were unqualified through to coaches who had Level 5 qualifications highlighted agreement on the perceived limited impact of coach education courses: "coaches viewed coach education courses as key providers of sport specific content but by and large [those coaches were] not very effective with other aspects of coaching, for example, decision making, pedagogy and

sports science" (Nash and Sproule, 2012: 48). The considerations of coach education in this area have prioritised players' perceptions of coaches following attendance at coach education courses or the coaches' perceptions of coach education courses. To date, there has been no positivist consideration of the coach educator and their impact which limits understanding of coach education.

The positivist studies demonstrate that coach education programmes are not all equally effective in all situations, with varying impact on overt coaching behaviours, athlete perceptions of coaching behaviour and athletes' anxiety and self-esteem reported. The claimed impact of coach education should also be treated cautiously, with the acknowledged limitations of attributing the findings to the training programmes to the numerous variables, varied potential importance and contribution of different elements, blurred training components, and wider confounding experiences of interaction (Smith, Smoll and Curtis, 1979; Smoll et al., 1993; Smith, Smoll and Barnett, 1995; Campbell and Sullivan, 2007; Smith, Smoll and Cumming, 2007). The predominantly quasi-experimental design of the positivistic coach education studies weakens the internal validity of the research, with the absence of fully randomised designs questioning the generalisations and applicability of the findings beyond the constraints of the actual study (Cushion et al., 2010; Bryman, 2012). This suggests that the basic principles underpinning positivism, which are claimed by many to be the paradigms strength, are not applied particularly effectively in positivist coach education research.

It is important to recognise that the quantitative behavioural assessment methods adopted may limit the understanding of coach education courses as the pre-determined Likert scales are overly simplistic (Abrahams and Collins, 1998), only offer measurements on selected aspects of reality, and may not necessarily be applicable to each individual (Markula and Silk, 2011). The observational measurement of coaching behaviour is also limited, as it does not enable the observer to establish the

meaning of the behaviour (Bryman, 2012). Arguably, the preoccupation of evaluating the effectiveness of coach education programmes through measurement of behaviour within the positivist approaches summarised earlier, means that many components that constitute coach education are ignored and they fail to capture the participant's perspectives due to the underlying epistemological reliance on remote, inferential empirical methods and materials (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008). The production of population-specific generalisations and reduced complexity are key criticisms of research in the positivist paradigm (Lyle and Vergeer, 2013), with generalisations that ignore or simplify environmental and social aspects of practice (North, 2013). The reductionist nature of positivist research arguably offers an over-simplification of process and practice, resulting in an analysis of only parts of coach education to understand the functioning whole (Cushion, Armour and Jones, 2003; Jones and Wallace, 2005; Bowes and Jones, 2006).

A predominant concern with the cognitive and behavioural elements of coach education courses is the portrayal of coach educators as free from the relational and complex networks with others (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Certainly, my reading of the positivist-based research around coach education led me to question why the interactions of the coach learner and the coach educator were notably absent from this body of work. Secondly, the multitude of emotions that I both experienced and encountered were simply just not reflective of the linear, sanitised and emotionless portrayal of coach education courses captured in the positivist coach education research. Therefore, alternative paradigms and methodologies to positivism are clearly warranted that may enable *in situ* insight into the social, dynamic and interactive processes and emotional realities and complexities of coach education.

2.3. Poststructuralist investigations of coach education

Poststructuralism offers an alternative paradigm which focuses on differences, complex relations and instabilities and is concerned with how social spaces are constructed and subjectivities made (Macdonald et al., 2002; Filmer et al., 2004). In contrast to the fixed laws and quantifiable outcomes of positivism, poststructuralism embraces “multiplicity, contradictions, variety and fragmentation” (Howell, 2013: 115). The interests of post-structuralists lie both within what can be explained but also what appears to sit outside of conventional culture (Taylor, 2014) and explores the creation of relationships between the self and social constructs regarding power and knowledge (Macdonald et al., 2002). Poststructuralism is considered an aspect of postmodernism that focuses upon discourse and language patterns linked with subjectivity and identity (Howell, 2013). Within poststructuralism the concept of discourse provides a route to understanding dominant practices within a selected social field (Markula and Silk, 2011; Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014). The understanding of the social world is situated via discourses that are produced through power relations which are continually changing (Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014).

Ontologically, poststructuralism assumes truths to be fragmented and contested (Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014), proposing that the meaning an individual ascribes will change as it is subject to contrasting and multiple discourses, interests, experiences and memories (Richardson and St Pierre, 2008), thus representing a belief in multiple realities (Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014; Mills and Denison, 2014). Epistemologically, poststructuralism employs subjectivism where “there are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the worlds of –and between – the observer and the observed” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008: 29), suggesting “the development of certain discourses serve vested and fluctuating positions” (Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014: 78). Research positioned within the poststructuralist paradigm is “inevitably influenced by the social, and thus always

contextual and subjective whether scientific or sociological" (Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014: 43). Methodologically poststructuralists are committed to an "emic, idiographic, case-based position that directs attention to the specifics of particular cases" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008: 29). Poststructuralists use research methods differently to other paradigms to gain or produce research knowledge (Markula and Silk, 2011). Poststructuralist researchers employ a variety of qualitative interpretive methods to better understand the world (Richardson and St Pierre, 2008). This often entails the selection and application of a critical standpoint or individual theory (e.g., Foucault, Derrida) that offers a lens for reading, analysis and sense-making of a particular social condition (Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014; Taylor, 2014).

The scholarly writings of Foucault have been applied as poststructuralist tools in the limited work in coach education to date (Piggott, 2012; Avner, Markula and Denison, 2017). Drawing upon Foucault's poststructuralist notions of governmentality and power, Piggott (2012) sought to cast light on the rationalistic practices inherent in formal coach education courses. Piggott (2012) employed a critical rationalism (Popper, 1972) philosophy to explore coaches' experiences of formal coach education. Drawing upon Munz's (1985) concept of 'closed circles' to theorise and hypothesise that "The knowledge and methods formal courses propound are too rigid and insensitive to coaches' (often messy) experiences. Moreover, they become dogmatic and petrified because they are protected from criticism from within and without" (Piggott, 2012: 542-3). This then led to substantive questions exploring whether the hypothesis holds in different sports and levels of experience, and, if it does hold, the social mechanisms through which the dogma is protected. Semi-structured, one-to-one interviews were conducted with eight male and four female coaches who had completed various levels of team and individual formal coach education courses in the UK in the last two years. The interviews consisted of an explanation of the general problem and the closed circle hypothesis by the interviewer

before asking the participants to reflect upon the degree to which their experiences met with the hypotheses.

The study revealed that the closed circle hypothesis does hold in many but not all cases. For most of the larger and more established NGB coach education courses, the coaches experienced closed circle style courses that "tended to be characterised as 'by the book', 'formulaic', 'dogmatic' and presenting a 'single style' or 'model' which had to be 'accepted without discussion'" (Piggott, 2012: 546) and classed them of limited value. The smaller NGBs such as volleyball embraced a more liberal and discursive philosophy. In follow up, coaches' reflections on the pedagogical environment created by the coach educators, indicated a plethora of rationalities, techniques and institutional practices inclusive of stratified progression through each level, a requirement to follow prescriptive methods and techniques of coaching, and coaching status and coach educators as gatekeepers to knowledge. This revealed the approaches deployed by coach educators to (re)produce knowledge and through references to experience and status (power and expert knowledge) to protect their positions of power (Piggott, 2012). These actions led to coaches' experiences on the course being accompanied by feelings of frustration, exasperation, self-doubt and even fear and resulted in coaches 'subconsciously' ceasing asking questions and following the coach educators' line.

Drawing upon poststructuralist theorising of Foucault's notions of governmentality and power revealed how the rationalities and disciplinary practices rendered participants as 'docile bodies' because of either self-doubt on the part of the coach, or the coach educators preventing coaches from explicitly criticising the status quo, which coaches felt unable to challenge or resist the dominant discourse (re)produced within the coach education courses (Piggott, 2012). It is only through the adoption of poststructuralist inquiry that it is possible to highlight these otherwise hidden practices and power relations in coach education that "by rendering the states

and mechanisms of domination *more* visible, they become *less* effective. In this sense, the neo-Foucauldian project is essentially concerned with reducing the naturalness or taken for granted character of how things are done" (Piggott, 2012: 551; emphases in the original).

Further poststructuralist analysis of coach education in the exploration of actions and talk of Football Association coach educators has revealed the (re)production of gendered discourses (Fielding-Lloyd and Meân, 2011). This specifically portrayed a lone female on a coach education course as different, naturally inferior, and deficient in ability, thus not only limiting her opportunities to reach her potential but also explicitly indicating to the male coach participants on the course that women need to be taught and coached differently, "thereby explicitly re/producing gendered discourses within coach education" (Fielding-Lloyd and Meân, 2011: 355). Adoption of poststructuralist theory has also provided a critical reading of female coach learners' experiences of the UEFA A Licence coach education programme and highlighted the taken-for-granted normative practices of male authority, behaviour and expectations within the course structure, content, and delivery in marginalising and suppressing females on the course (Sawiuk, Lewis and Taylor, 2021). Similarly, examinations of Canadian coach education course material adopting discourse analysis framed within a Foucauldian analysis revealed how the discourses of physical training, scientific principles and striving for results were the dominant discourses which shaped coaches' understanding of effective coaching practice (Avner, Markula and Denison, 2017).

In the absence of the deployment of a poststructuralist lens to examine the area of coach education, positivist portrayals of coach education as technocratic, rationalistic, and prescriptive that neglect to appreciate the (re)production of knowledge would remain. Scholars have started to uncover dominant discourses (Fielding-Lloyd and Meân, 2011; Piggott, 2012; Avner, Markula and Denison, 2017)

which reveal otherwise unknown practices in coach education. Despite this, gaps remain surrounding not only coach educators' practices (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019), but also the emotional nature of coach education practice (Jones et al., 2011b; Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Indeed, there is a paucity of poststructural research addressing coach educators and emotion. A poststructural lens, drawing upon sociological theory, may offer valuable insights and a more nuanced understanding of practice (Potrac et al., 2013; Townsend and Cushion, 2017) and develop a more in-depth insight than the limited neophyte research in this area (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). In poststructuralist approaches the involvement of human beings is not denied but repositioned as the paradigm reflects the idea that "all knowledge, truth, and reality is inevitably political (in the sense that it is tied to power relations) and all human beings are involved in their production since all human beings are a part of power relations" (Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014: 43). Indeed, whilst self-agency may not be explicitly privileged as poststructuralists reject a divide between agency and structure (Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014), it can be argued that the immersive approach of postmodernism to people's lives and environments reproduce rich and contextualised tales and histories recalled by individuals and the community studied (Denzin, 1989).

Poststructuralism is criticised for promoting "attacks on reason and truth" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008: 16). Whilst this can be problematic, poststructuralism does encourage reflexivity and acknowledgement that researchers are writing at a specific point in time which is subject to change (Richardson and St Pierre, 2008). These reflective practices enable the consideration of topics from "multiple perspectives and so produce rich, nuanced, coherent, and contextualised research" (Mills and Denison, 2014: 224). Such methods may involve "verisimilitude, emotionality, personal responsibility, an ethic of caring, political praxis, multivoiced texts, and dialogues with subjects" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008: 16). Arguably, it is the challenge to the taken-

for-granted practices and ‘truths’ which develop understanding that appeal to researchers adopting a poststructuralist perspective (Denison and Avner, 2011). In relation to validation and truth, the poststructuralist perspective of truth as multiple and subjective offers researchers’ avenues to “always consider their topic from multiple perspectives and to produce rich, nuanced, coherent, reflexive, and contextualised research knowledge” (Avner, Denison and Markula, 2019: 48). Therefore, by adopting a poststructuralist approach the analysis process works towards highlighting structural criticisms to “expose a more accurate account of phenomena” (Taylor, 2014: 185). In sports coaching, this problematising part of poststructuralist research purposefully seeks to (re)politicise taken-for-granted coaching ‘truths’ in search of developing more effective coaching practices (Denison and Avner, 2011; Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014; Avner, Denison and Markula, 2019), which could equally be applied to coach education practices to expose dominant discourses of emotional features of coach education. Indeed, as scholars suggest, there is a need to understand emotions socio-culturally, institutionally and politically within coaching practice (Hargreaves, 1998; Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac et al., 2013) and poststructuralism offers a means by which to begin to undertake this in the context of coach education. The paucity of poststructuralist research addressing coach educators and emotions is an area the current study will address and offers the chance to provide new insights for developing effective practice (Denison and Avner, 2011) and work towards de-familiarising existing practices (Nelson, Groom and Potrac, 2014).

2.4. Interpretivist investigations of coach education

An additional paradigm which examines the social world of coach education is interpretivism which “attempts to understand phenomena through accessing the meanings that participants assign to them” (Hastie and Hay, 2012: 80). The

interpretivist paradigm subscribes to a relativist ontology (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008), which suggests "social reality is humanly constructed and shaped in ways that make it fluid and multifaceted" (Sparkes and Smith, 2014: 11). Like poststructuralists, interpretivist researchers believe realities and truths are multiple (Sparkes, 1992; Markula and Silk, 2011; Creswell, 2012). Positivist researchers differ in this view to interpretivists and poststructuralists as they believe in a reality that is out there to be measured via scientific method (Mallett and Tinning, 2014).

Interpretivism adopts a subjective epistemology where "there can be no separation of mind and object since the two are inextricably linked together, the knower and the process of knowing cannot be separated from what is known, and facts cannot be separated from values" (Sparkes, 1992: 27). This contrasts with the positivist epistemology where "the investigator and the external world (or what could be discovered) are totally separate" (Howell, 2013: 52). Realities for interpretivists are co-constructed between the researcher and the participants and shaped via individual experience (Markula and Silk, 2011; Creswell, 2012). A key difference of interpretivist research is that truth and reality are found in comparison to poststructuralist research where they are produced through discourse (Markula and Silk, 2011). In interpretivism truth and reality are said to exist through the lived experiences and interaction of the individual (Markula and Silk, 2011; Creswell, 2012), with research findings created through a process of interaction between knower and known (Sparkes and Smith, 2014), In poststructuralist research, however, understanding of the social world is situated in dynamic and fluid power relationships that are unavoidably political (Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014). Methodologically, interpretivism advocates an ideographic approach (Burrell and Morgan, 1987; Sparkes, 1992) (i.e., case studies, narratives and autoethnographies), where effort is directed towards understanding the meaning of subjective and unique occurrences of a small number of individuals or situations (Mallett and Tinning, 2014) and employs inductive research strategies

(Creswell, 2012; Hastie and Hay, 2012) (e.g., comparative analysis) to generate categories and explanations where the researcher undertakes a “deep examination of the details and specifics of the data to discover important patterns, themes and interrelationships” (Hastie and Glotova, 2012: 319).

Following the criticisms of positivist enquiry into coach education, Jones and Wallace (2005) have called for a knowledge-for-understanding approach to the complexities of coaching to develop a greater appreciation of the pathos and ambiguity in coaching, and by association the same could be equated to coach education. It is essential that coach education takes “a better account of the interactive, social nature of coaching, inclusive of agential and structural factors, if it is to have a greater degree of relevancy for and impact upon, practitioners” (Bowes and Jones, 2006: 241). The positioning of coaching by scholars as a negotiated, relational and contested activity abound with micropolitical action indicates that directing attention towards interactions between individuals and groups can establish a better understanding and critical knowledge of the complexities and unknowns in coaching and coach education (Potrac and Jones, 2009a; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017).

The interpretivist approach has offered more reality grounded insight into the impact and nuances of coach education. For example, Jones, Armour and Potrac (2003) used an interactionist framework to examine the construction of coaching knowledge via a case study of an elite level football coach. They employed a life-story approach, collecting data via five informal interviews, around coaching philosophy, entering coaching, career, mentors, current coach education programmes and perceptions around accumulation of knowledge. The data were analysed via inductive processes. The professional soccer coach, Steve, perceived that certified coach education programmes provided organisational information but were of limited practical value and was critical of the prescriptive, direct way of playing. He ascribed

his coaching knowledge mainly to learning from others and through past experiences. He emphasised the importance of being yourself and placing your own personal spin on coaching as well as adapting to the players you are working with. The study hints that there is more complexity to the knowledge development of coaches than the rationalistic approaches that coach education programmes typically offer, and calls for a greater consideration of wider contextual and cultural influences that may contribute to the learning that coaches may encounter (Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2003).

Subsequent studies have echoed the limited contribution to knowledge of coach education programmes with coaches perceiving courses to be of low value and importance (Irwin, Hanton and Kerwin, 2004) and lacking application to the realities encountered in daily practice (Chesterfield et al., 2010; Lewis, Roberts and Andrews, 2018). However, exceptions to this apply where courses have contributed to technical and practical aspects of novice coaches' understanding (Irwin, Hanton and Kerwin, 2004; Lemyre, Trudel and Durand-Bush, 2007; Nash and Sproule, 2011). The interactional opportunities with other coaches on more advanced level courses have also been acknowledged to offer value and contribute to learning (Wright, Trudel and Culver, 2007). Coach education courses as a source of learning are reportedly varied from individual to individual and somewhat idiosyncratic (Wright, Trudel and Culver, 2007; Werthner and Trudel, 2009; Callary, Werthner and Trudel, 2012).

Several studies situated within the interpretivist paradigm have used theories to inform the interpretive process and explore how coach learners construct their social realities, meanings and actions following attendance at coach education courses. Goffman's (1959) presentation of the self and the dialectic of socialisation (Schempp and Graber, 1992) were used in Chesterfield, Potrac and Jones's (2010) analysis following six UK soccer coaches' completion of a UEFA A license coach education course. The analysis revealed the coach learners engaged in impression

management and studentship by presenting a 'front' to convince the coach educators that they appeared to be adhering to the expected behaviours and guidelines to pass the course, before reverting back to their previously learnt and developed coaching. For the coaches, the course content and methods used by the coach educators conflicted with their existing beliefs, methods and experience of coaching and "were considered to be somewhat out of kilter with the respondent coaches' understanding of their daily realities" (Chesterfield, Potrac and Jones, 2010: 306) and thus limited the impact of the course on learning. Theories around learning, identity construction and socially and contextual situated practices (Lave and Wenger; 1991; 1996; Lave, 2009; Lave and Packer, 2008) were drawn upon by Watts and Cushion (2017) in their analysis of professional football coaches' longitudinal experiences of learning from coach education. These theories, they argued, enhanced understanding of how the "reality of knowledge provided by formal coach education is not readily applicable in other contexts" (Watts and Cushion, 2017: 86). The theorising of Bourdieu (1977) provided specific insights into the very limited impact of coach education across all levels for women football coaches with Lewis, Roberts and Andrews (2018) highlighting the struggles for acceptance and gender stereotyping encountered on courses.

The experiences of coaches on coach education courses have been further explored retrospectively via interviews and sought to inform and offer recommendations for practice. An empirical investigation of coaches' experiences across a range of UK coach education courses drew upon educational theorising to understand that often what coach educators prioritised as important for the development of coaches, and what coaches want and need from coach education provision, is mismatched (Nelson, Cushion and Potrac, 2013). This led to a more detailed understanding of the desired qualities of effective coach educators and how interactions shaped the experiences of coach learners who wanted active learning

that involved them and provided opportunities to learn from each other. In furthering understanding of the impact of coach education, the importance of the coach learner's past experiences (biographies and cognitive structures) was highlighted in the work of Leduc, Culver and Werthner (2012) who used educational learning theories of Jarvis (2006; 2007; 2009) and Moon (2001; 2004) to understand coaches' perceptions of two National Canadian Coaching Programme modules. Whilst some coaches did not change their coaching practice, those who changed elements of their practice had to "experience a situation which they can transform cognitively, emotively and also practically" (Leduc, Culver and Werthner, 2012: 147) otherwise the impact on practice was limited. The work of Callary, Werthner and Trudel (2012) echoed the importance of establishing a meaningful connection between the information in the situation and the coach's biography for coach education courses to influence subsequent learning and coaching practices.

Exploring coaches' experiences of a Level 4 elite cricket coaching course through the lens of social theory Townsend and Cushion (2017) offered an alternative picture to coach learners portrayed as docile bodies in Piggott's (2012) work; instead, they revealed coaches as active social beings in the (re)production of knowledge on coach education courses. The application of a Bourdieusian framework highlighted the doxic system between "an accepted model of coach education with a singular and prescribed body of knowledge and a strong underlying sporting culture and individuals hierarchically placed within it" (Townsend and Cushion, 2017: 1). This demonstrated how coaches' experiences and learning are varied and as much determined by an individual's own status within the culture of cricket as it is by the coach educators and coach learners' on the course. This highlighted the arbitrary culture and contested structure present in cricket coach education and the nuanced nature of culture on interaction within courses (Townsend and Cushion, 2017).

Whilst many studies draw on the retrospective reflections of coaches' experiences on coach education courses, attention has also been given to coaches' perspectives during the course. McCullick, Belcher and Schempp (2005) examined 26 participants' and five coach educators' perceptions of a 10-day coaching and sport instructor certification (CSIC) programme. The participants' perceptions and experiences of the programme were gathered via group interviews and journals at the conclusion of each day of the ten-day course. The coach educators commented on their perception of student acceptance of the information presented and the success of the day. An investigator observed the participation levels of the coaches. All forms of data were subjected to inductive analysis and revealed that participants desired logical progression with instructor-student interaction, and that sufficient time be given to the application of pedagogical knowledge from a knowledgeable educator (McCullick, Belcher and Schempp, 2005). A longitudinal case study of two coaches before, during and after attendance at courses has extended insights into the impact of coach education on coach learning (Stodter and Cushion, 2014). Analysis drawing upon varied educational and cultural learning theories (e.g., Jarvis, 2006; Moon, 2004; Hodkinson et al., 2007; 2008) highlighted that not only do biography and interactional encounters shape coaches' learning whilst on a coach education course, the cultural complexities when a coach returns to their coaching environment can also contribute to the degree of change, if any, in coach learning, knowledge and practice (Stodter and Cushion, 2014). Another longitudinal exploration of coaches' experiences of an elite level coach education programme reinforced the problematic nature of competency-based coach education where coaches superficially engaged with course content which subsequently made little impact on their practices (Jones and Allison, 2014).

The impact across a Level 1 coaching course adopting a games-based approach to challenge novice coaches' previously experiential adopted and

behaviourist informed dispositions and coaching theory offered a different insight (Webb and Leeder, 2021). Using Hodkinson and colleagues' (2008) cultural learning theory and metaphor of learning conceptual framework as a theoretical lens, the analysis indicated a modification of coaches' dispositions during and, to some extent, after, the course leading to the maintenance and uptake of the learning culture within the Level 1 of game-based approaches and constructionist assumptions. This highlighted those specific social practices within a Level 1 coach education course that can influence learning through dispositional changes, although further research is needed to establish if this translates into practice beyond the immediacy of completing the course (Webb and Leeder, 2021).

To address and respond to criticisms of the gap between theory and practice of coach education courses (Jones and Wallace, 2005), various theoretical approaches have been adopted to inform course design and address the level of impact on learning. Employing an interpretivist approach using in-depth semi-structured interviews of a reflexive nature and open-ended questions, Cassidy, Potrac and McKenzie (2006) examined eight male rugby football union coaches' perceptions of a small-scale social science theory-based coach education programme (CoDe). An inductive analysis of the data revealed that the coaches valued the knowledge gained on learning preferences, as it provided a new perspective from which to critically consider the relationship between their delivery methods and athlete learning. The introduction of critical reflection was valued and felt to enhance their understanding of the coaching process and was different to the technical and performance aspects focused upon in previous coach education courses. Finally, the opportunity to talk and interact with other coaches was highlighted as beneficial in developing knowledge and practical strategies if it was effectively mediated and facilitated to be meaningful to all. Cassidy, Potrac and McKenzie (2006) proposed that, to some extent, the CoDe represented a coaching community of practice (Wenger, 1998)

where facilitated discussion, interaction and negotiation of meaning for the group of coaches, helped to develop knowledge and expertise.

Other interpretivist informed coach education or development programmes have centred around reflective practice (Knowles et al., 2001; Knowles, Borrie and Telfer, 2005; Kuklick and Kasales, 2019; Voldby and Klein-Døssing, 2020; Stodter, Cope and Townsend, 2021), problem-based learning (Jones and Turner, 2006), and communities of practice (Culver and Trudel, 2006; Jones, Morgan and Harris, 2012; Stoszkowski and Collins, 2014). These studies have provided further support towards how learning on coach education courses is partly dependent on the individual and the coaching context (Jones, Morgan and Harris, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2014) and is multi-faceted and complex (Jones and Turner, 2006). Clearly the approach by scholars to offer alternative and theory-based informed approaches to coach education have helped better engage coaches more fully in the process of learning as an experiential, dynamic and relevant experience (Morgan et al., 2013). This has provided important insights and understanding of coach education and the learner but given limited consideration to the coach educator.

Whilst the research outlined above has built upon understanding how courses may impact and change coaching behaviour (or not), and offered potentially theoretically informed solutions, attention has remained focused on the coaches in the coach education courses (Callary and Gearity, 2020). Despite being the 'public face' on courses (McQuade and Nash, 2015), little is known or understood of coach educators' practices. The literature exploring coaches' experiences and involvement within coach education has expanded, providing welcome insights and understanding, but that of the coach educator has remained elusive, with a clear paucity of research considering the experiences, interactions and practices of coach educators (Jones and Wallace, 2005; Cushion, Griffiths and Armour, 2019). Indeed, scholars have increasingly called for attention to be paid towards the emotions of

coach educators (Jones et al., 2011b; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017), with little still known and understood of their thoughts, feelings and actions (Cushion, Griffiths and Armour, 2019).

The work of Cushion, Griffiths and Armour (2019) sought to make visible the practices of and offer an insight to the social realities of working as a coach educator. The success or failure of the coach educator's work was contested within a field of power and struggles. This involved coach educators playing a symbolic and relational game where their work encompassed contextualised social practices situated within a complex web of power relations and interactions specific to the club that they were working within at that time. Indeed, the coach educators alluded to aligning with the dominant coaching ideology within the context to secure their position and role and negotiated their way between conflicting beliefs and values. The study highlighted that the coach educator's role was part of a broader relational system with coaching practices structured by and of the context (Cushion, Griffiths and Armour, 2019).

An area of focus in the recent empirical work of Watts, Cushion and Cale (2021) explored 16 coach educators from a range of sports journeys, perceptions and understandings of learning and coach education. Drawing upon the theorisations of Bourdieu, analysis revealed how coach educators' perceptions and beliefs were a product of taken for granted and doxic practices in their previous experiences as athletes, coaches and learners as well as through personal experiences of coach education and formal tutor training. The coach educators' own early athletic experiences and as recipients of coaching influenced and legitimated the way they thought about and understood coaching, learning and practice. At the same time these experiences offered only a moderate level of understanding of pedagogy and learning to coach educators. The coach educators recognised conflict between their own contextualised experiences and the decontextualised and artificial content encountered previously as coach learners on courses themselves, but accepted

unquestioningly the methods, pedagogies and practices adopted in their coaching and coach educator roles. A key finding was the lack of opportunity and ability to reflect upon and articulate the difference between real world coaching and their current practices as coach educators. Indeed, the coach educators were not required to think or provide voice or independence to their past experiences, creating "a barrier to the development of their knowledge and understanding" (Watts, Cushion and Cale, 2021: 9). Central to the coach educator role was the importance of a knowledge of learning, although this primarily was contradictory, limited and confused with reference to learning styles as the orthodox discourse identified from the coach educators' responses. Collectively the coach educators' accounts relating to effective features of practice in coach education included delivery that was holistic, player- or athlete-centred and involved group, in-game learning and question and answer formats that "represented an organised assemblage of thoughts and practices that can be characterised as a dominant system of meanings, or an ideology" (Watts, Cushion and Cale, 2021: 10).

Essentially, coach educators' practices and understanding of learning were normalised and legitimised via selective agency of cultural and traditional norms and institutional directives upholding the doxa of the coach education arena. The coach educators' understandings of learning and coaching were embedded within previous experiences of coaching, coach education and tutor training and at times tertiary education. The study began to encourage coach educators to engage in critical reflexivity of their own practices (Watts, Cushion and Cale, 2021). The learning pathways of Brazilian surf coach developers in the work of Brasil et al., (2018) revealed how becoming a coach developer involved a lifetime of socialisation processes. These processes of socialisation occurred in childhood, as a surfer, through career-based experience as a coach and accumulation of relevant qualifications and their developing professional identity. This socialisation process

connected to sociocultural links, social relations and authentic participation in the sport further suggests that coach educator understanding, and learning is informed by specific socio-cultural and contextual factors.

Exploration of FA coach educators' subjective experiences of their working role offered critical insights of coach educators' behaviour, interaction and experiences (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). Through an interpretive approach drawing upon the works of Keltchermans (1996), Keltchermans and Ballet, (2002a; 2005; 2009a), Goffman (1959) and Hochschild (2003 [1983]) as sensemaking frameworks, the dramaturgical, relational and micropolitical aspects of coach education were revealed as the coach educators described how they managed their interactions. The coach educators prioritised the construction and maintenance of a professional persona in which they invested cognitively and emotionally when interacting with managers and to secure positive feedback from coach learners and colleagues. The coach educators actively managed their interactions and relationships with coach learners and colleagues by generating certain situationally appropriate emotional displays and skilled social performances to uphold the impression they gave. These aspects related to role fulfilment and upholding reputation and were perceived as important by the coach educators and conducive to future employment and career progression. This was by no means an easy achievement and "required them to critically consider what they did, when, how and why in their efforts to influence the thoughts, feelings and actions of others" (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019: 371). The current study seeks to build upon the empirical coach educator work of Allanson, Potrac and Nelson (2019) which used a principally male sample confined to football by extending the line of inquiry to explore female netball coach educators. It intends to significantly contribute to the existing knowledge base that hints at the emotionally laden nature of coach education by focusing in detail on the emotional nature of coach educators' pedagogical interactions and work.

Interpretivist approaches have received multiple criticisms, based upon their ontological assumption, which orientates a subjective approach towards conducting research where the researcher's perspective cannot be isolated. One problematic aspect of the interpretivist approach is that it can result in truths that may change because their social construction and meaning are linked to the participants of the study (Macdonald et al., 2002). Subsequently this leads to further criticism for there being "no way of verifying their truth statements" (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003: 12). The interpretivist approach is further challenged for favouring individualism and agency and "focusing too narrowly on subjective experience" (Markula and Silk, 2011: 38). Perhaps one of the main criticisms of interpretivism is the dispute that individuals are free to create their own meanings and that interpretivism neglects to recognise the sociocultural, political and historical influences on knowledge and reality (Markula, Grant and Denison, 2001). In refuting these criticisms, whilst meaning making in interpretivist research is individual, it recognises that the interpretation of the social world by the individual is also influenced by a range of cultural, social and political factors (Howell, 2013; Potrac, Jones and Nelson, 2014) and can provide insights and perspectives from individuals that would otherwise remain unknown (Macdonald et al., 2002).

Further concerns have also been raised about the lack of generalisability of findings in interpretivist studies, due to the use of a small number of participants (Hammersley, 2013) and the context bound nature of the research (Guba and Lincoln, 1982). Questions have also been raised about the capacity of interviews to provide accurate representations of either the self or of the world (Hammersley, 2013). Despite this, supporters of the interpretivist approach argue that qualitative methodologies do recognise that the researcher is implicated in the research process (Willig, 2001). It is also acknowledged by Sparkes (1992) that as the researcher is central, validity becomes attached to the personal and interpersonal as opposed to

methodological. Interpretivists contend that some forms of generalisations can be made in qualitative research (Collingridge and Gantt, 2008; Delmar, 2010). It is possible for interpretivists to make, as Williams (2000) proposes, *moderatum* generalisations where the researcher develops an understanding of cultural consistency from the social world under investigation and recognisable features emerge which form generalisations.

Although cognisant of the criticisms of subjective experience associated with interpretivist meaning making and agency, it would be prudent for coach education scholars to give greater consideration towards how socio-political realities of coach education impact on the thoughts, feelings and actions of key stakeholders (including coach educators) engaged in this pedagogical activity. It is proposed that emotions are produced in a socio-cultural context (Zembylas, 2005c; Potrac et al., 2013) and that "experience, behaviour, interaction, and organization are connected to the mobilization and expression of emotions" (Turner and Stets, 2007: 1). Research is yet to explore in detail the emotional aspects of other actors involved in coach education, most noticeably coach educators, and such an approach may be capable of shedding light on coach educators' pedagogical practices and experiences (Jones et al., 2011a) and highlight the centrality of emotion in the social relationships and interactions of coach educators' practices (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Indeed, it is time to remove emotion from the "ontological basement" of inquiry (Liston and Garrison, 2004: 4). Thus, exploring the emotional experiences and practices of coach educators has the potential of illuminating the emotional nature and realities of coach educator work. This study intends to provide a significant step towards examining the emotions of coach educators in this manner.

2.5. A call for an emotional understanding of coach education

Scholars have increasingly called for attention to be directed towards the study of emotions in sports coaching and coach education (Potrac, et al., 2013; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017), yet explicit consideration of the emotional side of sports coaching continues to be largely missing (Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). The absence of an understanding of the emotional nature of coaching has resulted in the conveyance of primarily inhumane accounts of coaching and the portrayal of coaching as an asocial practice (Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2004; Potrac et al., 2012; 2013; 2017). The study of emotions can contribute by adding to the predominantly cognitive-focused understandings of social interaction in coaching and, indeed, coach education (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). The consideration and understanding of emotion in the interactions and relationships of coach education can challenge the representations of coach education as a rational, prescriptive, calculated approach in which the participants are devoid of binds, influences, challenges and emotions encountered in interactions and relationships with others (Potrac, et al., 2013).

The literature reviewed within this section will present an overview of the empirical studies that have explored emotions in coaching. The initial section overviews the emotional experiences of coaches, coach educators and other workers. The following sections then review the displaying of emotions, emotional rules, emotion management strategies and finally the wider costs and benefits of emotion work of these groups. Whilst considerable attention has been paid to the psychological study of emotions and cognitive based understanding, this literature falls beyond the scope of the current study which focuses upon the centrality of emotion in social relations and interactions (Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Consequently, the parameters of this review of literature are limited to studies that

have conducted sociological investigations of emotion in coaching, coach education and other work roles.

2.5.1. Emotional experiences, identities and social relationships

The knowledge and understanding of emotions in sports coaching is limited with interpretivist research using narrated stories (Douglas and Carless, 2017; Magill, et al., 2017; Martinelli, Day and Lowry, 2017; McNeill, Durand-Bush and Lemyre, 2017; Potrac et al., 2017), creative fiction (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016) and autoethnographic accounts (Potrac et al., 2012) to offer insights into the emotional experiences of athletes and coaches. An absence of concerted focus on emotions in coach education is even more apparent with very limited narrative-biographical accounts of coach educators offering a glimmer into the emotional side of coach educators' work (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019).

The empirical research in the area to date reveals that, for athletes, emotions including anxiety, fear, anger, frustration and pride were experienced by professional female footballers during video-based feedback sessions (Magill et al., 2017). Similar emotions of anger, frustration, joy, disappointment and happiness were experienced by the head-coach of a semi-professional football team within the pedagogical practices and interactions in his work (Nelson et al., 2013). The exploration of embodied emotional experiences within the coaching role unveils a variety of emotions (e.g., enjoyment, pride, excitement, frustration, guilt, sadness, anxiety) that are elicited through the challenges, dilemmas and rewards that an amateur women's football coach encountered in their interactions with various contextual stakeholders (e.g., parents, sponsors, club officials) (Potrac et al., 2017). The experiencing of emotions connected to a coach's interactions are also evident in the relational interpretations of a coach's (Chris) narrative story, where emotional and embodied experiences of anxiety, frustration, fear, guilt and excitement formed part of the social

relations and interdependencies (e.g., anxiety in terms of the ability to deliver the coaching sessions in a specific way) within the coach's work at a grass-roots football club (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). Emotions of anger, jealousy and guilt were exposed in a coach's emotional realities of relationships with fellow coaches within performance level football coaching (Potrac, et al., 2012). In coach education, the experiencing of anger, frustration and happiness have been hinted at in FA coach educators' work (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). The coach educators placed importance on performing well in their roles of coach educators and in front of colleagues through the management of emotional displays which included hiding anger and frustration and showing happiness. They also hinted at the reputational damage when emotions of anger were displayed to a manager (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019).

The only emotion to be explored as a stand-alone emotion specifically to date is that of guilt in the coach-athlete relationship where Matinelli, Day and Lowry (2017) explored coaches' guilt in the specific context of athletic injury. The consideration of emotion in coaching has revealed a plethora of emotions experienced by coaches in their interactions more broadly, yet very few studies have focused upon examining in-depth specific emotions (Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Indeed, there is a need to address this gap in the literature by considering how specific emotions of joy, frustration, anxiety and anger are produced and enacted through coaches' interactions and social relations (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac et al., 2013). Therefore, exploring specific emotions may have much to offer in enhancing the knowledge and understanding of emotions in coaching and coach education work. The embryonic research exploring emotion in sports coaching not only indicates the multi-faceted emotions that athletes and coaches experience but contributes significantly to providing a broader understanding that emotions are linked to identity and formed within social, contextual and power-based relationships. The relational

nature of emotions is highlighted in the sports coaching literature where emotions experienced were inherently linked to identity and the social and contextual relationships of the situation (Potrac et al., 2012; Douglas and Carless, 2017; Magill et al., 2017; Potrac et al., 2017).

The embodied emotions experienced were also related to the coach's biography, past emotional experiences and anticipated future which were imperative to the coach's sense-making of the present and indicative of the behaviour, choices and actions he made (Potrac et al., 2017). Similar use of previous emotional experiences to shape and inform a coach's emotional reactions and behaviours with players was evident in Nelson et al.'s (2013) explorations of emotion practices of interactions and pedagogical practices of a head-coach of a semi-professional football team. Nelson et al., (2013) offered further insight into emotion practices in coaching through the unpacking of critical reflection of a coach's own previous and vicarious experiences via Denzin's (1984) theorising on emotional understanding. In these moments the coach interpreted and understood the emotions and behaviours displayed by the players through reflecting upon his own emotional experiences as a player to inform his displayed emotions and subsequent behaviours. Furthermore, it is suggested by drawing upon Denzin's (1984) theorising of reflective emotional consciousness and emotional temporality that the coach's previous emotional experiences as a player, and how he wished to portray himself to the players, shaped his coaching practices and elevated the awareness of his own emotional displays (Nelson et al., 2013).

Attention has begun to be paid towards emotion within the wider professions of sports workers in exploration of the emotion management of professional sport medicine and science staff (Hings et al., 2018). It has hinted that professional practice in elite sport is bound with emotional labour and interpreted that their emotional labour enactment was influenced by context, culture and the individual practitioner (Hings et

al., 2018). The work of Allanson, Potrac and Nelson (2019), briefly touched upon coach educator's engagement in emotion work as part of an exploration of impression management in the creation and maintenance of a coach educator's desired professional identity. On numerous occasions the coach educators described actively presenting a front to hide their anxiety, frustration or anger. The coach educators demonstrated an awareness of the importance of this in reinforcing and advancing their reputation and future work roles. As one coach educator's accounts highlighted, the implications of breaking dominant occupational display rules when he displayed anger to a manager impacted longer-term on his relationship and allocation of work. Beyond this, coach educator's emotional experiences remain unknown and under-researched.

Despite the portrayal of coach education as a mainly emotionally absent endeavour, other settings are more advanced in their acknowledgement of the emotional nature of their work. Many elements of teaching involve emotional practices and teaching has been positioned increasingly as an emotional undertaking (Hargreaves; 1998; Hargreaves, 2000; Day, 2004; Keltchermans, 2005), which "by design or default" is inextricably emotional (Hargreaves, 2001a: 1057). The work of Hargreaves (1998) highlighted the need for sociological and political avenues of analysis to develop an understanding of emotion in a school context alongside an appreciation of how emotions are embedded and expressed in relationships that a teacher encounters there (Hargreaves, 1998). Avenues of empirical inquiry in the mainstream literature on teaching and the relationship of emotions (Hargreaves, 1998; Hargreaves, 2000; Zembylas, 2004) have offered insight into the emotional practice of teaching (Hargreaves, 1998). Through a social and organisational analysis of emotions based in the theoretical concepts of emotional understanding (Denzin, 1984) and emotional geographies (Hargreaves, 2001b) the emotional episodes of teachers' interactions with students (Hargreaves, 1998; 2000),

colleagues (2001b) and parents (2001a) have been revealed as a key part of teacher's daily work of an emotional nature.

Studies of emotional experiences of novice pre-service high school teachers first placement practices have indicated positive and negative emotional experiences that adapted in response to the gaining of experience of personal and professional geographies, developing identity and interactions with others (Heryatun and Septiana, 2020). Similar experiences of pre-service PE teachers' initial teaching practice highlighted that they experienced happiness, frustration, anxiety, fear and disappointment. These emotions influenced their teaching and altered in intensity in response to the circumstances and interactions with colleagues over the period of the placement (González-Calvo, Varea and Martinez-Álvarez, 2020). The importance of emotional understanding and emotion geographies in encounters and interactions with colleagues as part of a professional community are also an inherent part of teaching, and shape teachers' emotions and emotion strategies used to develop professionally and work effectively with others (Liu, 2016). The development of new pedagogical approaches is also emotionally laden with positive and negative emotions, including enthusiasm, happiness, frustration and resentment experienced by higher education lecturers in the transition to online teaching (Naylor and Nyanjom, 2021).

The educational literature has also furthered understanding of the role of emotions in the construction of relationships with children and colleagues through poststructuralist research (Zembylas, 2005c). In a three-year ethnographic study, Zembylas (2002) drew upon the historicity of emotional experiences to further explore emotions in science teacher's work and professional development. This revealed how the range of emotions experienced in science teaching were individually and historically informed; that is, emotions were used in relationships with others and that the emotions experienced were culturally, politically, and socially informed via the

classroom and school setting. For example, excitement expressed with the students in the teaching of science at an intrapersonal level, shaped pedagogical decisions. At an interpersonal level, the teacher's excitement intensified in response to her students' excitement, but also when students were frustrated the teacher's own disappointment led to her making decisions on her pedagogical approach, demonstrating how interactions with people and events socially inform the development of certain emotions (Zembylas, 2002). The teacher also experienced frustration early on in her career regarding her pedagogical approach to the articulation of emotions in science teaching as the school culture, colleagues and emotional rules challenged and restricted her values and beliefs in a socio-political context (Zembylas, 2002).

Building further on the centrality of emotion in science teaching, Zembylas' (2004) work pointed towards the emotional complexity of teaching, and the evaluative, relational and political features of emotion that are intertwined in the context within which teaching takes place. More specifically, the teacher's emotions were constituted socially and relationally through the evaluations of their own individual world and values as well as constructed through and in consideration of relationships with pupils, teaching context, and previous experiences as well as future interactions. The emotions in teaching were also constituted via political aspects of the school context where constraints, conventions and policies shaped teaching and were based on what the teacher understood to be the emotional rules (Zembylas, 2004). The work of Zembylas (2005b) also looks at how emotion work is enacted in different education contexts but via a post-structuralist framework offering an understanding of how culture, power and ideology create emotional discourses and how teachers participate by adopting or resisting these discourses. The consideration of emotion in sports coaching and coach education from a poststructuralist perspective may offer new insights into the emotional practices via examination of discourse. To date little

is known of the social and cultural elements of coach educators' work except for Allanson, Potrac and Nelson's (2019) recent empirical work and even less is understood of the political nature of coach educator work. Clearly the emotional undertakings of teaching as a pedagogical practice suggests that there may be much to be learnt about the emotional practices of coach educators when delivering coach education courses.

2.5.2. The hiding and showing of emotions

Within the limited exploration of emotional practices in sports coaching, athletes and coaches have revealed that their work involved the hiding or showing of situationally expected emotions. The fictional narratives of elite female footballers' emotional experiences of participation in video-based feedback sessions offered a valuable insight into the players hiding of anger, frustration, and pride in their pedagogically based encounters with coaches and teammates (Magill et al., 2017). The selective suppression and presentation of certain emotions is also apparent in coaches' daily work, where a semi-professional football coach (Zach) showed a positive and upbeat persona to his players and hid from them the apathy he was experiencing in relation to the delivery of a training session (Nelson et al., 2013). Other emotions concealed in the work of an amateur women's football coach were anger and frustration, with the display of smiles a frequent offering in the coach's interactions and encounters with various players, parents and administrators in the club (Potrac et al., 2017).

Echoing similar emotion displays, the concealment of anxiety and frustration and displays of positivity by a grassroots football coach were captured in creative fictional form in relation to the adoption and implementation of a FA preferred pedagogical delivery style (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). The displaying or hiding of situationally appropriate emotions based upon understanding and perceptions of display rules perceived to be externally imposed, or deemed as

obligated to follow, has also been highlighted in coaches experiencing burnout in their role (McNeill, Durand-Bush and Lemyre, 2017). The only consideration of emotion display within coach educators working practices indicated that their understanding of situational display rules as appropriate to their role informed which specific emotions should be hidden or shown, when and how to coach educators, coach learners and other colleagues (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). This suggests that display rules are guiding emotions in sports work but not much is known about them in detail.

The athletes' and coaches' display or concealment of emotions were informed via their understanding of situationally appropriate and expected emotion displays based upon the perceived display rules (i.e. when and how overt expressions of emotions in particular situations are to occur (Hochschild, 2000 [1983]) which they deemed they would be judged against by key others such as players (Nelson et al., 2013; Magill et al., 2017; Potrac et al., 2017), coach mentors (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016), and wider stakeholders (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Potrac et al., 2017) in the workplace. Overall, while a broader examination of emotion experiences in coaching has offered an initial insight into the emotions that football coaches' and players display and hide, this has yet to be addressed in the practices of coach educators. Although the existing literature hints at display rules informed by perceived expectations of emotional display through social interaction and in relation to relevant others, scholars are also yet to turn attention to the specific emotion display rules which guide sports practitioners' work. This is thus an area that is worthy of attention by coaches, athletes and coach educators.

Coaching literature has started to consider emotions but has not explored emotional rules like the wider literature on education and other specific occupations have. Educational scholars have suggested that teachers' emotional displays are governed by their understanding of emotion display rules. In teaching, the rules that

convey expected emotional displays broadly relate to maintaining positive emotions (Yin and Lee, 2012; Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018) and have been specifically linked to those that are associated with caring (Isenbarger and Zembylas, 2006) and teachers showing enthusiasm for students and passion for the subject (Winograd, 2003; Yin and Lee, 2012). A further rule linked to the understanding that teachers should remain calm and give the impression of being in control (Cowie, 2003), is an emotion display rule echoed by firefighters (Scott and Myers, 2005).

Conversely negative emotions that teachers are not expected to display, and associated rules included the hiding of negative emotions (Isenbarger and Zembylas, 2006; Yin and Lee, 2012), not conveying boredom (Kitching, 2009) and not displaying anger towards students (Cowie, 2003; Winograd, 2003; Sutton, 2005). The avoidance of displaying negative emotions was echoed in the emotion rules relating to the work of firefighters (Scott and Myers, 2005). For some roles displays of anger were the norm and encouraged, for example bill collectors (Sutton, 1991). General emotion display rules across a range of organisational settings also related to expressing emotions professionally by demonstrating control over both negative and positive emotional displays (Kramer and Hess, 2002). The rules relating to sports coaching and coach education and emotions to be displayed or hidden are yet to be explored.

A further understanding of the emotional displays required from teachers was that of neutrality (Zembylas, 2005b) and to not display any form of individual expression (Taylor, 2020). This is echoed in the emotion display requirements of GP receptionists (Ward and McMurray, 2011) and social control agents (e.g., police, door and prison workers) (Ward, McMurray and Sutcliffe, 2019). In addition to neutrality, rules relating to the degree of emotion display indicated that showing extreme emotions, particularly linked to negative emotions, were not expected (Winograd, 2003). Displays of strong emotions, either positive or negative, would be deemed unprofessional (Zembylas, 2005b), and displays of appropriate levels of emotional

intensity also guide the emotion display of firefighters (Scott and Myers, 2005). This indicates that not only are teachers and other workers guided in which emotions to display or express, but in some instances the intensity of emotion may also be informed as well. This is an under-researched area within sports coaching and specifically in relation to coach education.

That differential emotion rules are based upon who the person interacts with have also been hinted at in the area of service work and emotion display rules, particularly in relation to displays of anger and happiness, which vary depending upon the recipient of the emotional displays and cultural context (Grandey et al., 2010). Varied emotion rules were also evident in relation to nurses' work with physicians, other staff members, and patients, and were guided by the norms of the situation and the dominant subgroup (Morgan and Krone, 2001). The emotion rules in teaching were proposed by Zembylas (2005b) as historically contingent, and reflective of the power relations in which they are rooted. In teaching this creates a delineated zone where certain emotions are permitted and others were not (Zembylas, 2002). Coaching is yet to consider the specific emotion rules that govern practitioners' work, including the emotion rules that coach educators understand to guide their pedagogical delivery of their courses and shape their interactions with coach learners and others.

A limited amount of empirical work exists in the educational and wider occupational literature on how display rules are learnt, with research suggesting that, in some roles, organisations convey formal display rules and provide training on how to enact particular emotional labour techniques, for example in the work of debt collectors (Sutton, 1991; Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987), and flight attendants (Hochschild, 1983). A limited number of studies have sought to understand how individuals learn the emotion rules in their respective roles in the absence of training and in more informal ways. Existing research indicates that, irrespective of occupation, the rules

are learnt upon entry to the specific role as there is no explicit set of organisations rules or provision of training in the case of debt collectors (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987), bar staff (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005), beauty therapists (Sharma and Black, 2001), science teachers (Zembylas, 2005b) and firefighters (Scott and Myers, 2005).

The learning of appropriate emotion displays through socialisation whilst in the job role and via trial and error was evident across roles (Henderson, 2001; Seymour and Sandiford, 2005; Zembylas, 2005c; Taylor, 2020). The socialisation occurred in learning from colleagues (Henderson, 2001; Seymour and Sandiford, 2005; Scott and Myers, 2005; Zembylas, 2005a; Taylor, 2020), via management formally (Sutton, 1991) and informally (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005), and customers (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005). In Zembylas's (2004) analysis of teachers' emotional expressions and beliefs around teaching, emotional rules were derived from colleagues and school administration reflecting the social and power relations involved in shaping what the teacher understood as permitted or prohibited emotional expressions within the culture of the school, thus hinting at the discursive nature of emotion in teaching. In a study of bar staff, prior enculturation of personal experiences in a pub had also contributed to learning (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005). This insight into the learning of emotion rules and display is rather limited, and there is an absence of work on how emotion rules are learnt across sports coaching and within coach education and this therefore warrants further exploration.

2.5.3. Emotion management techniques

A prominent feature of the limited research on emotions in coaching is that coaches (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Potrac et al., 2017) and athletes (Magill, et al., 2017) selectively managed many of the emotions that they experienced in the fulfilment of their role. A prominent form of emotion management in coaching was Hochschild's (2000; [1983]) conception of surface

acting. This involved the regulation of emotions to create an appropriate, situation-specific and "publicly observable facial and bodily display" (Hochschild, 1983: 7). More specifically, the emotion management strategies of a semi-professional football coach when considered in light of Hochschild's (1983) theorising involved surface acting not only with players, where the coach "intentionally sought to deceive the players of his true emotions to achieve his desired objectives" (Nelson et al., 2013: 477), but also in the coach's interactions with wider stakeholders (e.g., parents, supporters, chairman) of the club (Nelson et al., 2013). Similar deployment of surface acting was alluded to in the management of emotions in the storied accounts of a grassroots football coach. Despite the anxiety he was experiencing in trying to implement a new pedagogical approach in his coaching, the coach conveyed he was happy and positive about the programme in his interactions with his FA mentor and the club secretary (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). In storied accounts of elite female footballers in Magill et al.'s (2017) study of the emotional and embodied experiences of video feedback sessions, players actively managed their emotions by surface acting (e.g. supressing smiles, supressing anger). Of particular interest and relevance was the revelation of the complexity of emotion management engaged in by these players that was differentiated by their interactions with the coach and other players and was at times conducted concurrently (Magill et al., 2017).

The use of surface acting was also explicitly employed by an athletics coach as a protective mechanism to hide their own emotions in relation to burnout with the intention of "sheltering" his athletes from them (McNeill, Durand-Bush and Lemyre, 2017). The regulation and management of guilt was a prominent feature of the emotion work recalled by coaches in Matinelli, Day and Lowry's (2017) study, particularly in relation to experiences of guilt when an athlete sustained injury in their sessions. This provided a more nuanced account of strategies and a varied approach to the management of guilt which included avoidance of the injured athlete, seeking

forgiveness and even self-punishment as a guilt regulation strategy (Martinelli, Day and Lowry, 2017). The unpacking of specific emotions and the way they are managed in sports coaching may offer further useful insights to assist in supporting and educating sports workers in this area, including coach educators.

Limited attention has only recently been given to emotion management strategies of wider sports workers, except for Hings et al., (2018) who focused upon elite sports medicine practitioners and Allanson, Potrac and Nelson's (2019) exploration of coach educators. The elite sports medicine and science staff accounts referred to engagement in surface acting and at times deep acting "whereby practitioners purposefully modified their felt emotions to be in alignment with the expressions that were required in a specific context e.g., arriving early to emotionally prepare" (Hings et al., 2018: 711) as part of a wider exploration of the demands of the role. Both surface and deep acting were perceived as key to promoting professional practice and necessary to establish successful working relationships and part of the requirements of the role (Hings et al., 2018). The Football Association (FA) coach educators in Allanson, Potrac and Nelson's (2019) study of career experiences employed varied emotion management techniques of surface acting where body language and para-verbal communication were managed to persuade others of their emotions, and deep acting where one of the coach educators transferred past positive emotions to currently problematic ones. Explicit and in-depth consideration of the emotion management of coach educators remains absent from the sport coaching literature.

Despite the frequent emotion management engaged in by coaches, it is important to recognise that on some occasions the coaches did not manage their emotions and there were instances when the coaches experienced and displayed emotions of happiness, guilt and sadness that were genuine and authentic and required no emotional work as the coach revealed their true emotions in their

interactions with others (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Potrac et al., 2017). These displays could be understood as a third form of emotional labour that is genuine and spontaneous (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993). Displays of authentic emotions are yet to be systematically considered in the sport coaching literature yet it offers a fruitful line of investigation regarding when, how and why authentic emotional displays occur.

The consideration of emotion management in coaching has predominantly been explored through Hochschild's theorising and whilst this has helped provide a preliminary insight into understandings of the emotional components of coaches' interactions and their experiences, there may be value in considering other theoretical options in which to further develop this knowledge and understanding (Potrac, et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). Coaching has started to consider emotion management, but it is primarily situated within the theorising of Hochschild's (1983) surface and deep acting. Consideration of the wider forms of emotional management like and beyond those investigated within other professions may prove fruitful in furthering knowledge in this area.

In response to the undertaking of emotional labour, several emotion management strategies are commonly employed in both teaching and wider work settings. Numerous empirical studies have drawn upon Hochschild's (1983) theorising of emotional labour to reveal the undertaking of surface acting where individuals hide their own emotions and is a strategy employed in teaching (Hebson, Earnshaw and Marchington, 2007; Chowdhry, 2014; Taylor, 2020), university lecturing (Ogbonna and Harris, 2004), bar work (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005) and nursing (Gray and Smith, 2009). Alternative approaches of deep acting have been used by FE teachers (Chowdhry, 2014), university lecturers (Ogbonna and Harris, 2004), flight attendants (Hochschild, 1983) and beauty therapists (Sharma and Black, 2001). At other points the empirical research on emotion management has started to

hint at alternative approaches that can be used, drawing upon Bolton's conceptual framework and theorising has indicated that at times teachers' emotional management is philanthropic through prioritising the needs of the student above themselves, this has also been hinted at in care settings where carers offer beyond the requirements of the job (Cranford and Miller, 2013).

Colleagues and other team members are also integral to management of emotions in schools, for example to cope with fears in the workplace, teachers shared them with other school members, albeit explicitly or implicitly (Oplatka and Iglan, 2020). Camaraderie with colleagues was also an important coping mechanism in adverse situations for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers (Taylor, 2020). Collaboration and relationships with colleagues that offered professional and emotional support was regarded as important by teachers in coping with the challenges and negative emotions and perceived inability to teach in a culturally diverse school setting (Karousiou, Hajisoteriou and Angelides, 2021). Parallels can also be drawn with the management of emotions via sharing with fellow colleagues in bar work (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005) and debt collectors' expressions of anger and insults following calls with debtors or sharing of jokes about nasty debtors that were supported socially by colleagues and, to an extent, managers (Sutton, 1991). These findings indicate another layer of emotion management in relation to the role of others and how an individual interacts with others to enable or assist their own emotion management and is an area yet to be considered in relation to emotion management of coach educators, coaches and other sports workers.

Emotional management is not just confined to one's self but also that of others and can take place between colleagues – as in bar staff (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005) – following conflicting encounters with customers or management, and after work socialisation with colleagues as a means of social support and as a method of calming them down or cheering them up. Nurses also reported management of their

own emotions to present the nursing self and manage the emotions of mothers' and their children to make them feel more comfortable in attendance at clinics (Gray and Smith, 2009). Firefighters' use of emotional labour to manage clients' emotions and what Tracy and Tracy (1998) term "double-faced emotion management" has helped firefighters in "neutralising their own emotions in order to calm the strong emotions of the patient and loved ones" (Scott and Myers, 2005: 76). The emotion management of others is, however, yet to be addressed in sports coaches' and coach educators' daily practices.

2.5.4. The costs and benefits of emotion work

One challenge of the emotional management employed by coaches was that the undertaking and continual engagement of emotion management was not necessarily easy, straight forward or without cost for coaches. The effort to perform certain emotional displays with players, staff and fans had a negative impact upon Zach's (the coach) motivation and enthusiasm to fulfil his coaching role (Nelson et al., 2013) and led him to experience feelings of inauthenticity, alienation and self-estrangement (Nelson et al., 2013). This can be explained through Hochschild's (1983) theorising that sustained emotion management can have psychological costs. This strain reflected on Zach's lack of emotional stamina (Turner and Stets, 2005). Similarly, the surface acting for a coach came with the psychological cost of not having the emotional stamina to maintain required emotional displays and such psychological cost resulted in a loss of job motivation (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016).

From a positivist perspective, the role of emotional labour on coaches' wellbeing has investigated the relationship between emotional labour strategies, emotional exhaustion and emotional intelligence as a moderating variable to enduring predisposed traits of positive and negative affectivity (Lee and Chelladurai, 2016).

Measured via questionnaires and studied primarily from a psychological perspective, the analysis revealed relationships – albeit tentatively – between positive affectivity and emotional labour strategies (surface acting, deep acting and genuine expression), that surface acting and genuine expression were positively related to emotional exhaustion, and that emotional intelligence moderated the surface acting-emotional exhaustion relationship. The limited research on the costs of emotional displays and emotion management raises awareness of the limited knowledge which exists in this area and draws attention to the need to better understand how fulfilling the work role impacts coach educator's health.

Coaching research has hinted at the benefits and costs of emotional labour but not to the extent of the wider literature. The demands of occupations requiring emotional labour has been raised as an area of concern since it is a source of job-related stress (Wharton, 1993). In teaching, the costs and effects of emotional labour have been identified as a fundamental feature of the teaching role that has potentially negative consequences for health and wellbeing (Hargreaves, 2000; Sutton, 2005). There are evident costs to the performance of emotional labour with a gathering level of empirical studies alluding to potentially lower levels of job satisfaction (Kinman, Wray and Strange, 2011), experiences of stress and depression from extended surface acting (Hebson, Earnshaw and Marchington, 2007) and ongoing emotion management can lead to stress and teacher burnout, emotional strain and disappointment (Isenbarger and Zembylas, 2006). High levels of emotional labour in teaching also holds links to job dissatisfaction, burnout and health symptoms (Schutz and Zembylas, 2009). Furthermore, Oplatka (2009) suggests that, as increasing demands are placed upon teachers in the current climate of marketisation, it is vital that their emotional well-being is considered. Higher education lecturers experiencing feelings of inadequacy at faking emotions to cope with legitimate demands led to guilt manifesting in high levels of stress (Ogbonna and Harris, 2004). The negative effects

of emotional labour, as a source of stress and decreased job satisfaction, have also being echoed in the work of prison officers (Nylander, Lindberg and Bruhn, 2011) and office workers (Mann, 1998). Student nurses' reliance on surface acting as an emotional labour strategy in early clinical practice indicates to negatively impact on well-being (McCloughen et al., 2020).

It should be acknowledged that there is an argument that emotional labour can also offer protective functions for, as empirical studies have indicated, teachers performing more emotional labour reported higher personal accomplishment (Kinman, Wray and Strange, 2011) and that teachers were able to perform surface acting easily and on demand within lessons and switch off afterwards to no detriment to themselves (Taylor, 2020). Similarly, the negative effects of emotional labour in beauty therapists' work were said to be moderated due to the autonomy and control the individual held in this role over the degree and kind of emotional labour undertaken (Sharma and Black, 2001). Based upon the identified costs and possible benefits of emotional labour and emotion management in teaching and wider roles, there appears to be value in examining these among sports coaches since they have been largely neglected in this population.

There is a gradual presentation of the emotional realities of sport coaching within the literature that are starting to offer an insight into the connections of emotion to coaching practice and possible junctures for future lines of investigation. There is a need to recognise that coaching inherently involves emotion and that much more detail and nuanced understanding can be gained through paying attention to the complex networks and relationships (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac et al., 2013; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017) in which emotion is enacted and experienced by coach educators. In answering the research questions (presented in Chapter One), this study will be the first to seek to identify specific emotion display rules. This will make a novel and original contribution to knowledge of emotion display rules both in

coach education and the wider coaching literature. The development of insights into the ways emotion rules are learnt represents the breaking of new ground to answer scholars calls in beginning to understand how emotion rules are learnt in sports coaching (Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). The exploration of emotion management strategies will contribute to the existing knowledge surrounding intra-emotion management in sports coaching and build upon Allanson, Potrac and Nelson's (2019) empirical work in coach education. By turning attention beyond intra-emotion management to inter-emotion management strategies it will contribute new exploratory insights and understanding of inter-emotion management strategies that are yet to receive attention in coach education and the wider sports coaching literature. It will offer initial exploratory insights into coach educators' motives for emotion management, an area that has yet to be investigated. The study will also respond to scholarly calls to consider consequences of emotion management (Potrac and Marshall, 2011) and add to existing empirical work in sports coaching (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). In the review of literature various terms in addition to coach educator have been utilised to address different roles and aspects within coach education including coach developer (International Council for Coaching Excellence (ICCE), 2014; Brasil et al., 2018) and coach mentor (Nash and McQuade, 2015; Leeder and Sawiuk, 2020). The term coach educator is adopted in this study as not only is it representative of wider understanding in the literature associated with the delivery of formal coach education courses (Watts, Cushion and Cale, 2021), it also aligns with the terminology employed by the National Governing Body of the sport.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1. Aims and structure of the chapter

In this chapter I provide an overview and justification of the paradigmatic, theoretical and methodological approaches adopted in this study. I then introduce the participants and discuss the processes of sample selection and ethical approval. Next, I offer a rationale and detailed description of the research methods employed in data collection before outlining the approaches, techniques and theoretical frameworks used in the analysis and sense making of the data.

3.2. Paradigmatic choices: An interpretive approach

The previous chapter highlighted that sports coaching research can be situated across a range of paradigmatic approaches (e.g., positivist, poststructuralist, interpretivist) that align with differing assumptions. Following consideration of these stances and associated beliefs as addressed in Chapter Two I adopted an interpretivist approach. The interpretive perspective claims "an individual's experience is best understood from the standpoint of the social world *of that individual*" (Garrick, 1999: 149), and this was an interesting and appealing option to align with to explore my own and other coach educators' experiences and realities. Indeed, the importance of gaining understanding from my own experience as a coach educator was a driving force in my paradigmatic choices as I found these experiences, perspectives and voices omitted from positivist research (presented in Chapter Two), where a preoccupation with evaluation of coach education impact in behavioural and cognitive terms (e.g., Smith, Smoll and Curtis, 1979; Barnett, Smoll and Smith, 1992; Smith, Smoll and Cumming, 2007) sanitised the role and involvement of the coach educator (Cushion and Nelson, 2012; Cushion, Griffiths and Armour, 2019). Simply painting the coach educator as the tool to effect change (Cushion and Nelson, 2012; Hussain et al., 2012) failed to highlight the experiences I was having as a coach educator and the ambiguities, dilemmas, challenges and

emotions that are a feature of engagements with others that had been previously questioned (Jones and Wallace, 2005) and hinted at in coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). The interpretive paradigm was also adopted in response to the (perhaps unintended) portrayal of coach educators as rational, calculating and dispassionate individuals and connections with others as unproblematic (Jones, 2009; Potrac and Jones, 2009a; Nelson et al. 2013; Potrac and Smith, 2014), which, in my experience, failed to reflect the realities of working in this setting. On numerous occasions I had experienced different emotions across courses in my work as a coach educator, including happiness, frustration, disappointment and anger that stemmed from my interactions with the coach learners on the course and the coach educators I worked alongside. Furthermore, my frustration at the portrayal of coach education as a cognitive process devoid of emotion (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Nelson et al., 2013) meant that the opportunity to focus on "not only how people make sense of that experience, but also what underpins that meaning making" (Mallett and Tinning, 2014: 14) via the interpretive approach resonated with me. Indeed, I would argue that the interpretive paradigm provides the opportunity to be able to start to address scholars' calls to gain insight of the emotional practices of coach educators and the associated political and socialisation features of emotional experience (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac et al., 2013). In essence, interpretivism was also perhaps the most pragmatic option and therefore the most suitable approach in providing a methodological starting point from which to address the research questions stated in Chapter One.

Following consideration of the research paradigms, I found that my assumptions aligned with the tenets of the interpretive paradigm. This included the belief that reality is discovered through participants' views, backgrounds and experiences (Creswell, 2003; Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, 2011) and encompasses multiple perspectives and versions of truth (Willis, 2007; Thanh and Thanh, 2015). In this regard, I subscribe to a relativist ontology (Sparkes, 1992; Denzin and Lincoln, 2008), a subjective epistemology (Sparkes, 1992), and an ideographic methodology

(Sparkes, 1992). From an ontological stance, I agree that "the world is not the orderly, law-bound place that realists believe it to be" (Willig, 2008: 26). Instead, I consider our complex social worlds to be constructed by individuals and bound-up with multiple meanings and interpretations (Sparkes, 1992; Markula and Silk, 2011; Potrac et al., 2014) so that "an understanding of reality is relative to an individual's context and experiences" (Markula and Silk, 2011: 37). This suggests that meaning making may alter in relation to changing interpretations that the individual attaches to their own or others' behaviours (Potrac, Jones and Nelson, 2014). Based upon this I subsequently recognise meaning to be negotiated within and through historical, social, cultural and political contexts (Jones and Wallace, 2005; Creswell, 2013; Potrac et al., 2014).

In terms of my interpretive epistemological positioning, I find myself rejecting positivism, which emphasises the objectivity of the research process and the belief that knowledge is factual and value free (Crotty, 2003). In response to this, I adopt the view that "knowledge is socially constructed" (Potrac et al., 2014: 34) and subscribe to an interpretivist perspective of the social world shaped via individuals' "subjectivities, interests, emotions and values" (Sparkes, 1992: 25). Therefore, I perceive the knowledge making process to be an interactive and co-constructed one between researcher and participant (Markula and Silk, 2011; Creswell, 2013). From this perspective, research cannot be "researcher proof" and there may be "many 'truths' available" (Sparkes, 1992: 33). Therefore, my interpretations as the researcher will be shaped by my personal experiences and background (Creswell, 2013) and these meanings and values should be clarified and accounted for prior to investigation (Denzin, 2001).

With regards to my methodological approach, I subscribe to a hermeneutic methodology where value-free research is not possible and the researcher's own preconceptions and interpretations require acknowledging as they ultimately shape, and are a central part of, the research (Heidegger, 1927/1962). Central to this approach is the notion of Verstehen ('empathetic understanding'), which refers to a

concept introduced by German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey who proposed that social reality requires analysis from the participants' perspective and therefore the researcher should strive to gain an empathetic insight into the first-hand beliefs, attitudes and perspectives of others in relation to personal experience, culture, history and society (Martin, 1999). Furthermore, I employed an ideographic approach (Burrell and Morgan, 1987; Mallet and Tinning, 2014). This involves providing detailed descriptions of specific social settings, relationships or processes (King and Horrocks, 2010) to "better understand how events, actions and meanings are shaped by the unique circumstances in which they occur" (Sparkes and Smith, 2014: 16). Rather than being focused on generalisations and scientific laws as would be integral to a positivistic approach (Crotty, 2003; Markula and Silk, 2011), the concern is with producing thick description which captures meanings and thick interpretation to reveal the meanings that shape an individual's experiences (Ball, 1991: Denzin, 2001). This will ensure that prior to offering explanations, time is taken to describe and interpret performers' s 'lifeworlds' (Strean, 1998; Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2004; Jones and Wallace, 2005; Jones, 2006; Nelson et al., 2013).

The current study is broadly located within the interpretive paradigm, and the ontological, epistemological and methodological approaches are in keeping with previous discussions as presented in the literature review (Chapter Two). Initially I found myself drawn towards the symbolic interactionist theorising of Goffman (1953), Hochschild (1983), Thoits (2004; 2011) and Turner and Stets (2005). Primarily I could see the utility in exploring the social processes and interaction at play in the role of a coach educator and specifically the emotional nature of such work via the theorists presented above. However, over time the more I explored and read and tried to make sense of my own and other coach educators' experiences, I became cognisant of the impact of wider structures and the power laden nature of my emotion experiences, practices and displays. In response I found utility in the argument of Denzin's interpretive interactionism for incorporating poststructuralism in addition to

interactionism and some of the critiques associated with interpretivism previously discussed in Chapter Two. I found myself agreeing with some of the arguments put forward by Denzin's (1992) interpretive interactionist perspective which draws upon wider social theory and aligned with my epistemological beliefs about how knowledge and the process of interpretation is socially, emotionally and politically constructed around influences that are inextricably linked to power and which provides the critical element of this perspective (Denzin, 2001). It was this wider exploration of what shapes interpretation that I considered important for developing understanding of coach educators' emotional experiences.

Additionally, I could see the benefits of poststructuralist approaches within the coaching research as they were valuable in revealing otherwise unknown practices of coach education (Fielding-Lloyd and Meân, 2011; Piggott, 2012; Avner, Markula and Denison, 2017) and offered the opportunity to raise awareness and begin to challenge dominant practices. The findings prompted me to reflect and think critically about my work as a coach educator (e.g., whether my coach educator practices replicate the formulaic and prescriptive methods). In line with poststructuralist scholars, I believe this approach offers important insights into the taken-for-granted truths of practice (Denison and Avner, 2011; Avner, Jones and Denison, 2014; Avner, Denison and Markula, 2019). Based upon this, I drew upon poststructural readings, in particular the works of Zembylas (2004; 2005c), to further critically explore meaning in relation to the individual and wider aspects of coach education.

3.3. The participants

3.3.1. Selection of participants

The research aims in qualitative research often contribute to defining the population from which the participants are selected (Guest, Namey and Mitchell, 2013). This research adopted a purposive sampling approach in the selection of participants, a technique deemed to assist in the selection of information rich cases

on an identified area of interest (Patton, 2002; Creswell and Creswell, 2018). This involved the identification and selection of individuals with experience or knowledge of a particular phenomena (Creswell and Plano-Clark, 2011) and based on them having specific characteristics (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). Drawing on Patton's (2015: 53) argument that "the logic and power of qualitative purposeful sampling derives from the emphasis on in-depth understanding of specific cases: information rich cases", my choices and approaches to the selection of coach educators for participation in this study were made with this in mind. Furthermore, my role as a coach educator assisted in the purposive selection of information rich participants aligned to the aims of the research (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). Criterion-based sampling was also employed to select participants who could offer information rich cases (Patton, 2002; Sparkes and Smith, 2014) and because they fulfilled pre-determined criteria (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). Specifically, individuals were able to participate if they were: (a) currently employed as a coach educator by England Netball; and (b) had recently delivered courses and/or were scheduled to deliver courses over the upcoming year.

In my role as a coach educator, I already had established connections and rapport with numerous netball coach educators which helped me access and recruit the participants (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). I initially contacted nine coach educators via e-mail and six replied indicating an interest in participating in the study. Following further details of the study and the required completion of emotion diaries and commitment to undertake interview schedules, four of the coach educators agreed to take part in the study. All four participants were previously known to me through our shared roles as coach educators. Knowing participants is a common occurrence in qualitative research (Gearity, Callary and Fulmer, 2013). This existing relationship and familiarity with the coach educators who participated in the study may have influenced the information they shared with me (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree, 2006; Purdy, 2014). This relationship presented two key considerations: that the coach

educators may have offered more detailed accounts due to shared experiences and trust and rapport but may have influenced the selection of which accounts were shared due to us being mutual colleagues (Purdy, 2014). At times the insider role enabled the sharing of my own emotions and experiences and encouraged the reflection and sharing of similar and different experiences by the coach educators. This demonstrated the possible benefits of my position and the associated challenges with ensuring steps were taken to ensure anonymity (Taylor, 2011).

Access was not only negotiated at an individual level with the coach educators in my research, but also at an organisational level to recognise the multi-dimensional nature of qualitative research and its associated influence on the researcher's co-construction of knowledge (Riese, 2019). As the setting of the research aimed to explore netball coach educators' experiences, by association this positioned England Netball as the wider site of the research and as gatekeepers who can "modify and structure the (inter)actions of (potential) participants and researchers" (Riese, 2019: 677). After discussing the aims and purpose of the study with England Netball they agreed to its undertaking with members of the coach education workforce. This can offer additional benefits in potentially developing a trusting and open relationship, as the project is endorsed by the employer of the participant and can help to enable the participant to take part (Riese, 2019). Institutional ethical approval was gained prior to the conduct of the research and potential participants were informed of the aims and objectives of the study, what their participation would involve, and how data would be gathered, analysed, stored and used prior to the gaining of informed consent. Informed consent was obtained from four coach educators who were willing to participate in the study, who were made aware they could withdraw from the study at any time in line with ethical protocols (Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

3.3.2. The participants' background

The four coach educators that participated in the study had between one to thirteen years' experience of delivering coach education courses. Due to the relatively

small workforce, potential for identification and to ensure anonymity, no further details of the participants are provided. All participants were allocated pseudonyms (Lucy, Nicola, Olivia and Katie) to preserve anonymity and confidentiality. As there are a limited number of coach educators, the 'small population' from which participants can be drawn increases the risk of identification and is a problem which can be encountered primarily in ethnographic studies (Ellis, 1995; Walford 2005; Saunders, Kitzinger and Kitzinger, 2015). Furthermore, the internal confidentiality (Tolich, 2004) of participants identifying themselves or other coach educators with whom they have worked alongside due to the interconnectedness of the research context was a possibility in terms of "risk to insiders from other insiders" (Tolich, 2004: 106). Thus, elements of references to geographical locations and occupational roles were generalised or broadened (Saunders, Kitzinger and Kitzinger, 2015) in steps to minimise this.

3.4. Methodological approach one: Fieldwork

Fieldwork as a method was adopted for the intention of developing cultural understanding and interpretation (Wolcott, 2008). The underpinning aim of fieldwork is "to understand the social worlds inhabited by others as *they* understand those worlds, that is, in terms of the meanings they ascribe to their everyday actions and experiences" (Hobbs and Wright, 2006: i; emphasis in original). It involves close contact with individuals in their own environments to gain an understanding of the realities and detail of everyday life (Patton, 2002). It is suggested that fieldwork can involve participant observation, intensive interviewing, or a combination of both (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: Wolcott, 2005; Blackstone, 2012). Essentially, understanding and knowledge is gained via a combination of interacting, questioning, watching, collecting documents, audio recording and video recording (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). In addition, 'enabling techniques' within fieldwork should be considered as they can stimulate thinking and expression and provide a supplement

to explore subconscious ideas, elements which are embedded in everyday life or are difficult to articulate (Arthur et al., 2014). A particular strength of field research is that it may uncover elements of people's experiences or group interactions of which we were not previously aware (Blackstone 2012). Fieldwork can both reveal the unknown and encourage questioning and re-examination of the familiar (Pole and Hillyard, 2016). A strength of fieldwork is that it has the potential to be flexible, allowing for changes in design as the research progresses (Sarantakos, 2013).

Fieldwork requires researchers to act reflexively and acknowledge their role and potential influence on the research and the interpretations they bring to situations (McCall, 2006; Fetterman, 2008; Pole and Hillyard, 2016). It also recognises that researchers' political and ideological positions are influenced by identities and life experiences (Kleinman and Copp, 1993). In acknowledgement of this issue, Wolcott (2005) argued for fieldwork approaches which ensure the visibility of the researcher and the researched, whilst also recognising the ambiguity present in such work. The process of fieldwork also involves practical, intellectual and emotional aspects as the relationships between the self, others and field are explored (Coffey, 1999). Therefore, as Pole and Hillyard (2016) point out, the physical, emotional and social characteristics of the researcher can both restrict and enable the undertaking of the fieldwork researcher.

In his discussion of ethnographic fieldwork Denzin (2001) acknowledges the inherently political and epistemological aspects of the approach. Fieldwork involves the capture of "multiple cases and personal histories of persons who have experienced the problem or phenomena being studied" (Denzin, 2001: 85). Denzin (2001) described four steps to assist the undertaking of ethnographic fieldwork. Firstly, when and where the persons experiencing phenomena interact. Secondly, gaining access and the temporal nature of interaction with who, what, when and where interactions take place reflecting the social structure of the interaction. The rationale for mapping is that it incorporates historical, biographical and personal

aspects to the research act (Denzin, 2001). Thirdly, learning a language and meanings so that shared experiences can be understood and interpreted alongside offering a historical understanding, Denzin (2001) refers to the 'double structure' of language in that the researcher must not only learn the language that is spoken in the area studied, but also decode it within storied accounts. In this sense language becomes "the gateway to the inner interpretive structures of the lives that are being studied" (Denzin, 2001: 91-2). Finally, through searching to become a knowledgeable member of the social structure being studied, the researcher connects individuals, biographies and social types to the relevant situations of interaction via "thick interpretations of personal experience stories" (Denzin, 2001: 97).

The criticisms of fieldwork suggest that the pursuit of detail results in a narrow focus and understanding of the area explored (Blackstone, 2012), that fieldworkers are selective in what they choose to report, and that their presence alters the environment of study (Hobbs and Wright, 2006). However, these criticisms reflect the key concepts of fieldwork based upon interpretivism which is "about finding ways to portray the subjective reality of social action in terms of its meaning for the social actors" (Pole and Hillyard, 2016: 16). Although the criticisms of fieldwork are acknowledged, the capacity of the researcher to be there (Wolcott, 2005), the acceptance that values are inevitably bound within the fieldwork conducted, and that the researcher is unavoidably positioned as an insider (Pole and Hillyard, 2016), align with my ontological beliefs that "an understanding of reality is relative to an individual's context and experiences" (Markula and Silk, 2011: 37) and my epistemological beliefs that research is co-constructed between the researcher and researched (Potrac et al., 2014; Sparkes and Smith, 2014). Arguably, "as interpretivist researchers, we create the field of observation through our interpretive practices. The field is where we are" (Denzin, 2001: 85) and there is a need to be insiders to achieve shared language and understanding (Denzin, 2001). Subsequently, I found myself aligned with Hobbs and Wright's (2006) view that fieldwork is critical to understanding how

individuals perceive and interpret their own actions and experiences in a specific cultural setting.

In contrast to traditional social scientists' approaches to maintaining objectivity, I believe that "detachment can limit one's openness to and understanding of the very nature of what one is studying, especially where meaning-making and emotion are part of the phenomenon" (Patton, 2002: 48). Fieldwork provided the opportunity to focus upon emotions which can contribute to insights that are otherwise illusive in systematic approaches (Kleinmann and Copp, 1993; Coffey, 1999; Wolcott, 2005). It enables a greater understanding of the intricacies and complexities of daily life. As it is deemed important that the researcher specifies their methodological stance (Mligo, 2013) and that fieldwork techniques are inherently related to the questions which guide the research (Wolcott, 2005), I therefore contend that the fieldwork choices made were guided by selecting the most appropriate options to explain the emotional and social world of coach educators.

3.4.1. Diaries: A rationale

As a method of data collection, diaries enable the researcher to capture thoughts, feelings and behaviours (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015) and candid experiences in relation to emotion (Cottingham and Erickson, 2020). Diary approaches are advantageous in that they can provide insights into aspects of a participant's life that otherwise would remain inaccessible via alternative methods such as interviews (Kenten, 2010; Nicholl, 2010; Bartlett and Milligan, 2015) and can provide "thick description" which conveys a participant's experience (Patterson, 2005). Diary methods also afford participants greater control over the pace and nature of data collection and allow them to complete the diary when it is temporally appropriate to do so (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015). Experiences, behaviours or feelings can be recorded closer to the time that they occurred and are said to reduce recall bias and overcome memory problems in comparison to interviews (Alaszewski, 2006;

Bartlett and Milligan, 2015). Solicited diaries, used in this study, represent the creation of a record which a participant has been asked to create for a researcher and the purpose of their research (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015). In the construction of a solicited diary the researcher shapes what information is being sought via the design, content and analysis (Elliott, 1997; Kenten, 2010). The participant's knowledge that the researcher will read the diary entries may influence the experiences detailed or omitted as the entries are subject to both conscious and unconscious editing (Pickard, 2013).

The format of diaries can range from unstructured (of varying degrees) where respondents are asked to record whatever they feel is relevant, to structured responses that report very specific activities (McGregor, 2006; Bowling, 2009). A structured diary employs a fixed response format and often gathers numerical data in relation to a specific activity or time period (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015). This approach is advantageous as it can provide relevant quantitative data (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015) and reduce the level of decision making in relation to what to include as well as the burden on the participant (Sheble, Thomson and Wildemuth, 2016). There are limitations to structured diaries as the categories and frame of reference that the researcher has constructed may obscure or restrict valuable information (Elliot, 1997) and the wording of questions may influence participants' responses, perceptions and behaviours (Sheble, Thomson and Wildemuth, 2016).

Diaries with less structure in the form of semi- or unstructured diaries have the potential to provide rich qualitative data (Elliott, 1997) and can offer a more in-depth understanding of people's interpretations of their worlds (Milligan, Bingley and Gatrell, 2005). Semi-structured diaries often involve a combination of specific questions and free text responses offering greater flexibility in the diarists' responses to themes and for them to record their own priorities (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015). Unstructured approaches adopt an open format with participants recording "their experiences, activities and feelings in relation to a particular issue or topic *in their own words*"

(Willig, 2013: 34) with any information they deem as relevant to the area of research. This is advantageous as it affords the researcher greater freedom to code and analyse the data (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015) and enables respondents' answers to reflect the weight, priority and meaning that they attach to different aspects (Elliott, 1997). However, the unstructured approach may not be feasible with large samples due to time and monetary constraints linked to analysis and interpretation of the data (Corti, 1993). A further challenge of unstructured diaries is that responses can be quite short and vague and opportunities to prompt for clarification and elaboration that can be achieved in the presence of the researcher are lost (Cottingham and Erickson, 2020).

The advancement of technology has increased the options for collecting diary data with the e-mail diary providing an electronic method of completion which may encourage participation and submission due to the reduced demand on participants (Day and Thatcher, 2009; Bartlett and Milligan, 2015; Jones and Woolley, 2015). Jones and Woolley (2015) warn of the need to consider participants' ease of access and confidence in using computers when selecting the internet as a method for diary data collection as it may exclude some participants. Audio diaries offer an alternative approach where participants verbalise their experiences into an audio recorder and may capture instant and accurate accounts and reveal changes in experience over time (Bolger, Davis and Rafaeli, 2003; Monrouxe, 2009). The audio recording may also offer participants the opportunity to capture relatively private moments and emotions with a feeling of security and anonymity that is not possible to achieve in interview methods (Cottingham and Erickson, 2020). They may also achieve a greater level of reflection and depth in relation to a particular issue (Markham and Couldry, 2007) and capture emotional reflexivity (Cottingham and Erickson, 2020). Potential disadvantages regarding the use of audio diaries are that background noise is captured which the researcher will need to choose whether to ignore, or if it is important to meaning to decipher it (Bartlett and Milligan, 2015; Cottingham and

Erickson, 2020). A further challenge to this approach is that if trust and empowerment is not developed in the researcher-participant relationship then completion of audio recordings may be infrequent and superficial (Cottingham and Erickson, 2020). Video diaries are another option that present similar challenges as although the participant has control of the camera and records their experiences alone, the absence of the researcher may provide space for greater depth and freedom of speech (Noyes, 2004). This can enable participants to break free from any preconceived perceptions that may be linked to their status and convey their own identity, emotions and experiences to the camera (Cashmore, Green and Scott, 2010). Conversely, the absence of the researcher may result in the participant experiencing frustration due to the lack of opportunity to engage in a two-way conversation (Jones et al., 2015). The negative aspects associated with video diaries are that initially participants may feel vulnerable and self-conscious in front of the camera and limit what they talk about (Jones et al., 2015) or monitor and alter their behaviour due to this (Pauwels, 2010).

The strengths of diaries are that they are more likely to capture emotional data because they are written or recorded in privacy, away from the researcher and closer to the time of the event (Spowart and Nairn, 2014). Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia's (2014) emotion-based research in education suggests that adopting alternative approaches to research design such as emotion diaries should be employed to access emotional experiences, the same could be considered within coach education research. Emotion diaries prompt people to be aware of emotions that they experience and record them as they notice them, rather than recall them retrospectively (Oatley, 1992). They seek to capture broader understanding about emotions (Bellocchi and Ritchie, 2015) as well as individual differences in emotional experiences (Zembylas, 2002; Ritchie et al., 2016). Emotion prompted diaries tend to capture participants' prominent emotions either because they are intense or particularly negative (Oatley, 2009). Emotion diaries may also make it easier to establish emotional experiences in relation to specific daily occurrences (Oatley,

1992) and can provide a pathway to further explore emotions (Alaszewski, 2006; Spowart and Nairn, 2014).

After considering the strengths and weaknesses of the diary approaches, a semi-structured diary design was selected comprising both open and closed questions. This ensured the participant was guided towards the areas that I was interested in as a researcher, but still enabled flexibility for the participant to offer their viewpoint and experiences, as is similar in other qualitative semi-structured techniques (Smith, 2009). In line with my epistemological perspective, the emotion diary provided multiple opportunities to gain an understanding of the emotional experiences of the coach educators. They provided the opportunity to capture how experiences and emotions were perceived at a specific point in time as well as how they may alter over time (Bernays, Rhodes and Terzic, 2014).

3.4.2. Collecting diary data

A semi-structured emotion diary was created to capture coach educators' emotions. The diary was based on Stets and Turner (2007) categorisation of emotions with a structured format to assist participants in identifying the emotions they were experiencing before adopting a more unstructured format to elaborate upon the specific emotion further. In a similar way that Thomas and Holland (2005) hoped memory books would de-centre the interview process and draw on participants' experiences beyond the room, it was hoped that the emotion diaries could achieve this in the interviews that followed them. The diary content was focused on capturing the emotions experienced when tutoring, the details of the situation that evoked the emotions, the context within which they were experienced, and their intensity and stability. The initial page provided information about the study and an overview of how to complete the diary. The researcher's contact details were also included. The diary was divided into sections according to each emotion experienced and comprised eleven questions. The first diary question requested that the coach educators

identified a specific emotion experienced during the delivery of the coach education course they were currently delivering and then complete eight open response (e.g., describe the situation in which the emotion occurred) and two closed response questions (e.g., was the emotion revealed or concealed?) related to the emotion experienced. Participants were required to circle as many aspects that applied for the short questions and provide as much detail as possible in the open questions. The coach educators then repeated this for each emotion experienced within the course.

Participants were offered three options for completing their diaries: via e-mail, verbal audio recording or hand-written. As Jacelon and Imperio (2005) suggest, offering multiple strategies for completion widens the participant pool by adapting to the individual's style of working and capabilities. The diary was presented to two of the participants in paper and two in electronic format based on personal preference. Participants were asked to complete a diary as soon as possible after each day of tutoring on a Level 1 or Level 2 Netball Coaching course, preferably immediately after, but at least within, twenty-four hours of completing the delivery. Diaries were completed between three and twenty-four hours after tutoring a day of a Level 1 or Level 2 course. The emotion diaries focused upon the emotional experiences relating to delivery of the course. Two participants submitted their diary via e-mail, one via photograph and one on paper. The average length of response varied by the method selected. The paper diaries were between three to four pages and the e-mail diaries were between two to three pages in length.

Hyland (1996) has suggested that days of non-completion can be expected and catered for within the design, therefore I followed up with the participants on the occasions that non-completion occurred and asked them to then complete on the next time they tutored. The diaries were completed in a sporadic pattern and at intermittent points over 18 months. The opportunity for diary completion was dictated by the availability of the coach educator and their allocation of work. This was reflective of the nature of the coach educators' employment on a casual contract basis. As Bartlett

and Milligan (2015) argue, the timeframe for diary collection tends to vary by study and is often determined by the researcher, based upon methodological rationale and resources, as was the case in this diary research. Diary submissions continued to be collected each time a tutor delivered a day of a course until it was felt that the diaries had provided enough depth of information (Bradley, Curry and Denvers, 2007) and informed interviews to answer the research questions. In terms of the diary completion, it also needed to be enough to capture the emotions being experienced without becoming burdensome to the participant (Corti, 1993).

I was particularly aware of the need to build a relationship with the participants, as this is important with regards to both recruitment of participants and completion of solicited diaries (Jones and Woolley, 2015). It was important to recognise that diary completion often develops a longer-term relationship between the participant and the researcher than other approaches and therefore requires a long-term commitment from the participant (Alaszewski, 2006: 54). Based upon these factors when participants were due to deliver a course, I contacted them the day before to prompt them to complete the diary and to provide any support they may require in completing the diary. It was hoped that offering such encouragement would increase participants' motivation to complete the diary (Bowling, 2009). In this study, diaries were completed as a starting point to gather and explore further the emotions experienced whilst tutoring and formed the basis for and facilitated subsequent interviews. A total of twenty-one diary entries were completed by the coach educators with variability in the number of emotions recalled related to each course ranging from two to six. The interview questions were informed from both the research questions and from the coach educators' emotion diaries.

3.4.3. Qualitative interviews: A rationale

Interviews involve a conversation with a specific structure and purpose (Tracy, 2013; Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). The aim is to gather the participant's perceptions,

perspectives and feelings (Holloway, 1997). Interviews go beyond just asking questions to receive an answer; they are interactive and situation specific (Purdy, 2014). Interviewing can thus be regarded as "a craft and social activity where two or more persons actively engage in embodied talk, jointly constructing knowledge about themselves and the social world as they interact with each other over time, through a range of senses, and in a certain context" (Sparkes and Smith, 2014: 83). According to Brinkmann (2012) such an exchange of views reflects the dialogical and interactional aspects of life and reflects a view of the self and the world. This approach is suitable when the focus is on human experience or the research question intends to explore how people understand and interpret their lives (Josselson, 2013; Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Interviews are particularly appropriate to find out about what it is not possible to observe such as thoughts, feelings, intentions and interpretations (Patton, 2002; Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). More specifically, interviews have the potential to provide access to emotions that otherwise may not be explored (Tracy, 2013).

The type of interviewing used in research varies depending on the researcher's epistemological and ontological positioning, the research questions and the tradition within which the qualitative researcher is working (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). It has been proposed by Markula and Silk (2011) that types of interviews can be classified in relation to the degree of structure involved, and that there are three main types of interview: structured, semi-structured and unstructured. Structured interviews adopt a standardised and pre-determined set of questions which remain the same throughout the study (Merriam, 2009; Tracy, 2013; Purdy, 2014). Closed questions are employed to ensure the interviewee answers the intended question(s) (Markula and Silk, 2011). This standardised approach to questioning "will lead to answers that can be compared across participants and possibly quantified" (Brinkmann, 2012: 85). Structured interviews, however, are limited via design and subsequently restrict the opportunity for the interviewer to probe and explore further

(Tracy, 2013). The use of pre-determined questions can limit access to, and understanding of, participants' perspectives of the world (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). They also produce potentially rational responses which fail to consider the emotional dimensions of a participant's answer (Fontana and Frey, 1994). It is also suggested that structured interviews gather passive recordings of attitudes and opinions, subsequently obscuring the "conversational production of social life itself" (Brinkmann, 2012: 85).

At the opposite end of the interview continuum is the unstructured interview which "seeks to *discover* the informant's *experience* of a particular topic or situation" (Lofland and Lofland, 1995: 18). The focus of the unstructured interview places emphasis "on the natural flow of the interaction and the knowledge and experience of the researcher and the participant" (Purdy, 2014: 162). The researcher allows the interviewee to answer freely and spontaneously, and the interviewer follows up on points of interest and relevance as required (Bryman, 2012; Sparkes and Smith, 2014) with the aim of stimulating discussion (Tracy, 2013). Within this approach, the interviewer adopts the role of listener and reflector as well as questioner (Tracy, 2013). The flexibility of unstructured interviews enables participants to convey complex views (Tracy, 2013) and affords the participant greater control over the interaction than in other interview types (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). This approach can obtain insights and understandings of the meanings participants give to events, emotions or behaviours (Sparkes and Smith, 2014) and allow the interviewer to pursue aspects of interest (Tracy, 2013). They can, however, make it difficult to ensure the line of questioning address the purpose of the study (Merriam, 2009), and if this is not managed, then there may potentially be large amounts of data that are irrelevant to the researcher's interests (Roulston, 2010; Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

The third and most common type of qualitative interview technique is the semi-structured interview (Markula and Silk, 2011). Within this approach an interview guide employing primarily open-ended questions is used by the researcher (Sparkes and

Smith, 2014). The guide may contain selected themes and questions that focus on certain topics (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015), "but the interviewee has a great deal of leeway in how to reply" (Bryman, 2012: 471). This type of interview can consist of flexibly worded questions or a combination of questions with differing levels of structure (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). Probes are usually used after each question by the interviewer to elicit further detail (Roulston, 2010). The flexibility of semi-structured interviews provides the opportunity for the researcher to explore further points which may arise through discussion (Brinkmann, 2012; Purdy, 2014) and allows for adaptation in response to each individual interview and the interviewee's experiences (Markula and Silk, 2011). Semi-structured interviews can also enable the interviewer to "become visible as a knowledge-producing participant in the process itself" (Brinkmann, 2012: 85). Despite the apparent strengths of the flexibility of semi-structured interviews, the underpinning structure of the guide and questions may not capture the full complexity of participants' lives (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). A further issue is that the nature of the relationship established between the researcher and participant may lead to certain information and experiences being withheld (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). Finally, Sparkes and Smith (2014) indicate that there could be challenges in analysing semi-structured interview data because of a wider variation of information due to probing and expansion from the interview guide.

After considering the aforementioned strengths and weaknesses, semi-structured interviews were selected as they can enable in-depth exploration of the interviewee's experiences and the meanings attached to them than a fully structured interview provides (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). Additionally, as I had a focus to the area I wanted to investigate, the semi-structured approach enabled me to address specific areas pertaining to emotions with the coach educators (Bryman, 2012). At the same time, it also acknowledges the uniqueness of the individual and their viewpoints enables the researcher to pursue any arising ideas and issues (Minichiello et al., 1990). Furthermore, in line with Brinkmann and Kvale (2015), deciding to

conduct interviews should be linked to the researcher's epistemological viewpoint and what one wants to know, I believed that the semi-structured interview was the most suitable for this study and its intended purposes. Based upon my epistemological stance that knowledge is socially constructed, I viewed my role as a researcher subjectively, and tried to "see the world and its problems as they are seen by the people who live inside particular lives" (Denzin, 2001: 65). Therefore, I perceived each interview as "a conversation, a give-and-take between two persons" (Denzin, 2001: 65), where the interaction between the interviewer and interviewee creates knowledge (Edwards and Holland, 2013). The interview guide content was created based upon the research questions and my knowledge from reading of associated literature on emotion, both within coaching and from wider areas (Tracy, 2020). Subsequent interviews guides were also informed by identification of new themes within the iterative analysis of the data and to further explore points of interest identified from previous interviews.

3.4.4. Collecting interview data

When conducting interviews, I worked as flexibly as I could to meet the participants at times and locations which suited them, as it is considered good practice to ask participants their preference for where they would like the interview to take place (King and Horrocks, 2010). I was also aware that the context and setting of the interview may influence content and direction (Purdy, 2014). This involved finding environments that were suitably private and comfortable for participants to feel at ease to respond openly and in detail to the questions asked and were appropriate for recording audible data (King and Horrocks, 2010; Tracy, 2013). The interviews took place face-to-face with three coach educators in neutral locations including coffee shops, sport centre receptions and restaurants. For the fourth coach educator, interviews took place via a combination of Skype and telephone interviews. Whilst cautions regarding telephone interviews are raised in relation to the absence of visual

cues to build rapport and interaction with the interviewee (Holt, 2010), the combination of remote face-to-face and telephone calls and the previous relationship of the researcher with the participant in the coach educator role was felt to account for this. The interviews were conducted until a rich understanding and insight was gained to answer all the research questions.

When conducting the research, I also considered my appearance as Sarantakos (2013) advises that researchers dress neutrally and similarly to the respondent to ensure that the focus of the interview is the research topic. To negate potential conflict between my role as researcher and that of a coach educator for England Netball, I emphasised that I was there in my capacity as a researcher. This was important to prevent participants' perceptions of my role and connections impacting upon building a relationship with the interviewee or the topics discussed (King and Horrocks, 2010). Therefore, I dressed neutrally (e.g., plain dress and boots) and casually rather than in England Netball clothing or more formal attire which could potentially situate me in a position where the interviewees may be guarded over what they say if they associated me directly with England Netball, or perceived that it may impact on their employment opportunities. Instead, I hoped that our similarity of background in working as coach educators would enable the development of a positive relationship built upon trust, co-operation and understanding (Sarantakos, 2013). To achieve this outcome, I demonstrated an interest, understanding and respect for what the interviewee said (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015) and looked to establish rapport and demonstrate empathy as the situations occurred within the interview (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). I employed the role of what Sparkes and Smith (2014) term an 'active' listener, responding both verbally and non-verbally to the participant throughout the interview. I aimed to convey my attention, interest and respect to what the participant had to say via maintaining eye contact and using the occasional smile or nod and by asking pertinent and relevant follow-up questions (Yeo et al., 2014). I also listened supportively and referenced previous answers or points

to show that I was listening (Tracy, 2013). Through immersing myself in the interview and paying attention to the situational cues and the interviewee, I hoped that this would aid the progression of the interviews to help answer the research question (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). Ultimately, I aimed to continue to develop a rapport and positive relationship which would reveal meaningful data and help to answer the research questions (Purdy, 2014; Yeo et al., 2014). Equally, at times, I shared my own emotion experiences as I had captured in the construction of my autoethnographic accounts to stimulate shared understanding. At other points the coach educators' responses triggered reflections upon my own emotion practices and experiences in course delivery.

Prior to commencing the first formal interview, I introduced the purpose of the study, ethical issues relating to anonymity, confidentiality, right to withdraw, data storage, how the information would be recorded and the interview procedure (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). This ensured the participant was honestly and clearly acquainted with what I was asking them to do (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). I explained that the interviews would be recorded on an audio recording device. This ensured both a complete and accurate record of the data (Purdy, 2014). It also meant I could pay attention to the information and dynamics of the interview and return at a later point to re-listen to and review the recordings (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009). The recording of each interview was transcribed verbatim where "all 'utterances' and words during the interview are faithfully transcribed" (Markula and Silk, 2011: 95). To reassure the participants, Purdy (2014) suggests that they be made aware of the confidentiality of the information they disclose and what will happen to the recordings. I explained that their anonymity would be maintained through the allocation of a pseudonym in the transcriptions, that all information would remain confidential (Sparkes, 2000; Purdy, 2014), and that I would be the only person to access the audio recordings and transcriptions which would be password protected (Braun and Clarke, 2013). Finally,

interviewees were reminded that they had a right to withdraw from participation in the research at any point (King and Horrocks, 2010).

During the semi-structured interviews, I initially employed questions requiring descriptive information to obtain demographic and contextual background regarding the participant's history of involvement in coach education. The purpose of this was, firstly, to introduce the interviewee to the dynamic of the interview situation and demonstrates their role is to answer questions in their own words using a familiar subject (Tracy, 2013; Yeo et al., 2014). Secondly, it provides a base upon which to build later when moving to questions that relate to perceptions, values, opinions and emotions (Merriam, 2009). I used this approach to explore the emotional experiences of the coach educators in their role delivering coach education courses, working with other tutors and coach learners and coach education training. The questions were framed around the above topics and informed by my research questions (Morris, 2015), reading of literature (Purdy, 2014) in relation to emotions in coaching, and broader contexts of research on emotion and relevant sociological theory, my personal emotional experiences as a coach educator and my ongoing review of interview transcripts (Nelson et al., 2014).

Following this, the interviews comprised a combination of generative (Tracy, 2013) and directive questions (Lindlof and Taylor, 2011; Tracy, 2013). Generative questions included timeline (e.g., At what point did you share your frustration?), behaviour and action (e.g., What emotion did you display instead?) and motive questions (e.g., How have you learnt the rule?). These were orientated towards the types of emotions experienced, how they were experienced, embodied and interpreted, their meaning and the way they shaped behaviour. Following on from the generative questions, I then asked directive questions which were more direct and structured and aimed to draw on more specific information (Lindlof and Taylor, 2011). I employed elicitation questions in relation to the emotion diaries and member reflection questions in the later interviews, for example to gain coach educators'

reflections on the identified display rules. I also used specific questions to elicit more precise descriptions (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015) such as “What did you do when you were angry?”; “Have you ever witnessed another coach educator display this?”. It is suggested by Tracy (2013) that the use of ‘how’ rather than ‘why’ at the start of a question is likely to generate a more useful account. This is supported by Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) that in interviews the use of ‘how’ is more likely to receive spontaneous description whereas the use of ‘why’ potentially results in over reflected and intellectualised interviews. This took the form of probing questions asking for clarification, detail or elaboration (Merriam, 2009; Smith and Sparkes, 2016).

Throughout each interview I employed probing techniques to follow-up initial questions and to develop accounts more deeply (Tracy, 2013; Sparkes and Smith, 2014). These involved a combination of pre-planned and spontaneous follow-up questions (Lofland and Lofland, 1995; Tracy, 2013). In trying to gain a greater picture, detail-oriented exploration questions were employed (Smith and Sparkes, 2016), for example: “What did that make you feel like inside?” “How did you show that?”. The use of elaboration probes encouraged the continuation of talking to gather more in-depth detail (Merriam, 2014; Smith and Sparkes, 2016) and included both non-verbal cues and further questioning (King and Horrocks, 2010), including nods of the head or questions including “can you tell me a little more about that situation?” Clarification probes were also employed to seek explanations of accounts or specific words or phrases (King and Horrocks, 2010; Smith and Sparkes, 2016), including: “I am not sure I understand what you mean by that”. On occasions silence was also employed as it provided the interviewee with either time to reflect and respond to the question (Tracy, 2013), or prompted them to expand upon their thoughts (Purdy, 2014). These techniques were also employed in each following interview to further explore and develop understandings and insights from previous interviews (Nelson et al., 2014). A total of 33 semi-structured interviews were conducted over a two-year period with

the participants and varied in length between 65 and 114 minutes. This generated 320 single line space pages of interview transcription.

3.5. Methodological approach two: Autoethnography

3.5.1. Autoethnography: A rationale

The use of autoethnography has expanded across disciplines (Adams, Holman-Jones and Ellis, 2015), employed by sociologists, anthropologists, literary critics and scholars in the humanities (Reed-Danahay, 1997). Within the field of sports coaching, studies employing autoethnographic approaches have begun to illuminate previously unexamined issues in coaching practice and context (Jones, 2006; Purdy et al., 2008; Jones, 2009; Potrac et al., 2012; Potrac et al., 2013). This is reflective of more scholars electing to explore their own voice and self as the focus of their research (Sparkes, 2002a). They have been used within the field of sport and exercise (Douglas, 2009; Brown, Gilbourne and Claydon, 2009; Allen Collinson, 2005; Douglas, 2014) and sports coaching (Jones, 2006; 2009; Purdy, Potrac and Jones, 2008; Denison, 2006; Potrac et al., 2017).

Autoethnography is offered as an alternative form of qualitative methodology to ethnography, and is recognised as a genre of work that conveys the individuals' lived experience (Richardson, 2000; Muncey, 2010). Here, the autoethnographer is positioned as "both the researcher and the researched" (Muncey, 2010: 3), thus merging the boundaries between the personal and the social, the self and the other (Reed-Danahay, 1997; Allen-Collinson, 2012). In essence autoethnographies are personalised accounts of the author's experience which extend sociological understanding (Sparkes, 2000). Sparkes and Smith (2014) contend that conveying individual experience by association reveals social experiences that are inherently connected to culture and therefore to the wider world. Additionally, it can enable links to be made between an individual's identity, values, feelings and culture and issues in society (Tracy, 2013).

Multiple approaches to, and forms of, autoethnography exist (Ellis, 2004; Wall, 2006; Denzin, 2014) and can take the form of short stories, poetry or novels, through to photographic essays (Ellis, 2004; Denzin, 2014). Conceptual controversy exists surrounding distinguishing different forms of autoethnography (Tracy, 2013). The evocative autoethnography approach seeks to show, rather than tell, to reveal the subjective emotional experiences of the writer (McMahon, 2016). It is synonymous with approaches that "deploy literary devices to recreate lived experience and evoke emotional responses" (Richardson, 2000: 11). Evocative autoethnography draws on postmodern sensibilities (Muncey, 2010; Markula and Silk, 2011) which question traditional research criteria by suggesting that the values and subjectivities of the researcher cannot be separated from the methods and procedures employed (Bochner, 2000). Criticisms of the evocative approach suggest it is self-absorbed and prioritises the personal over the political (Atkinson, 2006). However, it is argued that evocative autoethnographers "bypass the representational problem by invoking an epistemology of emotion, moving the reader to feel the feelings of the other" (Denzin, 1997: 228).

An alternative approach to evocative autoethnography, as advocated by Anderson (2006), is analytic autoethnography. The aim of analytic autoethnography is to capture, and then reach beyond, the subjective self-experience to broader generalisations (Anderson, 2006) where "the personal story plays an important, but clearly subordinate, role to the larger empirical-theoretical story central to analytic autoethnography" (Burnier, 2006: 415). The analytic approach aims to inform the reader about "what the tale is about and how it should, ideally, be read" (McMahon, 2016: 307). It involves complete membership, sustained reflexivity and ensuring visibility of the narrative self (Anderson, 2006). This is viewed with caution by Burnier (2006) who warns against such stringent categorical divides and acknowledges that, whilst each method encapsulates the researchers' epistemological values and

beliefs, the two should be blended to avoid reinstating previous divisions such as separating heart and mind, emotion and rationality.

Building upon such practices Richardson (2000) proposes the term creative analytic practices (CAP) to reflect research that is creative and analytic and brings lived experience to the forefront. This reflects the privileging of both aspects and "displays the writing process and the writing product as deeply intertwined" (Richardson, 2000: 10). Subsequently, this represents a move away from more conventional forms of social scientific writing which previously neglected the link between text and experience and recognises experience as "*created* in the social text by the researcher" (Sparkes and Smith, 2014: 155; emphasis in the original). It encourages researchers to employ new writing practices, methodological and analytical approaches and acknowledges that writing produced within the postmodernist context involves the positioning of the self and is subsequently always local, partial and situational (Richardson, 2000: 10). Ellis and Bocher (2000: 739) suggest it requires multiple layers of consciousness, where the autoethnographer focuses both outwards, linking personal experiences to the cultural and social before also looking inwards to reflect on the personal self. Autoethnography falls within this umbrella term of creative analytic practices and involves storied writing where the analysis emerges via the telling of the story (Smith and Sparkes, 2008; Gearity, 2014). They enable a focus on both the hows and whats that form an inseparable part of the story (Richardson, 2000; Smith and Sparkes, 2008).

Autoethnography enables the researcher to convey stories about the self which provide alternative perspectives of the world (Denison, 2002; Tracy, 2013). The insider positioning of autoethnography can provide a depth of meaning and knowledge of lived experience and feelings that would otherwise be unavailable and inaccessible (Muncey, 2010; Allen-Collinson, 2012). It can reveal new insights from the mundane of everyday life and provides the opportunity to problematise and challenge taken-for-granted knowledge (Gardiner, 2000). Furthermore,

autoethnography "enables exploration of "stuff" of life which (unlike the apparent neatness associated with concepts and theories) can often be uneven, unpredictable and messy" (Brown, Gilbourne and Claydon, 2009: 492). An additional strength of autoethnography is it can address the emotional dimension of the self and incorporate embodied ways of knowing which have previously been underdeveloped (Allen-Collinson and Hockey, 2005; Sparkes and Smith, 2014). Another strength of autoethnographic and narrative enquiry is that it can potentially reveal how individuals construct, revise and alter their identities and experiences (Smith and Sparkes, 2008; Adams and Holman Jones, 2011; Douglas, 2014). This is related to the open-ended, inconclusive and ambiguous nature of autoethnography which leaves scope for multiple interpretations (Denzin, 2014). Autoethnography can also engage others to think both reflexively and critically (Ellis, 2004; Holman-Jones 2005; Markula and Denison, 2005; Gearity, 2014).

Despite its apparent benefits, and support within interpretive and poststructuralist paradigms, critics of autoethnography take issue with the use of the self as a source (Coffey, 1999; Sparkes, 2000; Delamont, 2009) and the lack of methodological rigor, absence of theory and insufficient analysis (Wall, 2006; Ellis, Adams and Bochner, 2011; Denzin, 2014). Many of these claims have been refuted and rebutted on the grounds that writing about the self and individual experiences is not possible without connections to others and the social and cultural (Church, 1995; Bochner and Ellis, 1996; Sparkes 2002a). It has also been argued that autoethnography extends and contributes wider ways of knowing and understanding for both author and reader (Sparkes, 2002a; Pelias, 2013) and that alternative criteria are required for judging autoethnographic accounts (as will be addressed in a later section) (Sparkes, 2002b; Allen-Collinson, 2012).

With regards to my study, autoethnography was elected as to a large degree, in agreeance with Gearity's (2014) suggestion that for some scholars it is the only research approach suitable to convey their story, I found this to be true. It provided a

form of writing that was flexible and fluid (Ellis, 2004) and also enabled the conveyance of experiences and complex feelings which were not accessible via conventional methods (Muncey, 2010). It also included exploration of the personal and social whilst recognising research to be emotional, therapeutic as well as rigorous, theoretical and analytical (Ellis, Adams and Bochner, 2011), thus providing opportunities to connect the scholarly and theoretical with the narratives of my autoethnography. By drawing on my 'insider' position as a coach educator and the wealth of experiences and memories that I possessed from over seven years working as a coach educator, I believed employing autoethnography would enable me to investigate the social complexity of coach education and gain a fuller understanding of the emotional and social perspectives of a coach educator's world (Haleem et al., 2003; Purdy, Potrac and Jones, 2008; Adams, Holman-Jones and Ellis, 2015). More specifically, it enabled me to explore the emotional aspects of coach education and the way that coach educators 'see', 'feel' and 'act' (Jones, 2009), to provide a greater understanding of everyday realities of practice. It also provides the opportunity to explore the "nuances, mysteries and complexities of human interaction" (Potrac and Jones, 2009b: 564). Therefore, autoethnography can provide an additional approach to explore the much under researched area of coach education and potentially offer a "means of gaining rich and nuanced insights into the personal, lived experiences and situating these within a wider socio-cultural context" (Allen-Collinson, 2012: 25).

3.5.2. Constructing my autoethnography

Creative analytical practice was selected for use in the construction of my autoethnography as it enabled the portrayal of lived experience (Richardson, 2000), including the prioritisation and exploration of emotions in relation to individuals' cultural and historical contexts (Ellis and Bochner, 2006). It provided me with the scope to capture also the embodied aspects of lived experience such as emotions (Sparkes, 1996; Smith and Sparkes, 2009; McMahon and McGannon, 2016). The

appeal to be both analytical and evocative and essentially blend the personal and the scholarly provided further methodological justification for this selection (Burnier, 2006).

The construction of autoethnography can be based on just memories of lived experience (Brown, Gilbourne and Claydon, 2009) or use various sources, including medical records, newspaper articles, diary extracts (Sparkes, 1996), reflective journals (Holt, 2001), or combine two or more sources such as training diaries, e-mails and memories (Purdy, Potrac and Jones, 2008). The use of sources provides legitimation of the interpretations and claims within autoethnography beyond the reliance on just memory and its potential distortions (Muncey, 2005). Just as Coffey (1999) suggests that fieldwork notes and memories of lived experience cannot be separated in the production of ethnography, the same could be said in the production of autoethnography since memories are intertwined with other sources to produce such accounts.

I used a range of sources in data collection and construction of my autoethnography. This involved the completion of an emotion diary to capture and detail the various emotions experienced whilst delivering coach education courses over a period of two years. The diaries aimed to capture my emotion, their intensity and embodiment, the situation and interactions with others at the time and any change in emotions. The entries were also completed contemporaneously and then re-visited at a later point in time, in accordance with Ellis's (1999) suggestion that it is easier to analyse outside from a cultural perspective once you are more emotionally distanced from the event. Anderson and Glass-Coffin (2013) also indicate that there is greater opportunity for reflexive engagement. I also used emotional recall to draw upon any memories of emotions that I experienced over the six years I had previously worked as a coach educator. This was where I imagined myself back in the scene emotionally and physically, as Ellis (1999) suggested that revisiting a scenario emotionally can assist in remembering other details. The completion of my diaries

and recalling of memories provided a starting point from which I could begin a conscious self-examination of the emotions I experienced.

To understand the emotions I experienced as a coach educator, I also employed what Ellis (1991) refers to as systematic sociological introspection which can "generate interpretive materials from self and others useful for understanding the lived experience of emotions" (Ellis, 1991: 23). This involved drawing upon my embodied feelings, thoughts and emotions to try to understand my coach education experiences. Additionally, I engaged in dialogue and interactive introspection with my supervisors who I used as critical friends to help unpack my experiences and emotions further and provide feedback. This helped develop ongoing reflection, interpretations and understandings of my stories (Toner et al., 2012). Introspection enabled the examination of emotions and could provide revelations into how and why people manage emotions, as well as insights into the relationships between emotions actually experienced and the feelings, behaviours and actions displayed (Ellis, 1991). The emotional recall and introspection enabled me to link the personal to the cultural (Mykhalovskiy, 1996; Richardson, 2000; Ellis, 2004).

My writing aimed to encourage the reader to initially think with the stories by "allowing yourself to resonate with the story, reflect on it, become part of it" (Ellis and Bochner, 2000: 753), before thinking about the story which is to "reduce it to content and then analyse that content" (Frank, 1995: 23). Subsequently, I aimed to write evocative accounts of my experiences and emotions which moved the reader (Ellis and Bochner, 2000; Ellis 2004). I used creative non-fiction to create my stories and convey my emotions and experiences. This can achieve emotional vibrancy, a deeper understanding and reveal meaning (Cheney, 2001) as well as encourage the reader to vicariously experience the events described (Barone, 2002). Essentially, as Agar (1995) described, I employed fictional techniques to shape and dramatise and convey factual content. This involved, in parts, initially trying to *show* rather than *tell* through using detail, dialogue and scene setting (Ellis, 1995). This linked with the evocative

writing as I used rich and vivid description to hook the reader and enable them to feel the emotions and react emotionally (Gearity, 2014). These techniques aimed to recreate the sounds, smells, sights, dialogue and emotional tone of the situation so that the reader could experience it too, as if they were present (Agar, 1995; Ellis,1999; Richardson, 2000; Caulley, 2008). I employed numerous literary techniques as discussed by Caulley (2008), such as creating scenes which are connected by narrative, using the active voice, conveying captured conversations and carefully selecting diction, tone, syntax, metaphors, similes and compressions. Other aspects included character development, a plot and authorial presence (Agar, 1995). All such techniques were designed to invite the reader to 'relive' the experience (Richardson, 2000).

Despite recognising the value of evocative autoethnography, in subscribing to the creative analytical practices of autoethnography (Richardson, 2000). I wanted to do more than convey analysis purely through the presented stories (Ellis and Bochner, 2006). I wanted to include, in addition to showing, some telling and offer interpretation of the experiences written about (Sparkes, 2002a; Jones, 2006: Jones, 2009). I also wanted to make sense, contextualise and interpret the emotions and experiences through considering and using a range of theoretical frameworks. The argument against the use and incorporation of theory contends that narrative alone is sufficient and suggests that involving theory leads to reductive interpretations which risk obscuring the complexity, uncertainty and messiness of everyday life (Gilbourne, 2011). The argument for allowing stories to stand alone suggests that employing theory can lead to the tailoring of personal accounts to fit with specific theoretical frameworks, hence reducing or removing the personal element (Frank, 1995). Furthermore, it can deny the reader the scope to direct their thoughts and interpretations in their own way (Denison and Rinehart, 2000). In contrast, adopting theoretical frameworks enables possible interpretations of the story through telling, in addition to just showing within autoethnographical accounts (Sparkes, 2002c; Jones,

2009), which can assist readers' interpretations of the story given and may also resonate with similar experiences of the reader (Jones, 2006). Denison's (2016) more recent argument is that, alongside narratives, there is a need to incorporate social theory into our accounts and "blend rich description with thick analysis" as social life is too complex to be left to stand alone (Denison, 2016: 9). In urging the need to highlight the whys and how with narrative research as well as problematising the subject focused upon, Denison (2016) argues that it is important to consider the "change, contingency, context, improvisation and struggle…that communicate a commitment to cultural criticism and theoretical reflection" (Denison, 2016: 8). Following Denison (2016), I aimed to be both emotionally evocative and analytical through intertwining my accounts with social theory as part of my autoethnography, in the hope to provide an insight and understanding of the how and whys of the emotional experiences of coach educators.

It is important to acknowledge that my autoethnographies are constructed by me and that the experiences are described, interpreted and presented from my point of view (Sparkes, 2002b). Indeed, I present my narrative as just one possible lived experience and hope that it enables multiple voices to be heard and to problematise and shed light on the previously unknown (Denzin, 2014). Therefore, it should be recognised that I have selected what to include and subsequently the choices made in my interpretation and the lived experiences presented will ultimately shape and define to some extent what and how the reader interprets my stories (Diversi, 1998).

3.6. Iterative data analysis

Following the generating of data, I was aware of the need to decide upon which approach to adopt given the choices available in the explanation and analysis of data. Deductive reasoning is traditionally associated with positivism (North, 2017) and experimental approaches of a quantitative nature (Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014). In a deductive approach, theory is a framing device to assist in the selection

of data collection approaches and devise hypotheses or research questions (Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014) which are based upon prior reasoning, observational evidence or the existing research literature (Veal and Darcy, 2014). Deductive approaches are criticised for a lack of clarity in relation to how to select theory to be tested therefore it can be argued that "deductions only convey truths to a very limited extent" (Reichertz, 2014: 128). In comparison, inductive reasoning is typically associated with interpretivism (North, 2017) and interpretive approaches (Veal and Darcy, 2014). Qualitative researchers who undertake inductive reasoning start with the specifics and move on to broader generalisations and theories (Tracy, 2013). In the inductive process, "the data come first and the explanation later" (Veal and Darcy, 2014: 43). With an inductive approach "the researcher starts with an observation or study of a number of individual cases or incidents and then establishes generalities that link them to each other" (Sparkes and Smith, 2014: 25). The portrayal of inductive and deductive approaches as divided by paradigmatic approach is questionable, as scholars propose that qualitative research can involve elements of both induction and deduction (Tracy, 2013; Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Cassidy, 2016). In caution of these approaches, Bryman (2012) and Nelson et al., (2014) contend that neither inductive or deductive approaches are as concise as they may convey and would be more appropriately claimed as tendencies.

In relation to data analysis, for some researchers within the qualitative paradigm, it is traditionally an isolated event in a sequential research process (Creswell, 2013). In contrast, Merriam and Tisdell (2016: 195; emphasis in original) proposed that qualitative data collection and analysis should be a "*simultaneous* process". Furthermore, other qualitative researchers suggest that, regarding data analysis as a separate entity represents a false division, as thoughts, judgements and conclusions are inherent throughout the research process (Sparkes, 2002; Taylor, 2014). After considering these points, I adopted a phronetic iterative approach to analysis which involved alternating "between considering theories and research

questions on the one hand, and emergent qualitative data on the other" (Tracy, 2018: 63). Reflective of this, throughout this research study, I was moving back and forth between emic readings of the data and etic use of theories, models and explanations as appropriate (Tracy, 2019). This involved continuously refining my research questions, collecting emotion diaries, conducting interviews and writing autoethnography, whilst undertaking an ongoing analysis of the data, but also thinking whilst in and away from the field of what I had heard or read (Taylor, 2014). Subsequently, I viewed data analysis as a dynamic, recursive and iterative process (Taylor, 2014; Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). This provided the opportunity for continuous analysis of the data rather than undertaking analysis at the end of data collection when it can become "unfocused, repetitious and overwhelming" (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016: 197).

Ongoing analysis also provided the flexibility to follow-up on identified and new themes (Sparkes and Smith, 2002) and informed what was asked in subsequent interviews (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). In the same way, my autoethnographic accounts were also formed in a cyclical and iterative process. Essentially iteration was a reflexive process where I gradually developed and refined my focus and understanding through repeatedly revisiting the data and connecting it to insights and developing meaning (Srivastava and Hopwood, 2009; Tracy, 2013). This reflexive process of analysis was achieved through repeatedly reading and revisiting the data and continually engaging in reflective discussions with my supervisors, in what Tracy (2013) describes as the data immersion phase, to assist in sense-making and exploring different interpretations of the data. This was assisted by my supervisors adopting the role of 'critical friends' throughout the data analysis and listening to my developing interpretations of theory and providing a sounding board for my constructions of explanations and understanding of the data (Smith and McGannon, 2017). This repeated engagement in discussion and offering of critical feedback often

challenged and questioned my understanding, prompted new lines of thought and inquiry but also consolidated my interpretations whilst acknowledging those of others.

Adopting a phronetic iterative approach, my data analysis of each interview involved repeatedly alternating between data generation, emergent reading of the data and referring to relevant theoretical frameworks in continual cycles until I felt my analysis of each interview transcript was complete (Tracy, 2018). Of particular importance in this process is the recognition that the emic and etic phases of analysis were not neat, linear and isolated occurrences, and as an iterative process very much involved "cycles of data collection, data analysis, and, additional, more focused collection of data" (Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014: 84). The interview transcripts were each subjected to an emic or emergent analysis where I read and re-read the interview transcripts to identify meaningful data in relation to my research questions and establish 'what' was present within the data. This involved, as Tracy (2019) terms it, 'primary-cycle coding', whereupon with each reading I assigned phrases and words to capture the essence of the processes and activities within my data (e.g., smiling, frustration, expectation, professional). For example, with regards to answering research question two, relating to how the coach educators developed understanding of the emotion rules, the primary cycle coding captured key words included: experiencing, observing, copying, reflecting, avoiding, repeating, feedback, coach educator, coach learner, athlete, pupil, student, parents, child as first level codes. To try and avoid definitional drift and keep the codes as relevant to and reflective of the data as possible (Tracy, 2019), whilst undertaking the primary-cycle coding process, I also used the constant comparative method (Charmaz, 2006). This involved comparing the data under each code and either altering or modifying the code to fit with previously identified data or creating a new code to accommodate the data (e.g., noticing and watching were included within the code observing).

As meaningful data was identified from the primary-cycle coding phase, I critically examined the codes from the emic analysis and assigned them into more

"analytic and interpretive second-level codes" (Tracy, 2013: 194). These categories were informed and shaped by my research questions (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016) and the drawing on of relevant theories and literature, thus contributing to an etic analysis aligned with my iterative analysis approach. For example, in relation to research question two, the filtered second level codes included learning in role, previous educational experiences, family influence, and societal expectation. Within this phase, I also used 'analytic memos' to begin to establish preliminary links between the identified, meaningful data and possible theoretical concepts which may assist in explaining my data (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). These early theoretical links also contributed towards shaping questions in future interviews. Throughout this process it should be acknowledged that this analysis of data is influenced by what I, as the researcher, want to know and my interpretation of the data and is, inevitably, shaped by the theoretical lens, subjective perspectives, and ontological and epistemological positions adopted (Srivastava and Hopwood, 2009; Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014).

3.7. Reflexivity and researcher positionality

Reflexivity has become an accepted and expected part of qualitative research (Finlay, 2002). It requires "the researchers' reflections on their research as part of the process of knowledge production" (Flick, 2018: 7). It is suggested by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) that the concept of reflexivity involves researchers actively seeking to recognise and articulate their selves in their influence and role in the research. Reflexivity involves "not *getting rid* of the self, but *doubling* the self: distancing ourselves from ourselves to a greater or lesser extent, so that we have a sense of standing outside ourselves and observing what we are doing and thinking" (Hunt and Sampson, 2006: 4). This contrasts with the process of reflection, an activity that is undertaken independently and involves contemplation of aspects readily available to the researcher (Hunt and Sampson, 2006). In qualitative approaches

reflexivity encourages exploration of the subjectivity of the researcher as a key influence throughout all aspects of the research process including selection of the area of study, development of research questions, data collection, interpretation and analysis (Sparkes and Smith, 2014). By adopting a reflexive stance at all stages of the research process, including the reporting stage, the findings of qualitative research can be enhanced (Yoon and Uliassi, 2022). Indeed, in line with my philosophical and paradigmatic positioning I strove to adopt a reflexive stance to acknowledge my own subjectivities and raise awareness of their influences throughout the undertaking of this research. The choice of topic focus for my research upon emotion in this context developed from personal experiences, encounters and interactions as a coach educator, as illustrated upon in a previous section (Chapter One).

Central to the conducting of qualitative research is the notion of researcher-as-instrument (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000), where the researcher is the primary instrument in data generation, analysis and interpretation. Therefore, as the main instrument of data collection it is important to acknowledge my personal characteristics, experiences, background and how they impacted upon the collection of the data in particular concerning issues of status and power (Pillow 2010; Tracy, 2020). In adopting a reflexive approach, I considered how my role as a female researcher and a coach educator shaped the data during collection in the conducting of interviews (see Chapter Three, page 76). Furthermore, the interpretation of data was shaped by my selection, reading and interpretation of theory (see Chapter Three, page 91) and I therefore was central to the outcomes of the analysis (Nelson, Potrac and Groom, 2014).

To incorporate a reflexive approach to research, it is also necessary to clarify my own positionality. Positionality "reflects the position that the researcher has chosen to adopt within a given research study" (Savin-Baden and Major, 2013: 71). To develop researcher positionality Savin-Baden and Major (2013) suggest

researchers locate themselves in relation to their own viewpoint and that of their participants. In this study, my role as a netball coach educator provided insider status, where the researcher is a member of the group that the research is undertaken with (Brannick and Coghlan, 2007). In occupying this position, I was acutely aware that the information shared by participants may be shaped by both their underlying perceptions of me and relationships beyond the research context (see Chapter Three, pages 60-61). In the research context rather than striving for neutrality, I intentionally shared my own emotion experiences. This can lead to the development of trust and rapport between the researcher and participant (Dwyer and Buckle, 2009). The insider researcher holds as Mercer (2007) describes 'a double-edged sword', where more may be shared due to pre-existing knowledge and familiarity with the context or lost due to overfamiliarity which obscures what the researcher identifies. The engagement in discussions with supervisors in the role of 'critical friends' to challenge assumptions and prompt further inquiry was vital in helping to develop my interpretations and understandings and guard against this by turning attention towards the familiar and sometimes overlooked (Fleming, 2018). The completion of a reflective diary throughout the process assisted in capturing my "changing and developing understanding of method and content" (Etherington, 2004: 127).

3.8. Theoretical frameworks

In following an iterative analysis process, the emotional practices of coach educators were examined via theoretical frameworks and tools that were integral to the undertaking of an emic and etic analysis approach. Several theories situated within symbolic interactionism, dramaturgy and poststructuralism were drawn upon, as is reflective of the interpretivist positioning within the study and appropriate to the focus of the research questions under exploration.

In identifying the emotion rules that guide coach educators' emotional practices to answer research question one, Goffman's dramaturgical theorising (1990

[1959]) and Hochschild's seminal text, *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling* (2000 [1983]) and publication *Emotion Work, Feeling Rules and Social Structure* (1979), form the primary guiding devices for analysis in this part of the thesis. Hochschild's study of flight attendants' daily work and the nuances of emotion experienced, emotions displayed to others and the interplay with social interaction and context, led to the development of the concept of emotional labour. Of particular relevance to the analysis was the conceptualisation of display rules (Hochschild,1979; 1983). According to Hochschild (1983), display rules promote the expression of organisationally appropriate emotions when a dissonance occurs between the emotion experienced and the emotion that is expected and required of a worker (Hochschild, 1983). The display rules inform both the emotion that it is appropriate to express and the extent to which it should be expressed according to the social encounter and the individual's role (Theodosius, 2008).

To examine how emotion display rules are learnt by coach educators, the theorising of Thoits (1989; 2004) and Zembylas (2005c) were primarily used to assist in the analysis. The work of Thoits (1989, 2004) adopts an interactionist view that in her appraisal of micro and macro levels of emotion in *The Sociology of Emotions* (Thoits, 1989) and calls for a sociological consideration of emotions as she argues that "key determinants of emotional experience are not physiological but sociocultural" (Thoits, 1989: 320). In this regard, "subjective experiences and emotional beliefs are both socially acquired and socially structured" (Thoits, 1989: 319). Based upon this, Thoits (1989, 2004) conceptualisation of emotional socialisation as a process in relation to required emotion norms could inform and enhance understanding. In addition to the useful symbolic interactionist theorising of Thoits (2004) to understand how coach educators learn the display rules themselves in relation to emotion norms, I selected Zembylas's (2005) poststructuralist theorising on the understanding of learning emotion rules to develop insights regarding the relations of power that constitute norms in wider contexts. In doing so it offers a lens

to consider the social, cultural, political and historically constructed nature of emotion (Zembylas, 2005). In particular, Zembylas's (2005c) book *Teaching with Emotion: A Postmodern Enactment* offered an alternative perspective and an additional sensemaking tool. In this work, Zembylas (2005c) sought to highlight the sociohistorical, cultural and discursive aspects of emotion that shape teachers' emotion practices and performances. In the poststructuralist approach that underlies his work Zembylas (2005b; 2005c) presented a framework on the genealogies of emotions in teaching to explore the discursive structures and normative practices through which teaching is constituted.

Central to the analysis of coach educators' emotion management strategies in addressing research question three was the theorising of Hochschild (2012 [1983]) and Bolton (2005). A further ground-breaking element of Hochschild's (1983) work, influenced by Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical theorising, described the engagement in two forms of acting – surface and deep – to convey certain emotional states in their social interaction with others. In Bolton's (2005) text *Emotion Management in the Workplace*, a theoretical partnership of structural constraints of the capitalist labour process in combination with Goffman's conception of social actors as knowledgeable agents provided the underpinning to the typology of workplace emotion presented as a way of understanding organisational emotionality. Here, four categories; presentational, philanthropic, prescriptive and pecuniary (Bolton and Boyd, 2003; Bolton, 2005) are the proposed types of emotion management that actors can engage in. Building upon Hochschild's (1983, 2012) concept of emotional labour, Bolton's (2005) typology acknowledges a more dynamic, distinct form of emotion work aligned to feeling rules and provided a more multi-dimensional lens through which to analyse the coach educators' emotion management. Both Hochschild (1983) and Bolton's (2005) theorising contributed to sensemaking of management of own emotions.

In consideration of research question four, the management of the emotions of others, I drew upon the work of Thoits (1986; 2004) to analyse interpersonal

emotion management and concepts associated with active coping assistance (Thoits, 1986; 2011) and empathetic understanding (Thoits, 2011) in providing insights in this area. In addition to Thoits' (1986; 2011) interactionist perspectives, Foucault's (1995) text, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of The Prison*, in particular focused on the functioning of power in his work on disciplinary techniques and technologies of power were used to enhance sensemaking in this area using a poststructuralist perspective to understand emotion management. In addressing research question five on the motives, benefits and costs of emotion management, Bolton's (2005) typology of emotion management (as introduced above in analysis of research question three) proposes instrumental, altruistic, status, ontological, security and gift motives as central in relationships and social situations to understanding the emotion management in organisations. The work of Zembylas (2005c) (as introduced in relation to analysis of research question two) and his conception of positive and negative emotional labour were used to analyse the costs of emotion management.

3.9. Judging qualitative research

Judging the quality of qualitative research is a contested area (Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Smith and McGannon, 2017). Traditionally the criteria for judging the quality of research have been associated with quantitative measures related to validity, reliability and objectivity, though these have been increasingly regarded as unsuitable and at odds with the ontological and epistemological bases of qualitative research and associated paradigmatic assumptions (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) have argued that alternative, but comparable, criteria for judging and establishing quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research consisting of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. These parallel criteria – often adopted in sports coaching research (Sparkes, 2002c; Sparkes and Smith, 2009; 2014) – represented the 'gold standard' for judging the quality of qualitative research (Smith, Sparkes and Caddick, 2014; Sparkes and Smith, 2014). The

techniques Guba and Lincoln (1985) suggested for attaining these criteria include prolonged engagement in the field, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing, negative case analysis, referential adequacy and member checking.

The parallel criteria (Guba and Lincoln, 1985) have been questioned by some scholars (Sparkes, 1998; Sparkes and Smith, 2009; Smith and McGannon, 2017) who argue that Lincoln and Guba's (1985) perspective is philosophically contradictory because it subscribes to both epistemological foundationalism (i.e. reality can be found objectively via specific data gathering techniques and can determine trustworthy versus untrustworthy interpretations of reality) and ontological relativism (i.e. reality is multiple, created and mind-dependent) (Sparkes, 1998; 2009; Sparkes and Smith, 2009). This unsustainable position requires resolution in one of two ways: via acceptance of multiple realities that are researcher dependent and that techniques alone cannot determine trustworthiness, or acceptance of a reality existing as outside of the self and known via objective measurements and techniques (Smith, Sparkes and Caddick, 2014). I subscribe to the former. Smith and McGannon (2017) further highlight this contradictory stance in their critique of member checking as a means of judging the rigor and verifying the quality of qualitative research. They argue that the epistemological foundationalism that Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed member checking to be based on presupposes a neutrality which can objectively distinguish between the more-or-less trustworthy. This premise is problematic when made against the researcher and participant who will always influence the method and knowledge claims through their own subjectivities, and therefore reflect the ontological relativism and subsequent multiple and mind-dependent realities that Guba and Lincoln (1985) also accept. Further contradicting this stance is the implication that those under study are the 'real knowers' and holders of truth (Sparkes, 1998; Smith and Sparkes, 2009), and that member checking provides no way to decide upon which knowledge claim to privilege if a contradiction between researcher and participant interpretation occurs (Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

Scholars propose that judging all qualitative research against a pre-determined and universal criterion of trustworthiness is problematic (Sparkes and Smith, 2009; Smith and McGannon, 2017). Adopting such an approach, Sparkes and Smith (2009) suggest, creates a very narrow judgement system about what can be deemed as legitimate research, resulting in the exclusion of certain forms of qualitative research such as autoethnography because the criteria judge them as "bad" research. Further criticism of applying universal criteria is that it neglects to consider the specific intent and purpose of the research (Smith and McGannon, 2017). It is therefore not possible to determine trustworthy interpretations from untrustworthy ones when judging quality based on universal criteria (Smith and Deemer, 2000; Sparkes and Smith, 2014) and considering the criticisms raised, nor is it possible to apply universal criteria to all qualitative research (Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

In response to these criticisms, alternative positions and strategies for judging the goodness of qualitative research are proposed. A relativist position rejects the concept of fixed and pre-determined criteria and instead perceives criteria as an open-ended, socially constructed, list of characteristics which is subject to change and re-interpretation (Smith and Deemer, 2000; Sparkes and Smith, 2009; Burke, 2016; Smith and McGannon, 2017). One such approach, informed by a relativist perspective, is what Sparkes (1998; 2002c) and Sparkes and Smith (2014) call the "letting go position". This involves abandoning the traditional notion of validity and instead adopts time and place contingent lists of characteristics to judge the 'goodness' of a qualitative study (Smith, Sparkes and Caddick, 2014; Sparkes and Smith, 2014). However, a relativist approach does not mean that "anything goes" when judging the quality of a study, but that "a relativist is unwilling to mandate what one *must* do across all contexts and on all occasions, prior to any piece of research being conducted" (Smith and McGannon, 2017: 16; emphasis in original).

Based upon my interpretive philosophical beliefs and the suggestions by Denzin (2010) that work be considered within this paradigm, I found myself agreeing with the 'letting go' perspective (Sparkes, 1988; 2002c Sparkes and Smith, 2009; 2014) and subsequently invite readers to judge and evaluate the goodness of this study in relation to the interpretive criteria drawn upon from this perspective. More specifically, I selected criteria from lists suggested by Richardson (2000), Smith, Sparkes and Caddick, (2014), Holman-Jones (2005) and Barone and Eisner (2012) and whilst I acknowledge that these are not the only criteria available for making judgements, I ask the reader to consider the following. Firstly, does this investigation make a substantive contribution to our understanding of social life? Secondly, is this a worthy topic that is evocative, relevant, interesting and timely? Thirdly, does this study succeed aesthetically; that is to say, are creative and analytical practices utilised effectively to present the text in open, satisfying and complex ways which provide the opportunity for interpretive responses? Does it reveal through de-familiarisation a different perspective on a previously held view? Alternatively, does the research resonate with you via the evocative representations or transferability of experiences conveyed in the study? Fourthly, does it express a reality? That is "does this text embody a fleshed out sense of lived experience? Does it seem true – a credible account of a cultural, social, individual, or communal sense of the real?" (Richardson, 2000: 16). Finally, does it impact emotionally or intellectually and inspire further questioning about the everyday and emotional realities of coach education?

Chapter 4: Emotion rules

4.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to make theoretical sense of my own and the other coach educators' understanding of the emotional rules which guide pedagogical interactions when delivering netball coach education courses. To date no explicit consideration of the emotional rules that guide coach educators work has been undertaken, with emotional displays acknowledged more broadly in relation to organisational, societal and self-referenced expectations in the wider coaching literature (e.g., Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac et al., 2017). While the wider literature on the sociology of emotions has addressed emotion rules broadly, they are often considered in combination with emotion management or learning of rules (Dieffendorff and Gregarus, 2009; Zembylas, 2007b; Pickering, 2018). This chapter presents the emotional display rules that Lucy, Nicola, Olivia, Katie and myself understood guided our work as coach educators in relation to our pedagogical interactions with coach learners and other coach educators. My interpretations of coach educators' interview responses and my own autoethnographic accounts are presented here as they relate to four emotion rules: one regarding emotions the coach educators felt they should display, and the other three are emotions the coach educators felt they should refrain from displaying, two of which have certain boundaries attached.

4.2. Emotion display rules of coach educators

The rules that the coach educators understood to guide their emotional displays and behaviours are explored here using Hochschild's (1979; 1983) conceptualisation of display rules. Display rules are what guide appropriate displays of emotion in particular situations (Hochschild 1983) (for example, that one should

show gratitude at a gift and that big boys shouldn't cry), and are the "exchange of acts of display based on a prior shared understanding of patterned entitlement" (Hochschild, 1979: 568). This act, as Hochschild (1979) elaborated, involves the individual weighing up the bond involved and what is reasonably owed to oneself or another. Display rules are generally a function of societal, occupational and organisational norms (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989). They provide rules which inform and shape human behaviour about what is appropriate emotional behaviour in different settings and how it should be conveyed (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Grandey et al., 2010). Display rules promote the expression of organisationally appropriate emotions when there is a mismatch between the emotion that is experienced and the emotion that is required (Hochschild 1983). Essentially "display is what is sold" (Hochschild, 1983: 90). Within service encounters the customers hold clear expectations about what emotions front line staff should display as the societal norms of the interaction, such as being friendly, caring and enthusiastic (Hochschild, 1983; Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993). These display rules assist in guiding employee behaviour and interpersonal performance (Diefendorff and Gosserand, 2003). The coach educators alluded to several emotions that they perceived formed the display rules that shaped and guided their pedagogical interactions during course delivery.

4.2.1. Rule 1: Convey happiness to coach learners.

The most pertinent emotion display rule described by the coach educators related to appearing happy in front of the coach learners. This display rule of happiness has also been found to apply to other occupations and industries (Diefendorff and Gregauras, 2009), and in coach education where Allanson, Potrac and Nelson's (2019) study indicated coach educators' understanding of the requirement to display a happy and enthusiastic front in particular situations (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). Other studies have considered the emotional

displays of coaches and teachers (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2015; Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018) and highlighted display rules relating to a requirement for positive emotional displays. The coach educators described how displays of happiness were fulfilled through an array of enthusiastic displays to the coach learners, including smiling, being upbeat and displaying an interest in the learner as Nicola, Olivia, Katie and Lucy all explained below:

> It's not explicit, it doesn't say it in the job description that you must be happy, but I think, if you think about being approachable and things and what does that look like, for me, that looks like someone who is smiling and they are making eye contact with you and they are asking questions of you and showing an interest and they are getting excited about the next bit of the course. They are building excitement for the afternoon, yeah, so for me if somebody displayed those kind of actions I think that links with the emotion of being happy and I think I would think "Oh I'm quite excited and happy to be here." (Nicola)

> In the sessions they are going to do their own sessions, they are going to work as a group. We are going to teach them things, they are going to do stuff. So we try to make it as varied as possible within the groups and you get some crazy answers off them. You get people who are quite quiet because you have got young learners in there. You get people who never shut up, well I know this, and I know that and you have got to then manage the different learners in the group. Erm, no I think I am like that when I teach, I'm always upbeat, I like to have fun, I think that is how people learn, that's how I would learn. (Olivia)

> Coming over as happy and also displaying amazement would be a positive response to learners, promoting a happy atmosphere. You know when they do something really good and you go Woah amazing, displaying interest in the learners and their responses indicates that you are there for them and to aid their learning and progress, around this learner centred thing isn't it. (Katie)

> Yeah, you have got to display interest in what you are doing and yeah enthusiasm for it otherwise you would just lose the group a bit wouldn't you. Um, but, yeah, again I don't think it has been taught from anywhere, I think that that is just the type of person I am a bit more enthusiastic about things, it's just me. (Lucy)

Listening to those participants' stories about the displays of happiness in their work were ones that I could very much relate to. The accounts offered by Nicola and Lucy resonated with my own experiences and reminded me of my own ensuing displays of enthusiasm that I relied upon when working with coach learners:

> I'd timed it perfectly, all set up and ready to focus on the coach learners as they returned from their break for the second module, one of my favourite parts of the course. Smiling I introduced the module outcomes and enthused about the next bit which would be their first step into coaching. I started to deliver some fundamentals drawing on elements that I knew would challenge the group but were high paced and fun to get them involved. Smiling and switching my attention to different individuals and groups I put them through their paces of some movement skills, throwing around comments and feedback on the movements to groups and individuals with ease, smiling and questioning, making that connection, providing over exaggerated praise and at times enthusiasm for what was a relatively basic set of skills, excited to see how they would respond. Parts of it were a well-oiled machine that just took off when I stepped on court but changing it up in response to the group gave me the challenge and excitement too, the enthusiasm and buzz of my own that I wanted them to take on board too.

Similar displays are evident in teaching and coaching where accounts conveyed acting friendly, cheerful, enthusiastic and excited were equated more broadly with expressing positive emotions (Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018). In a coaching context a similar display rule was evident for a grassroots football coach who "had come to believe that he should think, feel and act positively when talking about and enacting the FA's preferred pedagogical delivery style" (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2015: 919).

For two of the coach educators, interpretation of the rule to display happiness had an even greater degree of refinement in terms of the amount of happiness they deemed it appropriate to display in their interactions with the coach learners. The coach educators explained how they thought it necessary to place a limit on the amount of happiness and excitement and their accounts highlighted how they tempered these emotions (Diefendorff and Greguras, 2009) to provide an impression of appearing professional, in a suitably enthusiastic but controlled manner. As Nicola and Lucy shared:

> Well I am going to link happiness and excitement together, well I don't mean that by all singing and dancing, I just mean that by when they walk in in the morning and you like you know, good morning, are you alright, where have you travelled from and you know having a smile on your face

> and being approachable rather than being sat behind a desk trying to sort out all the stuff behind the scenes it's just having excitement for the course as well and being happy that you are there, I think again it passes on to the learners if your happy and your smiling and your enjoying yourself then they are going to think well it's not that bad. (Nicola)

> I think that they expect me to be a bit more upbeat, I don't think they expect me to be like sad or frustrated or like a bit depressed, like I don't want to be there but I don't think that they expect me to be like absolutely elated either so I would imagine somewhere in between but a bit more towards the happy spectrum and like a bit enthusiastic about what I'm delivering cos then hopefully that emotion rubs off onto them as well. (Lucy)

Specific displays of happiness and reduced happiness in front of customers has been previously revealed in the understanding of display rules by service-based workers across four countries (Grandey et al., 2010). The coach educators understanding of limiting the degree of happiness displayed arguably indicates an ability to control emotional displays to ensure their roles and actions are perceived as genuine and authentic, since displays of too much happiness or smiling risks coming across as insincere or unprofessional (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Grandey et al., 2005). Alongside the emphasis on displays of happiness whilst they worked, the coach educators also held a strong underlying perception that happiness was the emotional display the coach learners expected from them. As highlighted by Olivia and Nicola:

> I am happy and enthusiastic on courses and that is what is expected, because if you are, you don't want to be there and like oh we will just miss this bit out, I think it shows onto the candidates because they have given up their weekend to go, they have been at work all week as well, they are probably tired, they have probably got kids and they have probably got nagging husbands as well. So I think you have sort of got to be upbeat and you have got to say good morning, how are you doing? You know, some of these people I don't know and you are probably never gonna see some of these people ever again, so I am not gonna turn up and be like a headmistress and say like right, tell me an answer now. (Olivia)

> I do think that you are expected to have an interest in what you do because if you don't, I think it comes on to the kind of things that I have noted down that I don't think you should show. I think you should be interested in what you are talking about, I think you should be interested in understanding why the people are there, what they want to get out of it, what are their next steps after the course, I do think you should be

> interested in that because I think that shapes how you deliver your course and how you interact with the group. Erm, again it's not maybe kind of explicit on your job description but I DO think it is expected of you and that you are interested in being there, interested in the content that you are delivering and bringing the coaches on. (Nicola)

Being expected to act friendly, provide "service with a smile" and display cheer are interpreted to be part of a service employees work role (van Maanen and Kunda, 1989; Brotheridge and Grandey, 2002; Diefendorff and Richard, 2003) evident across many service-based roles, including flight attendants, servants, Walt Disney employees and salespeople (Hochschild, 1983; Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987; Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993; Reyers and Matusitz, 2012). I would suggest that the coach educators' perceptions of expectations for displays of happiness by the coach learners revealed the positioning of the coach educators – to an extent – as a service provider and the coach learners as the customer. Customer satisfaction is reached through employee's being customer orientated (Zeithaml and Bitner, 2000), which Bradley et al. (2010) suggest is exhibited through being polite and recognising customer's needs. In their accounts, the coach educators emphasised learners' needs in their interpretation of the happy display that they understand they should provide. This display rule extends the previously broader appreciation of the need to convey positive emotions or happiness in interactions in coaching (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2015) and coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019), respectively, by identifying a specific display rule for happiness in front of coach learners in the specific context of pedagogical delivery. This makes an original contribution to the area of sports coaching by firstly identifying a display rule for happiness.

4.2.2. Rule 2: Do not display fear to coach learners

The coach educators agreed that they should refrain from displaying fear in front of the coach learners. Not displaying nerves, anxiety or worry have been

previously revealed by US student athletes who explained that they were expected to conceal these emotions to comply with university conveyed display rules of expressing mental toughness (Romo, 2016). Firefighters also indicated an understanding of not to display fear to remain focused on their job responsibilities (Scott and Myers, 2007). Correctional officers also were not expected to display fear as it was perceived as a weakness (Tracy, 2005). For the coach educators fear was equivocally understood as an emotion that was not expected to be displayed to establish an effective relationship with the coach learners. For Katie fear was an emotion that she vehemently did not display as a coach educator as she perceived it would prevent or damage building up relationships and trust with the coach learner. Here, she reflected:

> I don't think I have ever displayed fear, anyway, I wouldn't do it because if you show your frightened the learners are going to think what is this person on? It's not going to work at all is it, there is going to be no relationship, there is going to be no respect or trust if they know that you are frightened.

For Lucy not displaying fear in relation to her own lack of knowledge and experience of delivering the course was important in relation to building trust and the potential for negative evaluation. This was linked to a fear of either doing something wrong or being perceived as not good enough or negatively by the coach learners. As she expanded:

> With the fear it was definitely like when I first started delivering Level 2 I was definitely really fearful then, just because I didn't know the content and it was kind of learning all over again. Like when you first start tutoring, you don't really know the content, you don't really know who you are working with, you feel like the students almost have like one up on you, because they can sniff out or suss that you don't know what you are talking about. I think for me it was definitely a fear situation for the first time I delivered a Level 2 and probably for the first couple of courses I tutored and not showing it because I wanted to gain the confidence and trust of the learners…So I think in terms of not showing fear of not being good enough or not knowing my content.

In their understanding of the rule to not display fear, the coach educators explained how they perceived that this would be imperative to gain the coach learners' trust. The work of Hardin (2006) on trust holds potential utility to contribute to the analysis here. The concept of encapsulated trust is based on the "assumption that the potentially trusted person has an interest in maintaining a relationship with the truster, an interest that gives the potentially trusted person an incentive to be trustworthy" (Hardin, 2006: 17). Clearly, the building and continuity of trust in the relationship with the coach learner is valued and important to the coach educator, as is captured in the accounts above. One of the reasons Hardin (2002) offers for the trusted encapsulating the trustees' interest is that there is in an ongoing relationship that needs to be maintained because it is valuable to the trustee. The rule of not displaying fear is indeed key for the coach educator in gaining the coach learners' trust to build a relationship conducive to learning on the course. Similarities can be drawn here to the way that the community coaches in Gale et al.'s (2019) study placed trust in co-workers, and I believe that the coach educators desired the encapsulated trust from the coach learners to meet their own goals. Ultimately, the coach educators strove for trust from the coach learners because "their own interests [were] encapsulated in the interests of the trusted" (Hardin, 2006: 19).

The coach educators' understanding of not to display fear was also linked to their underlying reputation and the perceived evaluative judgements that would be made of them by the coach learners. For Olivia there was a clear perception that fear should not be displayed to the coach learners as you should not be in the role if you are fearful, as she described:

> Fear is not something that should ever be evident to the learners, that said, I don't think that I ever am fearful because if I don't know what I am delivering I shouldn't be doing it, so there is nothing that comes up where I think Oh I don't know what I am doing here.

In a similar approach Lucy agreed that she would not intentionally or knowingly display fear or put herself in a position to show she was fearful and be judged based on it, as she explained:

> Probably when I first started, I probably did display fear without really knowing it but as I got more comfortable in the role then I don't think I have ever displayed fear… I can't isolate like one scenario but I think that when you see people that are like not confident at delivering something, you like internally cringe for them and think oh well this person does not know what they are talking about and like disengage a little bit. I don't want to be that person so if I can speak with confidence and knowledge, hopefully I won't be portrayed in that light. (Lucy)

It was also conveyed by Nicola that fear is something that cannot be displayed as she explained:

> I think yeah, if your fearful or even if something is not going right and you're worried or something happens, you're worrying about the aftermath of it, I think you have just got to park it for one minute and then come to it later and look at how you manage it again.

I found that there was a strong alignment between the other coach educators' and my own interpretations of not displaying fear to learners. The urge to not display fear related to my lack of knowledge resonated with the examples provided by Lucy, whilst I could simultaneously understand the concerns raised by Nicola and Lucy about how I might be perceived by not only the coach learners but also the other coach educators. I agreed with Olivia that fear is something which is just not expected by the coach learners or that I would deem as acceptable to display to them.

> My mind was racing, recalling previous courses I had delivered, I couldn't remember this complex attacking activity, my heart was racing and my mouth becoming increasingly dry. What is Jane (pseudonym) the other coach educator doing I thought to myself, I really didn't know. Jane had not mentioned that she was intending to deliver anything differently or use a different approach to the prescribed content for the module in the tutor notes. It was supposed to be a basic catching and passing drill but what was unfolding was much more of a complex full court game-based activity. My fingertips stuck to the paper as my palms became increasingly sweaty and I frantically flicked through the tutor notes again and again,

> the urgency to know what was happening was matched by the panic rising through my body. Well she is the lead tutor I thought, so I will damn well let her lead, as I stayed firmly sat on the bench. The feeling of panic and the increasing heart rate in my chest was growing at my lack of inclusion in what was happening and I was worried that if I remained sitting here it made me look clueless, both to the coach learners and to Jane. That mattered, it mattered to me, how I came across to the coach learners. I didn't want to look like I was not knowledgeable, I didn't want the coach learners to look at me as the weak link in the team, the weaker coach educator next to Jane. I was annoyed at myself too, in my role as a coach educator I should know what was being delivered. When I am learning I expect the teacher, coach or course leader to be competent in all aspects and knowledgeable and in this instance I felt like I was not. What Jane was doing was beyond me and not only did it make me anxious, it made me question my ability and if I was good enough to be there. Time seemed to have slowed down, I had been sitting there for two minutes but it felt like twenty as I desperately tried to get a grasp of what was happening. I needed to find some energy and confidence to get involved. I was worried that the coach learners might think it too if they picked up on my worry and panic. My insides were trembling and a feeling of inferiority had settled upon me, this is not what the coach learners are supposed to see and neither would I admit these feelings to Jane. There was no way could I expect them to have confidence in me or listen to me if I come across like this. I certainly wouldn't be happy if a tutor was like that in front of me. Neither do England Netball expect me to be like this, the role of the tutor is to offer a high quality coach education programme via strong interpersonal skills, relevant netball knowledge and an interactive style, that's what I am supposed to provide, that's what is modelled in the way that the yearly tutor training session is delivered and in that moment I was way off from delivering this.

The accounts described by the coach educators above demonstrated further encapsulation of interests through not displaying fear was evident in relation to the valued placed upon the development and maintenance of their reputation as a good coach educator (Hardin, 2006). There was a sense that displaying fear would not be conducive to building trust, as trust exists where "A trusts B to do, or with respect to, X" (Hardin, 2006: 19). Namely in the coach educators' interpretations above this was to be competent and knowledgeable in their delivery to secure positive perceptions and a good reputation. This conception of upholding a positive reputation is alluded to by Allanson, Potrac and Nelson (2019) in their examination of coach educator work hinting that reputational damage could occur if the coach educators were seen to perform inadequately or poorly in their role. This study is the first to explore fear as

an emotion display rule in both coach education and the sports coaching research more widely.

4.2.3. Rule 3: Disappointment can only to be shown to coach learners in very limited circumstances

A further emotional display rule identified from the interviews was the expectation that disappointment was only appropriate in certain contexts. There were also specific boundaries about when disappointment should be displayed to learners. The coach educators considered displays of disappointment that were infrequent, purposeful and strategically driven to be acceptable. They were linked to eliciting a particular response or more effort from an individual coach learner when their work was not of an appropriate standard, as Olivia, Katie and Nicola described:

> Yeah yeah, you could be disappointed in them, depending on what they have been doing and you go "right that wasn't really what we wanted was it so how are you going to do it differently next time?" Yeah there are going to be times when you are disappointed, like I was disappointed at the girl who didn't take any notes, I said "listen, do you not think that you should" and she was like "I don't want to" and I was "right then!" so yeah I do get disappointed and I show that. (Olivia)

A recent example of her disappointment was elaborated upon by Olivia as she described:

> I had a couple who were put on it who just didn't have a clue what they were doing and I tried to help them and things like that and you would try to help them and tell them what they needed to do for certain things when they were doing their assessment but they just didn't listen to what you were telling them because they thought they knew better and then they went ahead and did it and they had loads of action points to do before they came for their final assessment and then I had a discussion with them and I said "listen, I don't know you but from the four days that you have been with me you know, you haven't really, you have not done your level one, you are not really coaching that much", you know and I went through a whole list of things that I had made notes on because obviously you are making notes about people so that if you have got any people that are a concern, I normally write a few notes and speak to the other

> tutor, so this person was advised not to do her external assessment and she argued the toss and argued the toss and I was like "Right, I'm just thinking about you, you have got at least another two years in which you can do it, go away and work on the things that you need to because I am not saying that you are not going to pass but in my experience if you have got all these action points to work on within the next three weeks, you are not going to have gone away and done all them". She basically turned round and said "well, I am going to go and be assessed" and I said "right, well that's fine". So I was disappointed that she didn't take anything on board that I had said, but she also didn't listen to the other tutor as well but then I found out that she didn't pass because she hadn't gone away and worked on the things that I had told her to work on.

This was also echoed by Katie in her displays of disappointment:

> Again, it's more disappointment, that's the word I'd use probably showing disappointment in their responses or work, or what they said is ok. I'd probably handle that by questioning them, such as, is that the answer I'm looking for or how could you do that better? I think I'm resolving it internally by questioning them and steering them in the right direction?

Katie provided an example of how she would do this:

> No, oh no, I said look, cast your mind back to the first weekend, where should you get these coaching points from and can you use your own? "No I should use these" she answered. So again through questioning we were able to establish which she should have used. The next question was, your questions, lovely questions but are they coaching points, no, so where should they be? Task and group management, and what about the answers to them, where should they be? Coaching points column. So again through questioning we got there.

A similar approach was echoed by Nicola:

> If they get that disappointment reaction off the tutor it could heighten their anxiety and then I just think it could either build them or not cos I think that is then quite risky if you don't know a person, but if you do it through a feedback process it is a bit more constructive it's a bit more complex.

Employing disappointment that was tempered and strategically delivered via carefully worded questioning and feedback to elicit more effort or achieve a particular outcome, like in the accounts Olivia, Katie and Nicola provided, was something that resonated strongly with my own deployment of disappointment. It was something that

I used intermittently to produce a desired response from the learners and reinforce a point that had been missed as my account illustrated:

> I watched the clock tick round to the last minute of the eight that the coach learners had been allocated to deliver their warm ups, “how have they still not got this?” I asked Lizzy, the co-tutor who was stood by my side.” I just don’t know how many more times I can go over it, look three of the groups are now doing things that have nothing to do with a warm up and the fourth just did static stretches, where in the warm up that I modelled was any of that?” Letting out an exasperated sigh I called the four groups over. “Can someone tell me where in the warm up earlier was there any drill related aspects or static stretches? When we went over all the principles of a warm up earlier you could apply it, I expected you to carry that through to these warm ups, please can you have a discussion in your groups and try it again, I thought you had a better grasp of this”.

Whilst disappointment as a specific display rule has not received much research attention, this display rule and its related intention is like the disappointment displayed in a coaching context. Several authors have identified the impact of negative emotional expression on increasing athletes’ focus and performance (Hanin, 2010; Ruiz and Hanin, 2011). Disappointment specifically was listed as one of several negative emotions which was perceived as required and necessary in coaching but not teaching (Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018). It was deemed necessary in a coaching role to create an appropriate environment to facilitate the achievement of the optimal performance of individuals and teams (Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018). This was explained by Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, (2018) as coaches using a negative or unpleasant emotion when performances were inefficient or lacked energy to change the response of the athletes and improve. In a similar way the coach educators displayed disappointment to move towards improving the coaching of the coach learners or successfully complete a task or element of the course.

One key aspect of consideration for Nicola and Olivia about whether disappointment could be displayed was whether there was an established

relationship or degree of familiarity or rapport with the learner to anticipate their reaction and avoid upsetting them:

> I think that would depend on the group, I think I have had a group where I wouldn't do that because I think I would get a look back going 'what' and I just don't think I would get back what I would hope, whereas in another group recently, whereas if you directed it in a challenge to improve way then that might have been useful. I think it depends on the context of the group and how it is delivered, I don't think I would, I don't know. You don't have long with the group to do that so if you have not got that relationship with them they might not take it very well. (Olivia)

> I would use it if the coach learner knew my intentions behind it and they would know my way of delivering and they would understand my way of interacting so that when I say that, they would know it is coming from a good place to push them a bit further because they will know that I see something in them that they might not see in themselves. If you do that with a stranger, it can be a bit like, well hang on a minute, I don't know how they would take it, I think if I was on a course where there was somebody on there that I knew and I saw them delivering something and I thought well actually you could do better than that, then yeah I might say, I think this is great but I think you can build on it, have you thought about this, this and this, maybe but if it was someone else I maybe wouldn't go down the disappointment route but I would still maybe go, that's good but have you thought about doing this and I have done this previously because I think that is my job, to challenge the ones that you think you can. You want them all to get on a certain level but then I think there are some that you could push a bit more, it is how you say it. (Nicola)

The examples above demonstrate the pedagogical sensibilities of the coach educators in relation to when to express disappointment and to who (Levering, 2000). They explained how making a judgement about whether to display disappointment would be based on their knowledge of how the individual would react to that disappointment. This positioned them as a pedagogically sensitive educator who "knows how to balance the motivating force of expectations with the risk of unpleasant feelings and lack of success" (Levering, 2000: 73).

Often when the coach educator displayed disappointment, they attached a positive that reinforced their belief in the coach learners' capability, thus reflecting what Levering (2000: 74) suggests teachers should convey along the lines of "I am disappointed; you can do so much better". At other points displays of disappointment

were understood to be expected by the coach learners or required to control or shape the direction of the course but only very intermittently as Olivia noted:

> I think as well, not that I tell people off but I think they expect, also expect us to be, if they are not sticking to task to like say come on let's stick to task so having some sort of discipline with the group or you know, because if not basically people start talking, people don't do things right and I think it is about controlling the group and knowing how you can control them and some people are rowdy or they don't listen or they are quite young so sometimes you do sort of have to have some authority and be able to say that you are not happy because such and such has happened, but it doesn't happen very often., it's very rare.

Purposeful displays of disappointment can be strategically employed to change the direction of behaviour of an individual to the benefit of the other person (Timmers, Fischer and Manstead, 1998; Van Kleef, DeDreu and Manstead, 2006). It can be deliberately employed to evoke a reaction (Levering, 2000) and often occurs when progress towards a goal is below expectations (Carver and Scheier, 1990). The establishment of disappointment as a display rule in coach education extends understanding in pedagogical contexts where it has previously been identified as acceptable in coaching (Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018). It moves the area forward by focusing in depth on disappointment as an emotion and contributes original insights into the strategic and nuanced way that coach educators consider emotion displays of disappointment to be acceptable.

4.2.4. Rule 4: Frustration perhaps, but displays of anger towards coach learners are prohibited

A further emotion all the coach educators explained was not expected to be displayed in front of the coach learners whilst delivering the course was anger. The importance of concealing anger has also been identified in other occupations including service-based workers (Grandey et al., 2010), paralegals (Lively, 2001) and

flight attendants (Hochschild, 1983). The perception that anger was an unacceptable emotion to display was also echoed by the coach educators. As Lucy and Nicola noted:

> I think we are not expected to show anger or if you're showing that you are angry it just doesn't give off the right impression and maybe, I think just the way you dress, although it's not really an emotion. Kind of your attitude, if you're a bit like huffing and puffing, like rolling your eyes, your emotion can filter through your body language can't it. (Lucy)
>
> Because it can be scary and it can be intimidating and I think for me, I think although you're the tutor and you are delivering the course, for me it's a two-way relationship, you can take a lot from the learners themselves and I have seen, I try not to go in with a dictatorial approach to tutoring, I like to do a lot of questioning and I like to do a lot of sharing experiences, I think for me, anger comes across as quite a forceful and dictatorial emotion and that is not something that I would buy into as a learner or individual. (Nicola)

Clearly the coach educators deemed displays of anger to be unacceptable and not expected in front of learners. The understanding to not display anger is echoed in the role of teaching where teachers perceived it as not required or acceptable in their role (Sutton, 2005; Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018). As Olivia described, anger was considered unnecessary given the nature of the relationship between herself and the coach learners:

> No I have never ever gotten angry with them, I just wouldn't, even when I'm teaching I don't get angry cos they know obviously at the start we will say there are certain things that we need to do, these are the rules and things like that, I think by the time we are into the course they know us as tutors and they know what they can do and what they can't and if they are not doing something we quite often say you need to start and listen and most of them are adults do you know what I mean so it's just a case of just reminding them some times, particularly the younger ones that we are here to work and that you need to stop talking.

Similarly, Katie acknowledged the importance of the relationship may mediate the requirement for displays of anger:

> Because you need to develop a good relationship where it's open, friendly and they realise that you know, you are just as wound up as they are

> probably, but showing them that you can cope with it and manage it and get on with the job you have got to do by not showing them that frustration, because if you show them that anger, that you're wound up, it would probably wind them up as well. Because again the relationship, all through my teaching career it was all about relationships, if you want people to learn and be on your side, follow what you're doing, if you have got that relationship, that happens, if you haven't, it sort of happens but it's not as deep as it should be.

Reflecting upon the stories provided by the other coach educators triggered a memory of a particular situation where I found myself in agreement with this rule of not displaying anger. On several occasions I can recall ensuring that my anger was not evident to the coach learner. In one instance, like Lucy and Nicola, I deemed it unacceptable to show my anger and this was partly related to wider concerns about the wider perceived costs and implications of doing so (addressed in Chapter Eight):

> "So what are the principles of defending?" one, two, three answers are immediately offered from various sides of the classroom by the coach learners. I'm hearing them and nodding in agreement, confirming the answers and awaiting more but my eyes are fixed on Josh (pseudonym) one of the other coach learners, my jaw tightens and there is a distant thumping sound in my ears of blood whooshing around my body, my nails dig harder into the palm of my left hand. The answers continue to trickle forward, my eyes are watering and begin to sting as I continue to stare refusing to let my eyes blink, I can feel the heat rise up my neck and across my face. The longer and harder I stare the bigger the hole I imagine appearing in his head, I'm willing him to raise his eyes to meet mine. He's talking about football, passing his phone across the table and generally distracting others around him, once again doing anything but the netball related task I have set. A voice inside my head is screaming "shut up and listen and just get on board with the course" whilst I continue to nod in agreement with the answers still floating in from around the classroom. My jaw is clenched and I can feel the pressure rising through my head, this guy is really testing my patience. Everyone around me is oblivious to how much I would love to just scream at him, but a part of me knows that I just can't. Surely there is a limit to how many times can I stare at him or try all the other behaviour management techniques I have encountered. What is really stopping me is that in all the time I have been delivering these courses with other coach educators or being in the place of Josh as a learner on the receiving end of training all I have ever witnessed is smiles and positivity. I don't want to be the one to break the pattern and step out of line by actually showing my anger. I was unsure if I did display my anger as to what the repercussions regarding my future opportunities for employment might be and what the coach learners and my fellow coach educator would make of it. In the back of my mind was an awareness that Kate one of the other coach educators had previously been quite openly blunt and annoyed with a group of coach learners after

> they continually forgot to use open questions to check for understanding. Following a complaint relating to this, Kate had attributed her workload allocation suddenly dropping to that incident. I didn't want to end up in that situation.

As demonstrated in the interview extracts (presented above) the coach educators recognised that they could not display anger towards the coach learner. Expressions of anger in the workplace are tightly controlled based on positions of power (Lively 2000). This is particularly the case for workers at the lower end of the status hierarchy that it is not acceptable to display anger (Pierce, 1995, Lively, 2000; Lively and Powell, 2006). There was also an element of the coach educators' understanding of the rule not to display anger being reflective of the wider service culture approach. Service sector workers are restricted in their emotional expression as their low status places them in a position where they are expected to show deference to others and unable to direct anger to others (Hochschild, 1983; Leidner, 1993, Rogers, 1995). As Olivia and Nicola alluded to:

> I don't think I have ever been angry with anybody on a course because they pay for it, they want to be there because they have some link to netball, they have got knowledge of playing or whatever it may be and I think it, would be different if it was a group of kids who didn't have experience, not that you would get angry but because they are adults and they are there because they have paid for it. I think as well, you wouldn't get to the point, you would have resolved it before you got to that angry stage, you would have said right, I don't know why you are not doing what I have asked you to do and it would be resolved, it wouldn't be a case of 'Well what you doing this for!' (raised aggressive voice). (Olivia)

> It's not an emotional behaviour that I want to display with the group because it's not something I think I would engage with and want to return back to and yeah I think where we have all been in those frustrated moments where people might be on the course, they think they already know the content because they have done it in a different sport and they are not translating it into this one, I think that can be quite frustrating but again don't get angry, look at their situation and how they are approaching the course and again that is really hard to do and quite draining. (Nicola)

In contrast to the general agreeance by the coach educators that anger was not acceptable, there were exceptions when it was appropriate to display 'controlled

anger'. This variation in the type of anger reflects the idea there are contextual limitations regarding the situation and setting where displays of anger are "considered normatively appropriate" (Gibson and Callister, 2010: 74). As is evidenced in Lucy's example:

> In a situation where someone has been repeatedly messing around and you have kind of gone through the whole had a conversation with them one-on-one and managed the big group situation, there might be a point where you go 'come on, we have had a word about this', so not like scream, make them feel awful anger but it might just be a different change in your tone or you know, what you say is slightly different, but cos I think there is a time and place for controlled anger but not can't be bothered with the day, lash out type anger. (Lucy)

In Lucy's account, under specific circumstances, there was an acceptable point in time to display controlled anger as required for the safe and efficient delivery of the course and to ensure a satisfactory experience for other learners that they expected it. This is consistent with other examples where expressions of anger have been employed by construction project managers to accomplish favourable results in relation to their objectives (Lindebaum and Fielden, 2011). It has also been acknowledged with student teachers that anger was a 'necessary evil' at points and had to be controlled as opposed to unleashed (Lindqvist et al., 2019). In the role of the coach, screaming and yelling at athletes was allowed and accepted (Chelladurai and Kuga, 1996) and justified in relation to the shared goal congruence between coach and athlete (Chelladurai, 1999). This seemingly paradoxical approach to the display rule of anger was also evident in the examination of military personnel where in certain instances the display of anger was deemed not required but that in particular situations, and in relation to certain tasks, it was required (Lindebaum, Jordan and Morris, 2016).

Upon follow up as to why controlled anger but not anger was expected, Lucy elaborated:

> Because again, like if, I think it's just again, it's just a norm, if someone is messing around usually the rest of the group will see, like most people are not daft and they are just looking at you thinking will you just sort this out and if you have tried on numerous occasions and people will usually sense that things have been tried. Then I think there is a point where you can use controlled anger, because probably half of the group at least are going thank God for that, they should buck their ideas up. So, it's my responsibility to make sure that the course goes ahead and is safe. So controlled anger might be required if all other strategies have been employed.

Consistent with Geddes and Callister's (2007) Dual Threshold Model, I believe the displays of controlled anger by the coach educators fall in between the expression threshold and impropriety thresholds, thus reflecting an intensity of emotional display considered appropriate by others. Controlled anger was perceived as accepted when frustration had not had an impact and it was expected and anticipated by the coach learners to resolve a situation that was impacting on the coach learners themselves.

Despite displays of anger being generally not regarded as acceptable, the coach educators agreed that displays of frustration would be acceptable or even at times expected in their delivery of coach education courses. This contrasts with other coaching research where frustration was not shown for fear of damaging relationships and negative judgements by members of the coach's social network (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). Another interpretation of not displaying frustration was indicated by US student athletes who conveyed that their emotional displays were governed by institutional display rules of the university linked to their position as student athletes (Romo, 2017). The power relationship between the athlete and the coach may mean that their displays of frustration are reflective perhaps of putting at risk or not meeting the expectations of someone in a higher position of power than them. For the coach educators, evaluations are an expected end point of a qualification which suggests that temporally there is a difference given they are responsible for the outcome of successful qualification rather than an impression evaluation from someone else in the process. There was a distinct difference in that

frustration had a purpose for the coach educators in terms of goal congruence to an external outcome.

This was evident for Olivia in relation to the coach learners as she elaborated:

> No never, I never get angry, no. I just get frustrated with them and I say why, I would say, come on, I know you can do better than that, I would never get angry. I like to have a laugh and I like the sessions to be quite lighthearted and yeah they are going to work hard in them but I would never shout or tell anybody off like at school, no definitely not. I don't really get angry.

There was a clear line between being angry and frustrated for some of the coach educators, including Katie who said:

> Anger no, cos that would totally destroy the relationship that you have managed to establish, annoyance yes, that would inform them that their responses were not as expected, tutors sometimes as well. For example, sometimes the learners will be chatting away while you're delivering and it distracts. I usually do it in a fun sort of way, Oh could the naughty table at the back be quiet please, could we focus on the task. It's that sort of thing, erm, so I'm, I don't show that I'm annoyed but I make it clear that I am not happy with what they are doing, yeah?

Additionally, for Olivia, it was about the expectation to use frustration for maintaining control:

> I think, not that I tell people off but I think they expect, also expect us to be if they are not sticking to task to like say come on let's stick to task so having some sort of discipline with the group or you know, because if not basically people start talking, people don't do things right and I think it is about controlling the group and knowing how you can control them by displaying frustration and some people are rowdy or they don't listen or they are quite young so sometimes you do sort of have to have some authority and be able to say that you are not very happy because such and such has happened, but it doesn't' happen very often…it's very rare. I would only use it really if they weren't listening, I know at the weekend the other tutor a couple of times sort of said come on you need to start listening, we are not at school, come on listen. So she told them off but straight away after that they were quiet and listened because they were quite a rowdy bunch.

It was apparent that some of the coach educators' perceptions of this were different and that it was necessary to display frustration because it was expected from the rest of the group to enhance the experience of the other coach learners on the course. I would interpret this as there is a social expectation that frustration be displayed to ensure that the course progresses, that learners are making sufficient progress, that control is retained of the course, and that the coach educators are able to manage the behaviour of the learners and that learners appreciate this.

> I suppose my bug bear and the thing that frustrates me is when people talk over other people, I just find it really rude and I think that would be something that would trigger me to step up and say can we listen and I think that is as far as my frustration would go and I don't think I would go past that but I would feel comfortable enough if someone was talking and someone was speaking to the group to go, I would feel comfortable enough to go, "can I just stop you, can you please listen." If anything… it's hard because you don't' want to be patronising especially because I am younger than some of the people on there as well, the level ones are not too bad because it is a good mix but I do feel like, sometimes I feel my age and I don't want to be patronising to you but equally I do want you to be quiet I think you are being rude. So yeah, that would be the only place that I would demonstrate mild, mild frustration would be to manage a situation like that but anger I just think it's not acceptable, so mild frustration is in order to change a behaviour. (Nicola)

> Yeah, I think so but I am not saying that I am emotionless because I am not, I will still like express like frustration if they were messing around for example but it wouldn't be like as I don't know, like so broad a spectrum than maybe when I am at home or something or in a different environment…I think people would lose a bit of trust and respect for me, not that I am like crazy but, that paints me in a really bad light but I think people expect to be delivered to in a certain way as well and if I think I got really frustrated with someone and either walked off or took a bit of time out or maybe snapped at them, it is obviously not what they are expecting and would probably complain. (Lucy)

That displays of frustration were perceived as acceptable relate to maintaining control of the group or as a signal that behaviour or responses were not as expected. In a similar way expressions of anger by leaders were accepted by soldiers if they were deemed as proportionate and justified and required to modify behaviour (Lindebaum, Jordan and Morris, 2016). Coach educators' frustration tended to be in relation to the learners fulfilling course objectives and altering behaviour to align with coach

educators' interests or needs. The delineation between anger and frustration as an emotion display rule adds a new dimension to the understanding of emotion display by highlighting the tempered, contextual and relational nature of coach educators' understanding of emotion display which is previously unconsidered in the limited work to date on emotion in coaching and coach education.

In this chapter I identified four emotion display rules relating to happiness, fear, disappointment and anger that coach educators understand guide their pedagogical practices within coach education courses. The identified rules capture the nuanced, relational, and contextual nature of coach educators' understanding of emotion display. To date no explicit consideration of emotion rules in coach education or other sports work has been addressed. This chapter offers a novel and significant contribution to the understanding of emotion display in the wider sports coaching literature. Secondly, it extends the broader study of the sociology of sport by providing an insight into specific emotion display rules that exist in this particular context and offers a starting point for the exploration of similar rules in other sporting settings such as coaching.

Chapter 5: How coach educators learnt the display rules

5.1. Introduction

In this chapter I explored the coach educators' understanding of how the emotion rules identified in Chapter Four were learnt. Scholars in sports coaching are yet to address this in any form, by doing so they will shed new light on an area that is little understood and offer a stimulus for further examination across the wider set of sports workers. To date this has only been addressed in roles outside of a sporting context (Lively, 2000; Scott and Myers, 2005; Seymour and Sandiford, 2005; Sharma and Black, 2005). In this way this chapter significantly contributes to the generation of new knowledge in understanding the learning of emotion rules.

5.2. Emotional socialisation

The coach educators indicated varied informal organisational ways that they had learnt the display rules. One theoretical approach that could assist in understanding how the coach educators learnt the emotional rules is Thoits' (2004) concept of emotional socialisation. She proposed that "emotion culture is transmuted into behaviour and hence into social structure, through the process of socialisation" (Thoits, 2004: 365). This process of emotional socialisation occurs when emotional knowledge, skills and values are acquired by a person in a specific role and emphasis is placed upon what the employee learns about what emotions and feelings it is situationally appropriate to display and the subsequent actions and behaviours that reflect this (Thoits, 2004). This has then been understood to be an important part of occupational training across a range of jobs and has assumed an important part in equipping individuals to fulfil their roles (Thoits, 2004). The coach educators described how they had learnt the emotion rules implicitly in their roles as coach

educators through them being modelled at standardisation training (Lucy) and via observation and replication of other tutors (Nicola, Katie, Me).

> So it's more just an expectation, I mean when you go to their top up, standardisation, well they try to be prepared, happy and confident, so you know, they lead by example don't they by not showing anger or fear. So yeah, it's not been said but I think it's just like there, it's just like their way…they expect you to do the same. (Lucy)

> When I'm tutoring I'm thinking maybe I'm not the expert, the other tutor may be more expert than me, so I copy them and what they do in the situation so that I knew exactly what to do too. I mean I have been with these people for years now so I just know what is right and what is wrong. (Katie)

> Every tutor that I have worked with because obviously when the group are doing practical, we have always gone back to notes to have a look so it is the way that they have managed that uncertainty that I think you just pick up. The same when I was in my previous job delivering, if I was uncertain I would, you would pick your moments when you would go and check what you were doing, you would think of moments where you can set them off going on things so you can manage that uncertainty if you need to. (Nicola)

I increasingly realised that my own learning of the display rules in the role of a coach educator mirrored the implicit organisational learning in the accounts by the other coach educators. It was evident that the predominant emotions that I had witnessed other coach educators display or not display in front of the coach learners in their work I had adopted and attempted to replicate.

> Passion and energy, that was all I had ever witnessed in the display of emotions evident in the delivery of netball courses by coach educators I had worked with in the past, ever since starting as a coach educator. Turning up to only my third session working as a lead tutor I was late after losing my preparation time hunting around the campus for the venue, as I found it, most of the coach learners were already there and waiting, I greeted them with a smile. Once in the building I assessed the space, the classroom was too small, the resource files were missing, and there was no projector, it was just going to be one of those days I thought to myself but couldn't let the coach learners know that. It really didn't matter, I had learnt from numerous other courses to just get on with it and make the most of it. Whenever the other tutors I had worked alongside had encountered something unexpected they just got on with it whilst being positive and upbeat. Thinking back to when I had delivered a course with Rachel, a particularly upbeat and positive tutor who was the lead tutor when I was fairly new to tutoring. At one point in the course, part way through the day a taekwondo team had turned up to use the sports hall

> which we had booked for the entire day and without which we would be unable to get through all the content of the course. Whilst she admitted to me she was panicking and furious with the venue for double booking she managed the situation with the learners by smiling and asking them to do a folder based task. In less than ten minutes, after a quick conversation with the facilities manager she led all the group outside and had organised for half of the car park to be sectioned off. Throughout all this she had remained upbeat and happy with the learners and after sharing a joke and smile even managed to integrate some theory about adapting sessions and risk assessment and carried on where she had left off. I was impressed at how smoothly and seamlessly she had dealt with the situation, I could never pull off such a transition I thought. Watching Rachel she had got all the coach learners back fully involved, as though delivering the course in a car park was standard practice. I needed to adopt the same approach right now. In the space of fifteen minutes I had cheerily organised the candidates onto a make-shift study area in the sports hall, stuck up hastily written posters to replace the lack of PowerPoint and was energetically up at the front smiling and introducing us and the plan for the day as though everything was running as smoothly and efficiently as it should. I hoped that I had given a positive impression to Michelle my co-tutor and that the coach learners were oblivious that anything had ever been wrong in the first place. Never revealing this to the coach learners was something that I learnt to replicate in my approach to coach education delivery. It was like an unwritten rule, it was a persona and emotional display that was adopted, assumed and expected.

The examples above encapsulate the coach educators' emotional socialisation (Thoits, 2004) of the display rules. They explained that they learnt the display rules from others in coach educator roles and within the organisation whilst working as a coach educator. Indeed, the emotion display rules for this group of coach educators in terms of what were the emotional display norms associated with the role were learnt to a certain extent via informal emotional socialisation. This echoes findings amongst a range of occupations who also learnt the rules through observing colleagues, including wedding consultants (Sharma and Black, 2005) paralegals (Lively, 2000), firefighters observing colleagues (Scott and Myers, 2005) and bar staff (Seymour and Sandiford, 2005). A key point raised by Thoits (2004) was that emotional socialisation often occurred in an informal and implicit manner, as it did for the coach educators. The organisational structure of working alongside another coach educator and the delivery of training at standardisation events promoted and reflected inherently

conveyed, unquestioned and accepted norms of emotional display. I believe this created a culture in which emotions should and should not be displayed whilst working with the coach learners, and subsequently coach educators were informally and implicitly socialised into this knowledge which guided their learning and understanding of the display rules.

There was no specific prescription of the emotional displays conveyed by England Netball in terms of coach educators learning what emotions to display or not, as Katie, Lucy and Olivia explained:

> Oh yeah, that's come across, you know that the learners have paid so much for the course and they deserve a positive experience and but actually how you do that hasn't been conveyed at all, no. I think you rely on individuals to work that out for themselves. I use my own approach, we've never really been given an approach by England Netball, we've been given the tutor notes, this is what you have got to get across, but how you actually do that is up to yourself, and you know, you can watch four, five tutors, they will all deliver the same thing in a different way. So long as the learners get the content that they should get, that's fine. (Katie)

> I mean it's never been, like, I don't think it has been said 'don't be anxious, show that you're happy and so on' but like they want to have a confident workforce going out cos I mean ultimately, it's their reputation on the line as well with you going out delivering on behalf of them. It's just me. I think they probably will say oh, you need to, I don't think they say you need to be approachable but to be there during breaks if its needed. They don't teach you how to be approachable on the tutoring course from what I can remember, urm or they don't ask of it on your CV, I think it's just an unwritten rule. (Lucy)

> That we are positive about what we are actually delivering and that we do enjoy it but nothing directly in terms of you must not be angry or you must not be anxious. (Olivia)

This is in contrast to numerous other organisations with a service-based focus who explicitly convey the expectations of the emotional display by the organisation via a process of formal selection, training, policies and monitoring that were learnt by the employees, including Delta Airlines in training flight attendants in Hochschild's (1983) work and the classes and handbooks issued to Walt Disney World employees to "display positive and self-esteem enhancing emotions to customers" (Rafaeli and

Sutton, 1987: 27). Whilst the transmission of normative content has socialised coach educators into what they should or should not display on the job, the interview responses indicated that the emotional socialisation of the coach educator within the job is only one element to explaining the learning of the display rules for the coach educators. Other aspects were involved in the learning of the display rules for the coach educators, highlighting a difference in the way that the display rules are learnt in the job of educating coach learners compared to other service-based roles such as flight attendants. Therefore, further exploration of how the rules were established, understood and learnt is warranted.

The coach educators intimated that in addition to learning whilst working as a coach educator, they learnt the display rules via their own experiences in other educational and wider learning settings. They demonstrated a heightened awareness of how the emotional displays by the person leading shaped and impacted their own experiences and understanding of which emotions should or should not be displayed and applied it to their own work and standards. Katie noted how it was based upon previous positive emotional displays when being coached as an athlete that she wanted to replicate:

> Yeah, others have displayed happiness to me, as an athlete, I had that from coaches oh you know, you have knocked so much off your time or well done you have worked really hard on your circuit training today, you have done it in less time than last time, erm, I have learnt from being on courses myself you know, on my degree courses, I've had really positive feedback from tutors or somebody else would say well done Katie, that was great. It really buoys you up and I try to pass that on to learners, if they are doing well I will tell them.

In a similar approach Nicola had considered being subjected to lecturers whose emotional displays made her experience negative emotions and comparatively coach educators whose emotional displays had enthused her:

> How did I know what emotions to show, like to be happy, maybe I have had lectures and courses where they have been dull, like oh gosh, ok, I've got two hours of this so yeah, maybe that, maybe from experiences again where kind of my tutor has been happy to be there and they have been

> passionate and excited about what they have been talking about and thought, maybe subconsciously tuned in a bit more because they are genuinely interested in what they are doing, they are happy to talk to you about it and they are happy and excited about what they are talking to you about. So yeah, I think, it's quite a difficult one the way you pick it up, I think if you are doing something you enjoy, I think naturally you display a happy emotion and excited emotion then if you don't enjoy what you are doing then you have to think more consciously about doing it. Well I enjoy it so as nervous and kinda apprehensive I might get, I actually love doing it so I am happy when I'm there, I'm excited every time I do a course so I think because I want to be there it's maybe easy to put it across, I don't think it's hard to say hi how are you doing, how is everything, nice to meet you.

In comparison, Lucy and I had drawn upon often negative experiences of when the emotions displayed had gone against our perceived expectations and created a negative impression and experience that we were determined not to replicate:

> It's probably been learnt probably from going to other workshops and when people haven't displayed the right emotions and when you can tell that the coach can't really be bothered (laughs), or is a bit grumpy and you just think, oh actually I wouldn't want to be sat in front, I wouldn't want my pupils to sit in front of me thinking Oh why am I here if she doesn't want to be here or have a bad impression of me so I think, yeah, it's almost like you go into, like a show or something you just put on a different front and become happy even if your not…I think probably just from, from like experience, like when I've seen, I've been on courses where you can tell that the tutor is like 'OH!' and they get like a bit huffy when you don't understand something and in the end I think oh I can't be bothered. I think, it's just how I teach on the standards I like. How I like to be treated basically, so I wouldn't want someone to behave like that to me. Yeah, like when I did a Level, what did I do?, my Level 3, the tutor got like a bit huffy puffy, so I thought 'Oh God'. I just think 'Oh well, Sod you then' and I just won't engage.

My learning of the display rules was like Lucy's. I would not wish to subject someone else to a negative experience through my own emotional displays and I have learnt what does not work through being a learner in that situation and applied them in my own practice:

> My experiences as a learner have highlighted the importance of that smile and influenced me to use it, knowing how hard it is to learn when the smile is absent and the perceptions it creates remain vivid memories of mine. It was yet another Wednesday evening of a busy week at work that I had to

endure sitting through my PGCE course. I was bored and struggling again to pay attention, the shuffling of feet and rattling of keys by my colleagues around the table indicated that they were as eager as me to escape home. Boring acetate slides were placed onto the projector one after another, matched by a lifeless teacher who was reading every word with an uninterested air and appeared as bored as the students listening to her. As I watched the clock tick round my irritation and annoyance grew at the time and money I was giving up to be on a course where I wanted to learn and was less than impressed with what was delivered and the way it was delivered. Listening and watching professional people tell me in a tired and dispirited manner how to teach, employing an anything but inspiring approach, it was the antithesis of what I intended to do. Where was the passion, the love of the subject, the enthusiasm and enthusing others I wondered, I felt sad that someone had been reduced to teaching this way. It made me determined to avoid coming across to my learners like this.

Based upon the coach educators' responses about how they perceived they learnt the display rules illustrated further another layer of emotional socialisation (Thoits, 2004) taking place, this time via the coach educators' own experiences as learners in the context of coach learners, students and athletes. The coach educators principally assigned their learning of the display rules through their pedagogical experiences and associated socialisation to operating in pedagogical contexts. The learning of the display rules in this way could be linked to the coach educators learning of the emotion norms in this setting.

An alternative perspective can be gained via Zembylas' (2005b) poststructuralist exploration of teachers' discursive understandings of emotion which illuminated how emotion display rules are framed around the complexity of power relations, culture and ideology to understand the complex learning of emotional rules. The historical contingency of emotional rules indicates how the emotional rules (in teaching in this instance) are constituted and experienced (Zembylas, 2005b), suggesting that "teachers are constituted through, and constitute themselves within, discursive practices and power relations…that result in an *emotional knowing* about teaching" (Zembylas, 2005b: 945). Thus, as Zembylas (2005b; 2005c; 2007b) argues, the emotional rules are socially and historically constructed. In this way the coach

educators developed emotional knowing about which emotions to display in their current pedagogical practices through reflection upon emotional knowledge gained as learners on previous coach education courses, and from experiences in other pedagogical contexts. To some extent the accounts of Nicola, Lucy and my own (above) indicated how the use of critical awareness of past experiences of emotional displays that were not conducive to establishing positive emotional experiences themselves, or to learning, assisted their understanding of what emotions to display in the pedagogical delivery of coach education.

For some of the coach educators there were wider aspects influencing the learning of the display rules, not just through interactions within pedagogical contexts. Alternative avenues of learning the emotion display rules were attributed to parental influence by Nicola, Lucy and myself across a variety of situations:

> Erm, probably, do you know it is a bit random but probably from umpiring because I used to, I started when I was sixteen and I used to get really really nervous because I was umpiring women, it was my parents that were like no, you know stay focused um and when you are umpiring you have got to stay calm because you have got to manage the situation, you haven't really got a choice, so I think from that experience I have just translated it into tutoring and coaching. That you know, eyes are on me, stay calm, control the situation to make sure everyone is safe etc. and just in that calm manner, especially when you do umpire, you definitely get the rapport back from the players if you are calm, collected and respectful. (Nicola)

> My mum's always had her own business so when we used to like go into the shop she would always like expect us to talk to the customers, be polite and make them a cup of tea or coffee, so I think right from a really, that was from when I was like primary school Year 6, so right from a really young age it's been drilled in to be not probably professional at that age because I probably didn't even know what it was but to just be polite and use manners. If you didn't do it you would get the glare so yeah I think I probably learnt it from my mum and then obviously getting part time jobs I just picked it up as I went along. (Lucy)

While to some extent my learning of the display rules echoed those experiences of my fellow coach educators in educational contexts, a deeper opportunity for

reflection in constructing my autoethnographic accounts revealed that some of the learning was undertaken in more personal settings:

> "Smile and say hello when someone you don't know speaks to you" my Mum whispered in my ear, this was a repeated phrase throughout my early childhood which I obediently carried out time after time until the phrase ceased and it was just something I displayed irrespective of whether I was happy or not, upon any social interaction with an adult or stranger. The phrase has now appeared again as I find myself saying it to my three-year-old and can watch history repeat itself as my Mum in the role of Nan now tells my son the same when encountering an adult or stranger. As an adult it is something that I still do, over the years that smile has transmuted itself into walking into job interviews and smiling, teaching with a smile in FE and HE settings and delivering to coach learners.

Thus contributing to Burkitt's (1997: 52) proposal of "a relational conception of the emotions, arguing that emotions are not 'things' internal to the individual and their biological constitution, but are to do with the social relations and interdependencies between people". In the examples here, a parent demonstrates or informs the child of the expected emotion in relation to their encounters with adults. Burkitt (1997) also argues that, from infancy, the cultural background of a child's parents combined with the members of the family group will contribute to a child's learning of emotions as dispositions which arise in specific social contexts forming an 'emotional habitus'. There is an insight that the display rules begin to be learnt in early childhood through the 'emotional habitus' that the child grows up in reflective of the cultural expectations and background (Burkitt, 1997). Arguably, the coach educators and myself have developed emotional expressions in given contexts and situations that are learnt from parents. This learning of appropriate techniques of the body and meanings given to emotional expression is often unconscious and situated within the networks of interdependence and the relationships in which individuals are involved. As alluded to in Lucy and Nicola's accounts (presented below), the coach educators' learning of the rules was to some extent done subconsciously:

> Probably, like not consciously but more sub consciously yeah, I'd say so. I think how you are brought up as well to be honest, like I think if you are brought up to be well mannered, say hello, goodbye, please and thankyou's I think it just carries through doesn't it, where as if you have

> not been brought up like that then it maybe doesn't come so naturally to people that haven't possibly. (Lucy)

> Again, probably fairly subconsciously, I don't think I've like come away and thought, like I've never really thought about it, it has all been subconscious and gained through experiences and not until I have had to sit down and think about it that oh I don't actually know how I have learned them, just sort of the experiences that I have had. Just sort of implicit. Not in that context where it's a course, you like do in different situations but it's trusting what is being said and advice. (Nicola)

Whilst Lucy initially was unsure how she had learnt the display rules, in later interviews she shared with me the societal norms and expectations within society and that she has been exposed to. As she noted:

> I don't really know, society just says that you shouldn't really behave in that way I think, no matter where you are or what you watch, on more occasions than not everyone is happy or tries to help, that's just how as a society we deal with people I think, I don't know, I think you shouldn't behave like that, pass! (laughs). I think on a day to day basis that's how you see people and I think that, there's always one but I think, I think because the more common norm is to see people happy and upbeat and helpful versus angry and hacked off that it is probably a societal norm that you go 'Oh I probably should behave like that and not like that.

From my own reflections and autoethnographic accounts I have learnt the display rules in wider contexts by observing them being broken and feeling uncomfortable with the unexpected displays of emotion by people. On other occasions I have broken a display rule, for example showing anger and subsequently being reprimanded for it, thus reinforcing that particular display rule:

> The meeting was dragging on, the same people were making the same point again and again, I stared at the assorted drinks on the table that had long ago gone cold or become empty. "I'm not fucking doing it, they can get stuffed", I jumped and looked to my right, Fiona had burst, she was always so eloquent and efficient in her points, I liked her immensely and her outburst was so out of place, the room was still, I held my breath and slowly leaned back in my chair, her rant continued for several minutes. I glanced round the room and everyone was fixated on Fiona. The chair of the meeting tried to intervene, Fiona's voice escalated as she continued, "it's too bloody much, they are taking the piss." Following my shock at the outburst I was now starting to feel uncomfortable and wondering if she was alright, as she finished making her point, she scooped up her bag,

> keys and notebook and stormed out of the meeting room, there was a long silence, the chair of the meeting mumbled "I think we will leave it there" and walked out. I'd never seen anyone react in a professional setting like that before and it was really inappropriate to the setting of a room full of colleagues and an expectation to be professional. Flashback 15 years and I can vividly recall my 21 year old self sat in my manager's office, cheeks burning and feeling furious inside, you have got to let the student sit the viva even though she didn't attend on the day, I've had a complaint from her Mum about you being aggressive and telling her that she can't sit it and you are going to have to let her do it. Feeling undermined by a smug 16-year-old girl, let alone embarrassed at being reprimanded for my actions, the churning and dislike in my core was an unpleasant feeling that I never wanted to experience again. There was little I could do, this was coming from my boss I nodded in agreeance, fighting back angry tears I left the room. The anger I felt at being overruled bubbled back up inside whenever I thought about the situation for the rest of the day.

Here Burkitt's (2014:119) positioning of emotion as central to reflection and the self is useful, suggesting that "when we reflect on ourselves we reflect through the words of others and the emotional-evaluative tones they have expressed towards us; these intonations make us feel something about ourselves" and shade our emotional response and view of our own self. This impacts upon our actions and the choices we make; it is part of the creation and interpretation of meaning (Burkitt, 2014). Thus, my own reflections and feelings of self and interactions with others have contributed to an understanding of the display rules. This has occurred on one level in the evaluation of others' emotion outbursts that have broken display rules and made me reflect upon how it makes me feel and informed my future actions, but also how my own breaking of emotional rules has led to experiencing negative emotions that have informed my understanding of emotion display.

5.3. Service-based contexts

Despite many of the coach educators' examples of learning of the emotion rules identified as occurring from within their own experiences in educational settings and wider family and social settings, some learning of the display rules took place in a

service-based context. The first was linked to the concept of providing good customer service to the coach learners who were perceived as customers by the coach educators, as Olivia and Lucy described:

> I think it's like if you go into a shop and you hear, like if you, say you went into MacDonald's and I hear the people behind the counter slagging somebody off or slagging work off I would think Oh it's not very good to work here and I would think customer service was poor and for me they are the customers and I have got to give them the good service, so I wouldn't be saying things negative about players or whatever in front of their faces, I'd maybe wait and say it to my tutor or have a word with them later. (Olivia)
>
> Yeah, and I think even at work and stuff we do like customer service, at my old work did like customer service um like workshops I'd say, so they do kind of teach you how to be not professional but have good customer service which is an element of professionalism isn't it. Just like, always trying to resolve a problem so if there was a problem don't just say Oh, I don't know. Make sure you can either resolve it or get someone that can resolve it or go away and find out or, making sure that you smile and say hello and goodbye or thank you. Just being helpful basically. (Lucy)

Similarly, my understanding of the expectations of emotional displays in service relationships that I encounter have contributed to the learning of the display rules that are expected to apply across different contexts and are almost viewed as something you are entitled to as a paying customer. It is not necessarily expected in social interactions which occur spontaneously in everyday encounters. As was evident from my autoethnography, this is something that has been learnt via recurrent exposure in day-to-day life that, as a customer paying for a service, there is an expectation that the server presents a very specific emotional display in providing a service. Part of the experience is not only to walk away with goods, but that the social interaction should be a pleasant and enjoyable encounter that makes the customer feel good and want to return:

> Waiting in line for my hot chocolate and the cheery young barista is welcoming each customer in the queue in front of me, smiling and enthusiastically asking if he can be of any more help, makes me less impatient than I would normally be in a long queue, I can see the efficiency in his service as he co-ordinated various items of drinks and food at speed on to the tray on the counter. Despite the wait I arrived at the front of the

> line smiling already, awaiting the smiling barista greeted me, “Good morning, how are you today, what can I get you?” I smile back, just a hot chocolate and a cappuccino to go please’ of course, anything else with that? Despite the long queue behind me he seamlessly adds the order into the till and moves around his colleagues to construct my hot chocolate. After a minute of me waiting and him stood there smiling at me, he glances to the lady working the coffee machine behind and steps over to hurry them up in a low voice demanding a cappuccino, there was an air of impatience towards his colleague before he turned back to me smiling, “sorry about your wait, here’s your cappuccino, have a good day”. As I walked away from the counter the conversation began again, “Good morning, how are you today?” Later that afternoon, walking through the busy city centre overrun with coffee shops, I selected the same chain to visit.

Even though they may not be fully aware of it, to some extent the coach educators are arguably docile bodies replicating a set of norms. As the coach educators’ accounts demonstrate, they refer to customer service but perhaps do not hold a tacit understanding of how the display rules are learnt in this context. Despite this, I feel that my autoethnographic account can provide a greater depth of understanding as it is through my autoethnographic accounts and reflections that I am now able to recognise this. Here I would argue that the reflexivity prompted by my autoethnographic accounts has made me more aware of how my understanding and learning of display rules had occurred. These emotion norms have led me to become emotionally socialised through recurrent experiences through interactions as a customer (Thoits, 2004), and the other coach educators are also beginning to articulate this. This has unconsciously shaped my (and their) understanding of the emotion display rules that I now am guided by and shape my conduct and interactions in my role as a coach educator and that of the other coach educators.

On another level these extracts reveal how the coach educators’ understanding of a customer service exchange shaped the perceptions and interpretations of the expected emotional displays that are aligned with this context. In part Zembylas’ (2005c) poststructuralist approach proposes language and culture to be pivotal in constituting the experience of emotion, where “emotion functions as a discursive

practice in which emotional expression is productive – that is to say, it makes individuals into socially and culturally specific persons" (Zembylas, 2005c: 26) can be usefully drawn upon here. In the case of the coach educators, it is proposed that their learning and understanding of emotional displays in the context of a service-based culture are replicated in the emotional displays of their coach educator work. Through previous training and repeated interactions in a service context as a customer, the culture of service-based display rules has been adopted and transitioned to the work of the coach educator. This could be further understood as constituted in the power relations that privilege the expression of "service with a smile" and deference to the customer; in this case, the coach learner which is adopted by the coach educator as the dominant discourse. Therefore, just as Zembylas (2005c) argued that emotional cultures in teaching are established through the repetition of interactions conveying particular emotional displays, the same appears true for coach educators and the emotional culture aligned with customer service.

As demonstrated in the review of literature, to date, coaching scholars have yet to consider how display rules are learnt. This chapter specifically highlights that, for coach educators, emotional display rules are learnt in a range of contexts. This chapter offers original insights into how the learning of display rules often occurs in implicit, unintentional and sometimes unconscious ways. This chapter demonstrated how the learning of emotion rules occurs: (a) whilst fulfilling the role; (b) is informed via previous personal experiences in learning and wider social settings; (c) is established in an array of relationships and networks of interdependence; and (d). often unknowingly developed through exposure to neo-liberal based cultural norms and settings and via prioritisation of particular discursive practices. Indeed, in making this original contribution, I have responded to the more recent call of Potrac, Smith and Nelson (2017) to investigate how emotion rules are learnt.

Chapter 6: Coach educators' self-management of emotions

6.1. Introduction

This chapter provides an insight into the various strategies that coach educators use to manage their own emotions in pedagogical interactions on coach education courses. The employment of emotion management by professional sports practitioners (Hings et al., 2017), within coaching (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Potrac, et al., 2017), and embryonic findings in coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019) has predominantly drawn upon Hochschild's (1983) theorising on emotion management. This has primarily involved accounts of surface acting where true emotions are hidden and an alternative emotion displayed (Hochschild, 1979; 1983), or deep acting where an individual consciously works at altering their feelings to believe in the emotions they are expressing (Hochschild, 2012 [1983]). The first part of this chapter seeks to build upon and deepen existing knowledge by further examining Hochschild's theorising on emotion management in coach educators' work. This is a useful starting point before moving beyond what is deemed by some scholars as a rather superficial understanding of emotion management (Bolton, 2005) to consider other strategies employed by coach educators. This study intends to offer significant new insights into additional types of emotion management and a more nuanced understanding of the forms of emotion management that are employed by coach educators.

6.2. Surface acting: Hiding true emotions

At times the coach educators experienced emotions which conflicted with the emotion display rules identified in Chapter Four, and what was further apparent from the findings was that all the coach educators, myself included, managed our own emotions at some points in front of the coach learners and in various ways to adhere

to the display rules. Contributing to and expanding the neophyte work in this area that indicates adoption of surface acting by coach educators (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019), it was clear that through pedagogical interactions with learners the coach educators and myself were engaged in surface acting (Hochschild, 2012 [1983]). The flight attendants engaged in surface acting in Hochschild's (1983) work by conveying a calm exterior to disguise and avoid displaying panic in a crisis, as one flight attendant highlighted: "even though I'm a very honest person. I have learned not to allow my face to mirror my alarm or my fright" (Hochschild, 1983: 107). The coach educators described numerous instances where they intentionally displayed a different emotion in front of the coach learners to the one that they experienced at the time. These included: (a) displaying confidence and hiding fear and anxiety; (b) displaying empathy, happiness or humour to hide anger and, on some occasions; and (c) remaining calm and neutral in the face of frustration or disappointment. In essence, the coach educators managed their emotions in alignment to the display rules introduced in Chapter Four.

6.2.1. Confident, calm and in control to hide fear and anxiety

The coach educators referred to how they would hide their fear and anxiety by displaying that they were calm and confident. For example, when delivering a Level 2 course for the first time in a new and unfamiliar situation, Lucy shared how she put on a display that she was calm and confident instead of showing the anxiety and fear that she was experiencing. In her own words:

> When I first started doing Level 2 and I didn't really know the course content that well because it was the first time that I had ever done it and I was working with a tutor that kind of didn't really follow the course em, pack, like jumped from section to section and would jump forwards and backwards, it just threw me. It absolutely threw me, I was kind of like, I don't know what I'm doing, I don't know what I'm doing here, I don't know what I'm doing trying to follow it, I don't know what I'm doing because YOU keep flittering around. So yeah, that made me feel really anxious. I

> think it's just not, you don't want to show that you don't know what you're talking about…I put across confidence and I always try and add a bit of humour when I can when I'm tutoring. Yeah, when actually I'm not, I'm swanning, they call it when your calm on the surface and your legs are going underneath. But behind the scenes you're like what's next, where am I going, what's that tutor said about that, so it's draining. I think by hiding it, I think even if I'm fearful and anxious but I have portrayed confidence to the rest of the group and they are like happy with me then I think that probably makes me feel better and probably reduces my fear.

I could relate to the fear Lucy recalled when finding myself working as a lead tutor for the first time:

> Was I good enough to lead I wondered, as I awaited a new group of learners arriving, it was all on me now, having taken on the role of lead tutor I felt an added level of worry and new things to think about, having arrived at the venue 20 minutes earlier than I had to be there, the extra time had ensured that I was organised and set up but it had also given me too much time to think, 'what if the other tutor doesn't do what they are supposed to', 'what if there is an injury', 'what if we are not progressing through the course quickly enough', 'what if the learners are not enjoying it', 'should I have agreed to this' were the thoughts running through my mind. Too late, it was out of my control, I was here in the midst of the course and they were here so I threw myself into it, feeling acutely aware of my red face and the increasing degree to which my t-shirt was sticking to my back as I spoke, I put on my mask of a smile, ramped up my enthusiasm and calmly began, 'Welcome to the level one'.

In another way, Nicola identified a situation where she had to convey herself as calm despite experiencing panic and fear when a coach learner became injured on the course:

> Yeah, I think fear is quite a strong one, I think fear I put different to worry and everything else because I think that is, when the lady fell over for example and hurt herself, luckily she was okay but in that situation we couldn't show that we were fearful because she was fearful and the rest of the group were fearful so we have got to manage that situation and stay calm, reassure her and do the safety check and then inside I'm like oh my god but like and afterwards I'm like oh my gosh but in the moment like the rest of the group are fearful and that is a really strong emotion to have and that can really change the tone as well. That's quite hard though, especially as a new tutor that's quite hard to manage um, I don't really know how I managed it if you were going to ask me that.

These examples of the suppression of anxiety and fear and replacement with confidence and calm to retain control were more common when the coach educator was at the start of their career, at a new point of responsibility, or dealing with an unexpected event. Clearly in these situations the coach educators perceived displays of confidence and calm was part of their role despite their experienced emotions to maintain their control of the course.

6.2.2. Hiding anger by smiling

All the coach educators recalled instances where they had displayed specific alternative emotions in place of the anger they experienced during the delivery of a course, albeit in a variety of situations. For example, Katie explained how she presented a calm and empathetic exterior to the coach learners in place of the annoyance she experienced when organisational matters (e.g., incorrect or vague course information beyond her control) impacted negatively on the course, and coach learners:

> I think it is showing and being apologetic to the learners, you show a different emotion to what you really feel yeah. You're calm and you're conveying that you are organised, that you are sorted but inwardly you're thinking Ohhh, you know, you're having a bit of a grout. I didn't want them to see that I was het up or annoyed, cos they were a bit het up, they have arrived at somewhere they have never been before, not gone to the right place to start with, so they were probably in the same mood as me to start with. Then we just try to get the course off to a good start.

There was also an instance where Lucy recalled displaying empathy to hide her anger:

> I mean I have had a few instances when ladies have got upset and just cried and I think oh god cos like I don't wanna deal with a crier today, but I wouldn't like avoid the situation. I suppose I might say to her friend that maybe she might be more confident in like oh do you want to go and see is she or he is ok… Urm, sometimes I feel like a bit sorry for them cos I can tell that they just want to do well and it's just that they are just a bit frustrated with the whole situation. Um and I think oh no, it sounds really bad but because you are so time restricted to get through a course, sometimes you're quite lucky and you can get through a course quite

> quick so you can allow for emotion to get in the way and spend a bit of time with a crier. But other times if your like, if you're really dragging a group through, you're thinking Oh I could do without ten minutes of my time spent with someone crying. Yeah, and sometimes it's a bit of anger with them delaying and disrupting, but more often than not I just feel a bit sorry for them and think poor you kind of thing. I'd like go and talk to them and make them feel a bit better um, but yeah I wouldn't show them that I was annoyed or anything like that.

The findings outlined above can be explained in relation to surface acting as clearly the coach educators were taking steps to manage their emotions by ensuring their displays were apologetic and empathetic with the learners and were able to recognise that in surface acting "we deceive others about what we really feel, but we do not deceive ourselves" (Hochschild (2012 [1983]: 33). It is also reflective of research on service roles where workers' anger in response to customers elicited suppressed emotions of anger to align with work demands (Grandey, Tam and Brauburger, 2002).

Forms of surface acting via positive displays to conceal anxiety, frustration and anger are also evident across grassroots (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016), semi-professional men's (Nelson et al., 2013) and amateur women's (Potrac et al., 2017) football coaching settings. In a PE teaching context, a large degree of surface acting involved positive emotional displays by PE teachers compared to a lesser extent when they assumed a coaching role (Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018). In a similar vein, the coach educators explained how they would display happy and positive emotions to the coach learners in replacement of the anger that they were experiencing. Lucy noted how when she was working with a coach learner who was struggling to grasp a concept on progressing a skill in a coaching plan, she had to work really hard with to get him to understand whilst she kept her annoyance hidden:

> I had to work quite hard with him to understand like all the developmental steps to get to that kind of end goal of the built up skill if you will to put it into a game. Yeah, and it's not, yeah I don't mind, it's not like his fault he didn't understand it, it's not like I bear grudges or anything like that but I think sometimes just more the frustration and annoyance of 'Oh please, please just understand it' and you can just, you've got the pressure of the

> other people going 'Oh my God, I wish he'd just understand it a bit quicker so we can move on'. So I think it's just that, it's pressure from all angles, we are trying to appease all people I suppose…I think once I have got them there, it's that I'm happy, probably relieved happy, but getting there is probably forced happiness, if they're answering in a way or I'm coaching them to answer that way, just to try and build their confidence because if I was the opposite and like for goodness sake why aren't you getting it, we'd never get to that point. Through like encouragement and being like "Oh well done", "I'm really proud" and sometimes I do joke and knowing my audience, I'll say "Ooh, I feel like a bit of a proud Mum now, well done" (Laughter), but yeah, I tailor that to the audience.

Further education (FE) lecturers have also employed surface acting to hide what they deem to be inappropriate emotions of frustration from learners by smiling or presenting a calm exterior (Chowdhry, 2014). It could be argued that the coach educators' surface acting through displays of happiness is, on one level, similar to other educational and coaching roles. However, at other points, the coach educators employed a different strategy and adopted humour in their surface acting to hide the anger they were experiencing. As Olivia recalled from one of her entries regarding a course where she was angry that many the coach learners attending a Level 2 course had not completed the requisite Level 1 beforehand. As Olivia explained:

> I have a bit of a laugh and a joke with them and I never show I'm angry by saying well you should have done your level one, and I understand that some people have already been coaching for a long time or that they are a player and they say well I think I should go onto a level two, it's a case of just saying right ok, there might be a few things that you have already covered if you have done your level one, we just need to reinforce it and go over it again, nobody ever says why are we doing this again. I like to have a joke with them and use humour you know, it's not their fault do you know what I mean and I can't change it so, so it's just making sure that you know we explain why we are doing things and then if we have got any questions we just answer them.

Lucy also recalled an example of using humour to hide her frustration and annoyance with a group of Super League players on a Level 2 course who were repeatedly not taking the course seriously and disrupting the course for the other learners:

> I hid it, but then erm I like kind of tried to build a rapport but had a bit of a jokey word with them with like, guys do you want to just rein it in, cos have you thought about this impact that it's having on the other half of the group. And erm, try to understand why they were here and some of them were maybe being a bit forced or had their arms twisted to go on the course to help the Jets community side of things out, rather than necessarily wanting to be there. I think it reduced and it was still there, but then, because we had kind of built that little bit of rapport and they understood it a bit more, then when they were like messing around I was like 'OI' and kind of have a bit of a jokey like, not tell off but sort of just comment, like use humour to kind of rein it in and then they would be like 'Oh Yeah!'and then they would rein it in a bit but in the back of my head I think I was still a bit like just calm yourselves down.

With surface acting unwanted feelings are suppressed and the appropriate display is faked (Grandey, 2000). These approaches to surface acting by the coach educators were similar to the flight attendants in Hochschild's (1983) work who pretended to be enthusiastic, or employed false high-pitched voices in their work, to hide feelings of anger and resent towards passengers.

The accounts of the other coach educators' experiences of hiding anger and presenting alternative emotion strongly reflected my own experiences, since I was often in agreement with and replicated the surface acting that they employed in my own delivery. The writing up of their accounts, and particularly the interaction by Lucy at displaying she was happy despite her anger, reminded me how hard I have worked at displaying that I was happy when I was actually angry on previous courses. It brought to the forefront one encounter which had been particularly demanding of keeping up a smile to cover my anger. It was a course that had several sport development officers on who had been reluctant to accept anything or be involved in much over the initial part of the course. One of the coach learners, Gemma, had been repeatedly off task throughout the course and was yet again doing something different and it made me angry, but I upheld a happy positive display in addressing her behaviour:

> I set the coach learners off delivering warm-ups, and leant my full weight against the sports hall wall, offering some relief to my aching legs after standing all morning, the cold of the wall seeped through my t-shirt and across my back, relieving the fog like fuzz that had been building in my head. I scanned the hall looking for all the key components to the warm-up from the four coach learner's leading, a ball suddenly flew across the hall, I glance to see Gemma playing football with the netballs, once again for the tenth time today not doing what she should be, "you have to be kidding me" I exclaimed to myself. Heat rushed up my neck to my head, I could feel myself turning red as I strode across the hall, each step propelling me further forward as though my anger was pushing through my legs down into the floor and propelling me faster towards Gemma, my heart was pounding in my chest and my blood bubbling. 'Don't lose it', I think to myself. As I get closer my stride breaks and becomes less purposeful. 'Don't lose it' I think to myself, 'don't let her win'.
>
> I really just can't let her see how annoyed I am, I smile, but it's not really my smile, more of a grin like grimace and consciously force my arms to relax down by their sides when really the pent-up energy in my muscles wants to escape
>
> Me: "Gemma can I have a word?" I asked in a deliberately measured tone, as I tried to ensure that it didn't sound aggressive.
>
> Me: "What are you doing?"
>
> Gemma: "Nothing"
>
> Me: "I don't think it's very fair that you'er messing around when Ellie is trying to deliver a warm-up, it's hard enough without having distractions. Is there a problem?
>
> Gemma: "No"
>
> Me: "Please could you try and do as she asks. It's only fair that you follow her session, as you would expect her to follow yours".
>
> In my head I wanted to tell her to get on with what she should be doing or just leave, instead. Gemma just shrugs and walks away and sits on a bench instead of re-joining her group. My heart is pounding and my insides are tight and burning and a voice in my mind is screaming ARRRRGH. I step away and decide to ignore her, and I continue to observe and smile in order to keep my true feelings hidden.

A more detailed consideration of the way that I employed surface acting revealed that acts of gestures such as the forced smiles in my interactions could be interpreted as further displays of surface acting where expressions and gestures are "put on", detached and superficial (Hochschild, 2000). It was clear that on numerous occasions the coach educators suppressed their own emotions and deceived the coach learners about what they really felt by surface acting.

6.3. Emotional neutrality: Remaining diplomatic, calm and neutral in the face of possible conflict

In other instances, the coach educators explained that they managed their emotions and presented a neutral display. For Katie and Olivia, presenting a neutral front in various pedagogical interactions when delivering coaching courses and managing their emotions of frustration and disappointment suggests that the coach educators' emotion management is guided by a shared understanding of the display rules specific to the role of working as a coach educator. Adopting a neutral display was emphasised by Katie when managing and hiding her disappointment when a coach learner had not correctly completed a session plan:

> No, oh no, I said look, cast your mind back to the first weekend, where should you get these coaching points from and can you use your own? No, I should use these. So again, through questioning we were able to establish which she should have used. The next question was, "your questions, lovely questions but are they coaching points, no, so where should they be?", "Task and group management, and what about the answers to them, where should they be?", "Coaching points column." So again, through questioning we got there. Staying calm and questioning to tease it our rather than saying well that's wrong, it should be there, I wouldn't display my disappointment. I'd hide disappointment but also display that you can use a questioning approach to give feedback like you are shown on the tutor training and that they are meant to be keeping on an even keel. If you give them direct feedback, that is not correct, it's sort of you know, tell me about or, where do those coaching points come from?

Olivia related to being annoyed at having to work with coach learners who had not completed a Level 1 course prior to attending Level 2, but presented a neutral display as she described:

> I did one not so long ago and it was only a half course which had ten on it and it was quite a few of them who had not done their Level 1 and it was quite frustrating because urgh I had to go through what other people had done, you had to go through some of the coaching points in more depth and they didn't really have the technical knowledge so you had to go through and give the demonstration and things so you had to sort of change the schedule round a little bit and it was same for the Level 2 I have been delivering recently, there were quite a few who hadn't done their Level 1. I know that they are coaches cos I know that they coach but it was sort of getting them into the England Netball way of thinking and

> using the right terminology and things like that but if they had been on a Level 1 they would have sort of already known what the principles were, what sort of words to use, but then there were other people who had been on a Level ! who, then they were probably thinking hang on I have already done this, so it's good to reinforce what they know but then I do find it frustrating because you do think, speak to the other tutor and say right we are going to have to spend a bit more time with this person because they don't necessarily understand what the structure of the course entails because if you have done a Level 1 you sort of know, you know what is expected of you, um and then, you would sort of know, oh they have done their level one, they will have done certain things, but you have to change the schedule a little bit which is a bit frustrating because you have to sort of think right hang on, I need to change this course a little bit to accommodate everybody in the group so, so I know that is a bug bear of mine that I do think you need to do a Level one before you do a Level two, it doesn't matter if you're an England player, it's the knowledge and the terminology behind it and things like that but I just have to hide that from the learners and continue as normal.

In a similar way Katie recalled experiencing anger but believed that she conveyed that she was calm when the coach learners persisted in asking irrelevant and minor questions. As Katie elaborated:

> Lots of time was being spent answering them or discussing them, the other tutor chipping in as well, you know, I'm conscious of time, we need to get on with it. It ended up with us being an hour behind by the end of the weekend, that's what I mean. The session on centre pass set ups we have got to do next weekend because we didn't get through it. I mean inside I was boiling, yeah in my chest, I felt hot, my eyes started going to the ceiling, yeah really angry. Instead, I just calmly said if you have got any odd questions we can discuss them at lunchtime or break time.

These extracts demonstrate how the coach educators employed emotional neutrality where an individual displays unemotional behaviour whilst supressing the emotion that they are experiencing (Ward and McMurray, 2011; 2016). The suppression of the emotion is the performance and has been reported to attain a calm environment by GP receptionists (Ward and McMurray, 2011) and maintain control and order in encounters, or diffuse potentially volatile situations, by using it as a de-escalating tool by agents of social order (doormen, police officers and prison officers) (Ward, McMurray and Sutcliffe, 2019). The suppression of frustration and

disappointment in the examples above contributed to the continuation of the course and the avoidance of personal emotions of the coach educators arising and potentially disrupting or causing conflict on the course. In these situations, the coach educators explained that to display neutrality and calm as part of their role, despite their experienced emotions, maintained their control of the course and was in keeping with what the emotional rules expected.

6.4. Deep acting: Feeling and expressing required emotions

Although the coach educators often shaped the outward appearance of their emotions to contrast the emotion that they experienced, there were some instances when they transformed their actual emotional experience so that it aligned with their outward emotional display. The coach educators described how they would try to prevent emotions of anxiety or disappointment surfacing as Lucy's and my own autoethnographic account captured. This strategy reflected Hochschild's (2012) alternative concept of emotion management of 'deep acting' where individuals shape and manage their emotions in social interactions. Employment of deep acting by flight attendants – via self-prompting – in trying to stop and eradicate feelings of anger at an annoying passenger and not to let him get to her (Hochschild, 1983) were similar to the deep acting emotion management approaches highlighted by the coach educators. The coach educators attempted to either suppress, evoke or allow a particular emotion (Hochschild, 2012) via the exhortation of feeling. For example, when Hochschild (2012) asked students to describe their experience of a deep emotion, responses included 'I squashed down my anger', 'I forced myself to have a good time' and 'I snapped myself out of the depression'. This concept is useful to understand how Lucy undertook emotional management to diminish her disappointment at the coach learner's lack of engagement and continue with the

delivery of the course. Here I believe that Lucy was undertaking conscious mental work (Hochschild, 2012 [1983]) to surpass the disappointment.

> There was one girl and she wasn't really understanding it, and I worked quite hard, she was only young like seventeen, eighteen, wasn't I just don't think she was that interested in being there, it just seemed like a bit of a shame that like she was funded by the club and possibly liked helping out but wasn't that bothered about being a coach. I almost wondered if that age and maturity she wasn't quite ready. I think I was probably a bit disappointed in her, I think I had tried to engage her a little bit erm, but you could tell that she just wanted to play around really more than anything…I just put my disappointment to one side and got on with it, just to maintain the continuity of the course really. Like she did do the work, but you could just tell that she didn't want to be there, there is no other way to describe it really. I just take a deep breath and just carry on, like I don't, I think yeah I think I go phhhh(expels breath) and think ok I'll get past it and just get to the end of the day. I definitely just carry on and get through the day. (Lucy)

> Get over it I thought to myself and forced myself to stand up. Come on Claire, you can do this, I silently repeated to myself, remember you know more than them. I could feel my heart pounding in my chest, what if I forget everything or get something wrong I worried as I put up the poster displays around the room. Come on, you do this every day at work standing up and talking and interacting with people, just get on with it I thought to myself. I pushed the rising panic to the pit of my stomach and turned around to face the group, feeling increasingly unsure whether I should be there as Emma the lead tutor introduced me to the group and I smiled and offered what I hoped was a confident introduction of myself. That was it, we were underway and I had no choice but to push away the panic and anxiety that had been building up inside me since 4am and get on with delivering my first course.

In a similar sense in terms of my autoethnographic account (above), it could be suggested that I worked upon exhorting feeling by trying to lock down the panic and anxiety I was experiencing and evoke feelings of happiness and being energised in my involvement at that point in the course. This resulted in self-induced feelings of happiness and confidence via an engagement in deep acting.

A second approach to deep acting proposed by Hochschild (2012) was indirectly using the trained imagination, here a person draws upon emotion memory to recall feelings, whether trying to elicit a feeling we wish we had or reduce one which we wish we did not have (Hochschild, 2012). This reflected emotion management in

respect to the rules of not displaying anxiety and fear. Katie employed a similar approach in stopping her frustration at another coach educator's behaviour only a few hours in to a four-day course:

> From being in that same situation before I have learnt, I know how to cope with it. I think it's just carry on regardless really, cos you know you have got the learners behind you so you just crack on with it. Ignore it as far as possible. Try not to let it drive you up the wall which it can do. I was concerned about the learners getting the best deal and I believe my approach gives them that. (Katie)

I also drew upon my emotion memory of a previous session where I had been happy and upbeat to try and capture and enact those emotions to convince myself I felt this way in this instance and to overcome the emotions I was experiencing:

> I thought of all the other times I had stepped out of my comfort zone whilst working on these courses and learnt something new and how that had then led me to be better at it next time around. I cast my mind back to a course I had delivered a few months ago, the session had been fun, fast paced and engaging, I could still feel the glow from the external verifier's comments which had complimented me on my delivery and interaction with the coach learners. I had been fully in control, happy with what I was doing, just what I needed to be like right now. I had to believe in myself and that I could adapt to this. Working to stay up beat and show willing I summoned up a smile and approached Katy, the coach learner nearest to me with a bounce in my step and interest in what she was doing and began questioning her observations on attacking principles As I spoke to her, my mind jumped back to all the well-structured and open ended questions that I had been praised for using in the past. Katy started talking about ensuring the players were ball side and explaining the positioning on court to achieve it. This was what I was looking for in the answers, I instantly felt relieved that what I had done was right. A tingle ran down my spine and pride followed the relief that I was making a difference and doing what I should be, making a positive contribution to the course and developing the coach learners. With every coach learner I spoke to, the fear and panic ebbed further away like a distant memory, I was buzzing, my movements were purposeful and I felt energised, firing questions and praising the responses, I couldn't get my words out quick enough. I was back in and involved, it felt good. The worry of being perceived as not up to the job by the coach learners or Jane had passed, and I was back fulfilling my role of the coach educator.

6.5. There's more to emotion management than surface and deep acting

Moving beyond surface or deep acting as emotion management strategies, a prominent feature identified from the analysis of the interviews and my own accounts was that the coach educators' emotion management was structured in terms of the social interactions and relationships with the coach learners and coach educators in the delivery of the course. This highlighted previous critiques of Hochschild's (1983) conceptualisation of emotion work in the form of employee's managing their own emotion through surface and deep acting struggles to adequately capture all forms of emotion management (Bolton, 2005; Bolton and Boyd, 2003).

Bolton (2005) contributes a more nuanced approach to emotion management, arguing that a typical response in emotional management in daily social interactions is not consciously calibrated but managed in accordance with more generic social rules (Bolton, 2005) involving presentational emotion management (Bolton, 2005; Bolton and Boyd, 2003). This is where social skills learnt in life through socialisation are adopted in the workplace (Bolton, 2005). Presentational emotion management which recognises the social actor and their repertoire of skills via life experience in 'the presentation of self' can be usefully employed to further understand additional aspects of the coach educators' emotional management.

The displays of emotions by the coach educators were often based upon general features of social interaction and broader social conventions of making people feel welcome, involved and included alongside building trust and relationships with someone because it is the socially appropriate thing to do. The coach educators arguably use presentational emotion management to "enact many encounters routinely" (Bolton and Boyd, 2003: 296). For example, all the coach educators alluded to being welcoming and building relationships on the courses with the coach learners in the management of their emotion:

I think you convey you're happy and sort of welcoming to them and open cos that, that's what you want, you want that situation where it's an open relationship and again it's a two-way process. (Katie)

Yeah, just to try and like, not necessarily be funny I sound like I'm trying to be a bit of a comedian, I just try to be a bit more so I can relate to people and have a bit of a chat to them. If you walk into a room and no one smiles, makes eye contact or talks to you its awful, like I do like netball but not to the extent of seven days a week and we all have lives outside of that and it's quite nice to just relate to people so that they feel more at ease when they walk in a room that's why I do it and that's how I like it so, it's nice. I don't want to feel like someone is jumping down my neck about the meeting or a conference when I walk in a room. (Lucy)

Yeah I think if you are not interested in what you are talking about I think how are you going to get other people to be interested and engage them, they might be interested it might just be your style of delivery like it might just be a natural style of delivery which it is just not for me, I just really want to, not sell coaching, that is the wrong word, I really want people to leave thinking yeah I can't wait to go and do my session, which doesn't happen if someone doesn't come across as happy and I think it is harder to kind of engage the group and get them thinking about it and on task if you are not showing that engagement in the learning yourself, even though you might know the content like the back of your hand, it is still their first experience. Like I did a course today and one of the ladies came up at the end and said oh I really enjoyed that and I said thanks and she went yeah I enjoyed it more than I thought I would so I was ok thanks and she was like oh no I don't really enjoy courses, I don't enjoy going on them and I wasn't really looking forward to it so I suppose by following the emotional rules and because they had had a heavy day with lots of information and a short lunch break and many of them had a long drive and they needed to engage with this content and they had to know it and be on board with it so to get them I was like come on guys and happy, maybe I was a bit bouncy, people describe me as bouncy in a light hearted way. (Nicola)

Oh yeah, because if you are, you don't want to be there and like oh we will just miss this bit out, I think it shows onto the candidates because they have given up their weekend to go, they have been at work all work as well, they are probably tired, they have probably got kids and they have probably got nagging husbands as well. So I think you have sort of got to be upbeat and you have got to say good morning, how are you doing? You know, some of these people I don't know and you are probably never gonna see some of these people ever again, so I am not gonna turn up and be like a headmistress and say like right, tell me an answer now. That's, I'm not like that when I'm teaching, I'm not like that when I am coaching so I am up for the learners to do things and discover things for themselves, ask them questions, cos that is how they are then going to get their players to do that on court. In the sessions they are going to do their own sessions, they are going to work as a group, we are going to teach them things, they are going to do stuff, so we try to make it as varied as possible within the groups and you get some crazy answers off them, you get people who are quite quiet because you have got young learners in there, you get people who never shut up, well I know this, and I know

> that and you have got to then manage the different learners in the group. I think I am like that when I teach, I'm always upbeat, I like to have fun, I think that is how people learn, that's how I would learn. (Olivia)

The examples presented above highlight the coach educators' engagement in presentational emotion management, where the coach educators managed emotions and displayed them in socially appropriate ways based upon their cultural context and past experiences (Bolton, 2005). For example, one should be happy at a wedding and sad at a funeral reflect societal display rules (Bolton and Boyd, 2003).

At other points the coach educators performed presentational emotion management in their interactions with the coach learners to demonstrate their human side and maintain elements of their own identity, not just adopt that of being a coach educator using humour. As Katie and Lucy explained:

> Oh I smile, I tell jokes, bad ones! Erm have a giggle, you know, that sort of thing. Present yourself as an ordinary person with a bit of netball knowledge basically and that's it. You know, you're an ordinary, everyday person. I have always believed you know, if you want a good response from somebody you have to be, you have to behave the way that you want them to behave, if you're friendly and kind most of the time you get that back and that is what respect is about really. If you show respect to someone else, normally you get the same level of respect back. (Katie)
>
> I think at the start of a course I always try and shape a course by speaking to people as they come in and say if there is like, I don't know, I'm a celebrity on or x factor, I usually use that as a bit of a point to, Oh has anyone watched this, just to try and get the group talking and to realise that yeah I'm a tutor but I'm a human, do you know what I mean, you can talk to me about other things, I don't necessarily wanna talk about netball for nine hours either, like I'm happy to talk about something else in breaks and stuff like that. Erm, yeah so I think at the start of the course I always use a bit of humour to just try and build rapport in a setting that's not necessarily about netball. (Lucy)

These actions by the coach educators could be explained by the fact that "actors continually seek spaces in organisations where they can be their 'authentic' selves and perform presentational or philanthropic emotion management according to the social rules they are familiar with" (Bolton, 2005: 101).

The coach educators revealed how during the delivery of a course they often shared different emotional displays that conflicted with the display rules identified earlier (Chapter Four) in their interactions with their colleagues over the duration of a course. These included forms of shared glances or open venting of frustration, annoyance or relief or sharing that they were not happy. In these instances the coach educators created 'back regions' (Goffman, 1959) or 'spaces' (Bolton, 2005) to display their true emotions with some of their colleagues. These actions further encapsulated Bolton's (2005) presentational emotion management where the coach educators' interactions were guided by implicit social rules to "maintain familial bonds, relieve anger and anxiety, register resistance to demands of organisation or offer extra emotion work" (Bolton, 2005: 135). As Lucy, Nicola and my own reflections shared:

> Yeah, I definitely do that with people, I like might big them up and say well done, that's really good, I'm so happy with you and then I might turn round and I'm like 'Oooh Jesus and take a bit of a breath to either the wall or the other tutor and be like, blooming heck, that was hard work, we got there in the end'. I wouldn't show it to their face, yeah, I'd show that I am really happy to them, to make them feel confident, but yeah I think once I have turned round and they can't see me or hear me um yeah then I might like say otherwise to the other tutor be honest. (Lucy)

> Oh yeah, the lead knew I was nervous and worried. She knew, cos she phoned me. So she sent me through the documents and was like Oh can you do module x,y,and z. Do I have to prep any content for it? So I got a phone call like an hour later saying have you done a course before? And I said no this is my first one, so she was like leave it with me, they had no idea, it was just a general mistake and like it worked out fine actually, throwing me in the deep end was the best thing to do, um so yeah, she knew. She was like you don't have to prep at all, I'll send you everything. She was really good. (Nicola)

> Um I probably shared my disappointment with the other tutor. Yeah probably had a word with the tutor and said what shall we do? Um and what would you do here? But yeah, that was probably it. I wouldn't ever do it with the participants it's just not professional. (Lucy)

I believe that within these spaces because the level of prescriptive emotion management by the organisation was not that explicit and a large degree of autonomy was available to myself and the other coach educators in our work, then we were able

to a certain extent “create their own form of organisational reality” (Bolton, 2005: 134). As I became increasingly aware of this in the other coach educators’ work, I realised that it was indeed something that I did and there was already clear interweaving and evidence of this in my other autoethnographic accounts where I suppressed anger in order to follow the rules (Chapter Four), as well as hiding my frustrations but displayed them to the co-tutor at a lack of resources. I was slowly realising that my co-tutor was an important sounding board for the display or release of my own experienced emotions. I found there was a resonance in my own and others’ emotional management because these very social and presentational forms of emotional displays were going on at the same time that I and others were enacting prescriptive emotional management with the coach learners (Bolton, 2005). Evidently multiple forms of emotion management were taking place at once, like the cabin crew in Bolton and Boyd’s (2003) study who as multi-skilled emotion managers performed a mixing and matching of all forms of emotion management.

Whilst the public displays of emotion in front of the coach learners were managed, this is not to say that the coach educators were not experiencing a range of emotions that could not be shared with a select few or trusted others. This often happened backstage, or covertly and out of sight of the coach learners. These are explained by Bolton (2005) as the creation of ‘unmanaged spaces’ when “a situation arises where specific prescriptive organisational rules do not apply, or when they are significantly relaxed” (Bolton, 2005: 134). This could be interpreted as reflecting Bolton’s (2005) proposal of the engagement in presentational management, whereby actors “mix and match feeling rules according to the needs of the situation whilst also allowing them to create ‘spaces’ into which they may ‘escape’ (Bolton, 2005: 112). By interacting on a presentational level with colleagues, the coach educators were able to uphold the display rules and prescriptive emotion management that they deemed

were expected and subject to professional and organisational demands in front of the coach learners.

> I think it's because I've got six years of working with them, where as with other people I haven't. Like you and I when we tutor together, I could probably say like more to you than I would someone I've only tutored with once or twice and it's just building that rapport with understanding how people work and how to phrase it. Like my boss needs black and white you can't like fluff around any situation cos he just doesn't get it, like you've just gotta tell him (laughs)…I think it is hard tutoring, it's not like when your in a school or at work, you know those people you've like built that level of rapport to be able to go what are you doing, what's all this. When you don't know someone and your not maybe 100% sure yourself, for me it was maybe not being comfortable enough to kind of share or challenge it really cos I was still learning on the job a little bit myself. (Lucy)

> Oh yeah, it would be horrible if you were working with somebody who you didn't get along with and you couldn't talk to them about stuff and share what you really think and feel, I think that would be quite hard, I have never had that before. (Olivia)

Performing presentational emotion management can prepare an emotional labourer to perform pecuniary or prescriptive emotion management because conforming to societal display rules often is a prerequisite for interacting with others at work (Bolton, 2005). It could be suggested that such prescriptive emotion management is achieved because the coach educators have learnt to present themselves based upon the implicit rules of the situation previously learnt via socially guided interactions (Bolton, 2005). This is arguably evident in the coach educators' accounts from chapter five where emotional display rules have been learnt implicitly and informally via emotional socialisation through wider social interactions as a learner and in the neo-liberal market as a customer.

The coach educators could also be deemed to have engaged in reciprocal emotion management which is the "reciprocal and sometimes simultaneous management of emotion among similar others" (Lively, 2000: 33). This is where the employee manages their emotion to meet the expected display rules of hierarchically higher order colleagues or clients, but engage with similar status co-workers in

‘horizontal reciprocal emotion management’ to relieve their stress. As Katie and Olivia described:

> I think it is keeping a lid on emotion in terms of the learners because you know, all the time they are the ones who have paid to go on the course. The learners are the ones who deserve the best I can give them and if I start to get frustrated and start reacting to it, it’s going to effect them in a negative way. I just manage to side line it by sharing my feelings with who I work with usually and focus on the learners and repeat the process each time. (Katie)
>
> I delivered a Level 2 at the weekend and afterwards I said to the other tutor, I didn’t like that course at all, cos it, there was people on it who weren’t experienced, they weren’t even coaching, I don’t even know why they were on a Level 2…I didn’t hide it from the other tutor and she didn’t hide it from me either but I think the benefits of hiding it from the learners are that the course was positive and it ran smoothly and that candidates were non the wiser (Olivia)

These displays and development of supportive interpersonal relationships between the co-tutors are of benefit to themselves and others. The coach educators use each other to manage their own reactions to the emotion management that they are performing in front of the coach learners and meet work demands. It could therefore be contended that, at times, similarly to the paralegals, the coach educators acts of reciprocal emotion management “allowed them to remain professional in the face of the demands placed on them to be professional” (Lively, 2000: 48).

6.6. Going beyond the expected emotional display

Following further analysis of the interviews there were examples provided by the coach educators of them managing their own emotions beyond what was deemed necessary by the organisation and/or important professionally. This aligned with philanthropic emotion management which is a specific form of presentational emotion management where an employee may “decide to give that ‘little extra’ during a social exchange in the workplace” (Bolton, 2005: 92). It is recognised as above and beyond

the social norms associated with presentation of self and involves the giving of emotion as a “gift” during an interaction (Hochschild, 1983; Bolton, 2005). For example, a nurse may take time to display empathy to patients, or a funeral director shows compassion and care for someone who has lost a loved one. It involved more than being a good coach educator and was instead about showing genuine concern for the coach learner on a one-to-one basis as a human being, rather than as a coach learner and offering them confidence and dignity.

This highlighted that the coach educators and I were able to move beyond the constraints of pecuniary and prescriptive emotion management and relate to the coach learner as a person. For example, Lucy recounted a situation where she had given up extra time to help a coach learner who was struggling with the work on the course despite the boredom that she felt happy to do it:

> There was a girl on one of my courses in, where was it?, I don’t know the specific location, but she was quite, she just didn’t really get any of the coursework that she had filled out, it was all completely wrong. I sat with her before, during and after each day and I went through it all again and she started then to understand it a bit better and kind of filled it in more correctly so for me that was quite, it was quite tedious cos it was the full kind of workbook (laughter). BUT it was quite rewarding once she did understand it and she was quite appreciative of the fact that time had been spent with her so I quite liked that actually. I quite like, I like to back the underdog (laughter), I like to, I get like a pride and happiness and enjoyment of seeing someone that has maybe struggled actually achieve, I find that a lot more rewarding than the others so, I think, yeah I quite like it and I like seeing people’s confidence grow.

Similarly, Katie cited an example of supporting a coach learner who found the course difficult:

> Yeah I had a learner, I did a course on my own, a half course just before Christmas and there was a learner on there, and she kept saying to me ‘Oh I’m really unsure you know whether I should be here’. I was constantly, almost every session, having to reinforce that she was fine. If she had got an issue, come to me and ask the question and she did that and in the end she came out of it alright. But she’d got this feeling that she wasn’t up to the standard of everybody else. But in a way that was good because she was there thinking I’m here to learn and she came out of it really well. Probably better than some of the ones who thought they

> were brilliant but weren't really, yeah. Some tutors might have felt that was frustrating or when is this person gonna get it, where as I don't do that I go along with it and just keep on encouraging, jollying her along and eventually she got it. I got superb feedback from her in the end in an e-mail. Thanks for all your support on the course, I really appreciate it and all the rest of it. It's a great buzz, yeah and if you know, there are people in that situation where they are not quite sure if they are on the right course, if they are up to it, I want them to be able to feel that they can approach me and say look I'm not quite sure about that can you go through it again with me or I'm a bit you know, I'm not quite sure that I'm doing the right thing, it's that, that you want, a relationship where they feel they can do that and admit it to you and also knowing that they feel that I will help them and guide them in the right direction and not be sort of like Oh come on get on with it.

For Nicola it was also providing extra time and input to get particular learners through the course:

> I think a lot of the people coming on the courses are already nervous and I think if you're quite, not harsh, harsh is the wrong word but quite by the book all the time and quite, like you don't display a range of emotions it's hard for people to read you, it's hard for people to build that trust with you and to feel like you're approachable so I try and come across as happy, approachable and friendly, like I am genuinely there to help them, like I don't mind sitting on my lunch and going through portfolios, I don't mind getting there early or staying late to help them and yeah I think you can tell a lot about people by their body language and what emotions they display and how they are. (Nicola)

I could relate to the accounts the other coach educators provided in their philanthropic management of emotions and was able to identify with a similar situation that I had been in:

> Jo sat down beside me with a thud on the bench, I shuffled my paperwork into order and turned towards her smiling, ready to feedback on the micro-coaching session I had just observed. "Well that was really enjoyable to…tears began to roll down Jo's cheeks and her face crumpled. My face dropped from a smile to a frown, I didn't have a clue where this had all come from and I became increasingly concerned as to why she was crying. As she removed her glasses and whilst I waited for her to catch her breath I reflected on her involvement in the course over the last two days. She had been so upbeat and involved. I just couldn't pinpoint anything as to why she was crying. 'What's wrong?' I asked and waited patiently for her to answer, through the hiccups and gasps that she was desperately trying to get under control and I was politely trying to ignore Jo stuttered. "Ive been so worried about doing this and not passing, I nearly didn't come today, I didn't sleep last night" "Its been so stressful, there is just so much to remember". "Well you shouldn't think or feel like that, you did really well, if I had any doubts in you being able to do this I

would have pulled you to one side and told you by now", I put my arm around her and gave her shoulder a squeeze, hoping to reinforce my words and comfort her. "Please don't be upset, there really is no need to be". My phone interrupted us, vibrating on my clipboard to indicate that time was up and according to my tutor notes I should be moving onto the next coach learner by now, each of them had been allocated 15 minutes to coach and five minutes of feedback. I silenced the timer and put my clipboard down, the feedback would wait and the other coach learners too. I smiled again at Jo, hoping that she could see that I wanted to help her, "Take your time to get your breath and we can chat". I looked over to the other nine coach learners who had gathered in a group and were anxiously looking over in our direction, "take ten minutes, get a drink and have a break then we will carry on" I called over the noise. They disappeared out of the sports hall and my attention returned to Jo, 'are you ok?' Jo nodded but continued to cry, I waited for her to continue "everyone else is so good and I'm so old to be doing this I didn't think I could". I glanced at my watch, I had spent an extra 20 minutes talking with Jo and was now way behind schedule, not that it was important, we would just have to finish a little later or catch the time up on the evaluations at the end I think. The other coach learners began to filter back in, 'You will come to the assessment day won't you?" I didn't want all this to be for nothing, "is there anything else you want to go over or check?". "No its fine, thankyou for helping me I feel so much better and yes I will do the assessment" replied Jo. Feeling a little better inside, "right whose next?" I called to the group of assembled coach learners as Jo re-joined the group.

In my autoethnography and the responses of the other coach educators, it was evident that we were willing to place extended time and effort into supporting coach learners beyond the allocated time on the course, despite the time constraints and pressures of delivering a course. Although not part of the specified job role as a coach educator, these emotional displays reflect showing empathy, respect and caring for the individual as a person, not just as a coach learner. The philanthropic emotion management employed in these instances demonstrate the coach educators are being guided partially by implicit social feeling rules and "ritualised acts of deference and demeanour" (Bolton, 2005: 161). In these instances, the coach educators clearly managed their own emotions for the benefit of the coach learner(s), demonstrating that emotional self-management is not always set by the organisation but that the coach educator also has a degree of agency.

6.7. There's no acting here: Authentic emotion management

One particular insight of when the coach educators employed natural, genuine and authentic displays of emotion which did not require deliberate or conscious attention, and which enabled the spontaneous expression of expected emotions (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993), was when the more experienced coach educators displayed emotions of excitement and enjoyment to the coach learners. For the more experienced coach educators, Katie and Olivia this was particularly and more consistently the case:

> I just have a new anticipation and excitement for each course and, just my sort of enjoyment of doing it, doing the job and you know enjoying coaching netball and you know, hopefully that I might get that across to people. It is genuine and enthusiastic excitement each time. (Katie)

> I absolutely love delivering courses, I don't get up and think like you know, Oh God I've got to do that, I'm too tired, I'm up early, I love delivering. I have even got all the stuff in the back of the car without thinking about it, it's already in there, I don't even need to make a list because I just know what to do, I know what I am delivering on the schedule, yes it changes, I know what the other person is doing, but I do really enjoy delivering the courses. (Olivia)

When employees are truly satisfied with their jobs, they may not need to fake smiles during interactions (Humphrey, Ashforth and Diefendorff, 2015: 750). The genuine expression of emotion still entails management for it to be aligned to the demands of the situation (Lee, Chelladurai and Kim, 2015). This implies that, for the coach educators here, "that emotion may be felt and displayed with relatively little effortful prompting" (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993: 94). "Because older workers are likely to have greater job experience using emotional labour, their study also implies that more skilled workers are likely to use genuine emotional labour" (Humphrey, Ashforth and Diefendorff, 2015: 753). It could be explained in terms of the high level of experience of these two coach educators who have been in the role a long time, since they were more likely to express naturally felt emotions or employ deep acting than employ surface acting (Dahling and Perez, 2010).

In contrast, as a less experienced coach educator, Nicola explained that some of the time she was genuine in the emotion that she displayed:

> Maybe 65:35 managed, yeah I definitely feel like I manage them but equally I feel like they are genuine, I just feel like I enjoy doing the course, I enjoy delivering the content, I am happy to be there, I am passionate, I do care, so like they are genuine but I do feel like I have to manage them because I want to do well and because I want to be there and because I want to do a good job, that sometimes heightens my anxiety because then I am like, what if I don't do this or what if I don't do that or what if I say the wrong thing or what if I miss something out so then that is what I have to manage for myself but the emotions are genuine. (Nicola)

As a relatively experienced coach educator of over 10 years the accounts of genuine and authentic emotional expression by the other coach educators (Katie and Olivia) reflected my experiences. Looking back over the years I can now see how my emotion management has transitioned and become less calculated and acted and more genuine and spontaneous. However, that is not to say that my displays are always authentic and genuine. In my interactions within a course there is a time-bound element to the authenticity and that often at key points in a course (e.g., the start, relating to assessment and when an unanticipated situation demands) my emotion display is much less authentic and genuine, coherent with how I feel and more strategic. These occasions have become less as I have gained experience and knowledge of how to be in this role which has increased my ease with which I display my emotions.

Apart from previous research revealing the use of genuine emotion as a form of emotion management by employees in addition to surface and deep acting (Glomb and Tews 2004; Diefendorff, Croyle and Gosserand, 2005) and the authentic display of emotion hinted at in the emotion display work of sports medics and scientists (Hings et al., 2018), where "many SMSs disclosed their awareness of felt emotions in everyday practice and discussed the effortless congruence between felt emotions and emotional expressions in specific situations" (Hings et al., 2018: 711). Studies

exploring emotion management have consistently failed to consider the place of authentic emotion display in employees' work (Allen et al., 2010). The repeated calls for further research in this area, and to routinely include authentic emotion in future studies (Humphrey, Ashforth and Diefendorff, 2015), highlights that it is an area of emotion management that continues to be little understood.

6.8. Emotion management as dynamic and interactional

From the analysis of the interviews with the coach educators it was also identified that their emotion management was of an interactional and dynamic nature. The coach educators revealed the fluid and changing nature of their emotion management at times in their accounts where interactions, connections and relationships that developed between themselves and the coach learners shaped and altered the emotion management employed. The coach educators' emotion management varied on a course-by-course basis and within courses in relation to various aspects. As Nicola described:

> I think that when you don't know the group at the start, I am not saying I would fake it but I think I over exaggerate my welcome and happiness, for the first hour you are working at it because you want them to feel welcome, you want them to talk to each other, you want them to feel at ease, especially if they are really early. So yeah, I think that is the only time and like when I am in the classroom I feel like I have got to present and manage more because that is where I have got less experience, whereas when I am on the court I am used to the environment, I am used to having people around me, I am used to questioning so that I don't work as hard at presenting myself… I think when you know what you are getting from them it makes it a lot easier, and you become a little bit more down to earth and a bit more light hearted and I think you stop having to work at it so much. That first hour or hours where you have got like that happy emotion, you are approachable, you are welcoming that first impression and that professionalism. I am a massive believer in that you judge people in the first few moments of knowing them and I think that is one of the most important bits of the course, that welcome. Then yeah it is just managing that throughout the day if you need to. (Nicola)

Here Nicola illuminated how her emotion management transitioned as she developed an understanding of the coach learners and their needs. A similar point is made by Lucy but both in relation to the tutor she was working with as well as the group of coach learners.

> Yeah, I definitely like kind of get in to the course and I might be like fake happy if that makes sense but sometimes like if I know I'm tutoring with someone I know or I like then actually I'm like Oh it won't be that bad of a weekend. Say like when we tutor together, that's quite nice, I think oh I know what she's like, it'll be nice to have a catch up but if its someone completely new or someone that I am not so keen on then I think like, it's almost like a bit acting, like I might walk in and act. (Lucy)
>
> I think if I'm tired the person your working with can make a complete difference, cos obviously the people your tutoring you don't really know, like you might recognise someone once you get there but it's not them that makes it, that sounds awful, it's the person that I'm tutoring with. Or the group might make it, if they are a really nice group or really engaged or a bit chatty or have got a bit of something about them, I go in fake happy but then actually end up quite enjoying it but if they are a hard work group, they are not talking, they don't understand it or they are not netballers then yeah I think fake happiness will probably continue to rise because I am just trying to get through. (Nicola)

It was clear that Nicola and Lucy employed a greater level and different type of emotion management (or surface acting) at the start of a course with unfamiliar coach learners. They also indicated that the emotion management as the day developed altered based on their interaction, relationship and judgement of the learners. The coach educators' perceptions related to the social nature of the interactions in addition to the objectives of course progress which reflects on the coach educator who responded with emotion management according to the perceived nature and degree to which it is required in the given circumstances. The work of Scott and Barnes (2011) has hinted at the varied emotion strategies that individual employees might use and the dynamic nature, but calls for more understanding of the differences both within and between individuals.

The coach educators also revealed that they made strategic choices and considered judgements about when and how to manage their disappointment based upon their relationship with the coach learners:

> I think that would depend on the group, I think I have had a group where I wouldn't do that because I think I would get a look back going 'what' and I just don't think I would get back what I would hope, where as in another group recently, where as if you directed it in a challenge to improve way then that might have been useful. I think it depends on the context of the group and how it is delivered, I don't think I would, I don't know. You don't have long with the group to do that so if you have not got that relationship with them they might not take it very well. (Lucy)

> If I knew someone a bit better I would display disappointment maybe because they would know my intentions behind it and they would know my way of delivering and they would understand my way of interacting so that when I say that, they would know it is coming from a good place to push them a bit further because they will know that I see something in them that they might not see in themselves. If you do that with a stranger, it can be a bit like, well hang on a minute, I don't know how they would take it, I think if I was on a course where there was somebody on there that I knew and I saw them delivering something and I thought well actually you could do better than that, then yeah I might say, I think this is great but I think you can build on it, have you thought about this, this and this, maybe but if it was someone else I maybe wouldn't go down the disappointment route but I would still maybe go, that's good but have you thought about doing this and I have done this previously because I think that is my job, to challenge the ones that you think you can. You want them all to get on a certain level but then I think there are some that you could push a bit more, it is how you say it, I wouldn't class that as disappointment, I don't know what I would class it. (Nicola)

> Yeah, I think that's it, because you don't know how what you're saying comes across and although you might mean it with good intention, you might not say it in the right way and if they are working to what they deem as an assessment, because they don't see past the assessment on the course, they see the course, if they get that disappointment reaction off the tutor it could heighten their anxiety and then I just think it could either build them or not cos I think that is then quite risky if you don't know a person, but if you do it through a feedback process it is a bit more constructive it's a bit more complex. (Katie)

In this chapter I identify a number of intra-emotion management strategies that coach educators adopt in their enactment of the display rules in the pedagogical delivery of coach education courses. The deployment of surface and deep acting strategies provides further insights into their previously indicated use in coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019) and sports coaching (Nelson et al.,

2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Potrac et al., 2017). Additionally, I believe that understanding in this area is then extended via theoretically novel use of Bolton's (2005) framework on emotion management and offers an original contribution to understanding emotion management of coach educators. The chapter also introduces the concept of authentic emotion management in coach education and initial exploration into the context in which it is employed. Finally, the identification of emotion management as dynamic, temporal and relational in nature I believe makes an original contribution to existing sports coaching and coach education literature on emotion.

Chapter 7: They didn't just manage their own but others' emotions too

7.1. Introduction

The literature on emotion management has primarily paid attention to the management of one's own emotions to date in coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019) and the wider coaching literature (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Magill et al., 2017). Whilst this provides a useful starting point from which to explore the emotion management at play in the role of the coach educator, it was also limiting because there has been no focused consideration of the management of others' emotions to date in any coaching context. Through my own reflexive writing and upon analysis of the interviews with the coach educators, it became apparent that there were instances when the coach educators and I managed others' emotions. The works of Thoits (1984; 1986) Denzin (1984) and Foucault (1977) will be deployed to examine the interpersonal management of emotion. This section intends to explore the approaches by the coach educators to manage not only the learners' emotions, but those of other coach educators.

7.2. Managing coach learners' emotions

The coach educators often adopted emotion management strategies towards the coach learners, and more infrequently other coach educators, to manage the emotions experienced or displayed respectively. This approach entailed inter-personal emotion management (Thoits, 1986; 2004), where emotional labour is used to manage or influence client or customer emotions. Here the management of others' emotions, in this case that of the coach learners by the coach educators, could be understood in relation to Thoits (1984) who argued that emotions are composed of physiological sensations, expressive gestures and feeling interpretations (or emotional labels) associated with situational cues and that each component can be manipulated to alter or control emotional reactions. The coach educators described

how when they were aware of the coach learners experiencing negative emotions, they tried to manage their emotions towards a positive by employing praise and sharing happiness. As Lucy and Nicola noted:

> Maybe just a little bit more focused attention towards them, so a little bit more one on one, maybe kind of sitting with them, helping them like talk through some paperwork or help them understand a little bit. Or maybe just kind of like build up their confidence, like give them a bit more praise and I feel as if that's what they respond well to…I'd smile and say like look well done, or I'm quite proud of you, erm and then I'd kind of turn it back and say how do you feel now you can do it and kind of big them up a little bit like that, maybe you can go for the next course now or something like that. I just wanted to make her feel a lot better, make her feel, like walk away feeling that she was capable. That she might be motivated and like do the next course, not walk away kinda being put off cos I think that is quite easy to do. Cos tutoring or going on courses you're exposing yourself really in front of people you don't even really know.

In a similar way, Nicola tried to manage the nerves of a coach learner on a course:

> I think the last course that I did, there was a lady that came and she was quite quiet, she was a netballer but going into coaching was unfamiliar territory for her, she was quite nervous kind of about everything and just kind of working with her, making sure that she could take part in certain things because there were some elements of the practical that she couldn't do, trying to get her involved in a different way and challenging her from a coaching perspective when she couldn't do the practical bits, giving her different jobs and then yeah, she came on the assessment day and I don't think she ate all day either bless her, she was really nervous, but she passed and yeah she was really happy afterwards and they had made a little group of friends on the course and had a photo together at the end. Yeah that was nice, she had come in really nervous to unfamiliar territory and ended up walking away happy and with a really positive experience.

Upon follow up as to what actions she took, Nicola elaborated:

> I think I displayed it, I can be quite animated at times, I think if someone has done something well I like to make sure that they recognise it, rather than just recognising areas to work on, it's good to recognise that they have done that and know that we are, like I think everyone is human so it's good when they see that someone else is smiling and you know, is happy for you, you think Oh I have done a good job. It's nice when that happens, it's nice when you know that you have helped them get from where they were, even if it's just that little bit of confidence which is more than what they came with, yeah, that's why I like tutoring.

This emotion management was primarily used to alter the undesirable emotions of nerves and worry and boost the confidence of the learners so that they felt happier in the situation and their experience on the course. Of particular use here is Thoits' (1986; 2011) conceptualisation of active coping assistance which involved the alteration, removal or control of emotions linked to a situation or demands through "active participation of significant others in an individual's stress management efforts" (Thoits 1986: 417). It can be achieved via any one or combination of helping the person to change or manage the situation (instrumental support), assisting to change the meaning of the situation (informational support), or aid in improving the (usually) negative emotional reaction to the situation (emotional support) (Thoits, 1986). The extracts above highlighted how the coach educators offered emotional support (Thoits, 1986) to the coach learners and managed their emotion away from a negative reaction. Adding to her conceptualisation of active coping assistance, Thoits (2011) indicated that support, guidance and encouragement when supplied by secondary group members (e.g., peers, co-workers, supervisors and instructors) would be more effective in assisting the individual in comparison to primary group members. Of particular importance here are the similar others which the coach educators and coach learners fall within and would be positioned to be effective in influencing others.

The coach educators also employed inter-personal emotion management when coach learners were upset on a course. For example, Lucy referred to managing a learner when they were upset following feedback on a micro-coaching session:

> I just kind of said like, you know you've done all these things well, this is what we have pulled up on but tell me how you would improve it or tell me how you would change it, then from that she has gone oh well, I'd do this, this and this and I've gone exactly well done. Like so you do know how to do it so that's all you need to do in the next session. Then kind of made that thing that's she's obsessing over and seems huge to her seem really minor and then go oh yeah, I don't know what I was worrying about actually. I wanted to just build her confidence and make her realise that she can do it I suppose and go away feeling happy and like she wants to come back.

In this instance the coach educator provided informational support (Thoits, 1986) through feedback in the form of facts and highlighted personal achievement to the coach learner when they became upset in relation to assessment to try and change the meaning of the situation. From reflection upon my own experiences of encounters with coach learners who were anxious or upset, I could relate to the other coach educators approaches to attempting to manage the coach learners' emotions as my autoethnographic account highlighted an instance where I had employed a mixture of both emotional support and informational support (Thoits, 1986) to alter the coach learner's negative emotional reaction and provided feedback to alter the meaning of the situation. As I recalled:

> Jane discreetly let me know that her friend Michelle was extremely panicked and nervous and considering not returning for day two part way through day one. I deliberately positioned myself so that she would be in my group for the feedback as her next micro-coaching session drew to an end. I strolled over to the group, I knew I had to trivialise how enormous this task might seem to her, I could see her panic as she stared at me wide eyed and tugged at the ends of her sleeves, she wasn't from a netballing background and I could understand how intimidated she might be by some of those that were, but in fact she was better equipped and better at delivering than those who were all kitted out in the trademark netball asics, club kit and clearly in love with the sport. "I have just watched you deliver and you have such an easy and supportive coaching nature that I think some of the others could learn from you Michelle, you know the best netballers don't always make the best coaches." I could see her relax a little. "I only coach a small team of primary school children and I have only been doing it a few weeks, so I feel a little out of my depth" Jane explained. "It's normal to feel that way, particularly when we are asking you to coach adults and you want to work with children, but just know that everyone will support you when you coach, in fact they will be far more obedient and quieter than any seven year olds you come across." She smiled. Before they left Jane let me know they would both be returning next week, and Jane came across to say thank you for the first day and although it had been challenging that she felt more comfortable and capable than she had earlier in the day, see you for day two I replied.

At other points in the delivery of a course, the coach educators explained that they empathised with how the coach learners may potentially be emotionally experiencing the course through reflections upon their own experiences on similar

courses. This involved emotional understanding (Denzin, 1984) from the coach educators' undertaking "an intersubjective process requiring that one person enter into the field of experience of another and experience for herself the same or similar experiences experienced by another" (Denzin, 1984: 137). Through experiencing negative emotions in their own attendance at coach education and wider courses, the coach educators were able to draw upon these to appreciate and anticipate the potential emotions of nerves, boredom or anxiety that the coach learners may be experiencing and attempted to manage their behaviours and emotional displays to shape the emotions of the coach learners.

The coach educators developed an emotional understanding via vicarious emotional reflection, where the coach educators could empathise with the specific situation that the coach learners found themselves in on the course (Denzin, 1984). As Lucy, Nicola and Olivia explained:

> I think, well its important to get more coaches, but I think, I think I've probably experienced like going to something, having a really bad experience where the course leader was flat and not very enthusiastic or interested in me and then not doing it again and it makes you feel a bit rubbish and you know, so I think, well I don't really want to inflict that on someone else and I don't want to be a scary teacher, I want to be liked when I go, not freak people out, so I think it's important just for me personally more than anyone that I'm like that. (Lucy)

> Yeah, just being approachable, whatever that might look like, whether it being sat at the back of the class and saying hi are you alright or bringing chocolates or sweets in and saying here have a sweet, don't be nervous. I just think, I think you have got to put yourself in their shoes, I mean I have gone through both courses myself, so, a lot of them don't know anyone else there, a lot of them might not have come from a coaching background if they are doing their level one, a lot of them might be there because they have got to be there, some might be there because they want to be there but it's already a daunting experience for them walking through the door. A lot of the stuff we get is that this is really out of my comfort zone, so I think if that was me I would want someone that maybe I could talk to them, I would want someone that was smiley, I would want someone that was positive about what they were doing so it made me feel positive about what I was doing, so maybe it is a bit of a strategy but I would like to think that, that is also just my personality. (Nicola)

> I know when I'm not in my own region it's a bit harder because I don't see the coaches but most of the time they give you honest feedback if they haven't enjoyed it but the thing is though that we make it so that they do

> enjoy it, because I put myself in the learners position, if you're sitting in a class all day, it's boring, it's freezing, you know I take tea and coffee and stuff like that so they can have a cup of tea, I couldn't last without a cup of tea. So you know they say things like, thanks for bringing the tea along that was a great idea to keep us going, so I think I put myself in their position and if it, if I think it's boring, it's boring for them and you just have to keep doing different things and learning, so saying when I have coached x, y and z, they have done this and they have done that, so they go Oh, they listen to what you are saying so it's more relevant, they are thinking she has actually coached at a high level, she knows what she is talking about. Well I hope I do anyway (laughs). (Olivia)

The coach educators demonstrated an ability to reflect upon their own previous experiences and place themselves in the position of the coach learner. In doing so they not only recounted negative emotions that they wanted to avoid, but also perceived what emotions they would want someone to display in that situation as well as and engaged in actions and emotional displays to shape the coach learners' emotions.

The coach educators also placed themselves in the situation of the learner when they displayed empathy to the coach learner's situation to manage their emotional response. Offering emotional support by placing themselves in the role of the distressed person and understanding and relating to the emotional and practical concerns of the situation was critical to this process (Thoits, 2011). On occasions where a coach learner became upset or annoyed, they offered empathy to limit the upset the coach learner experienced. As Lucy recalled in response to a coach learner who was upset:

> I think like once when you're doing the micro-coaching sections and you provide feedback and then they get a bit upset, I've had that before where I've, they're usually young, I think one of them was like a young girl actually and I think I had provided some feedback, nothing, it wasn't like rude or like, it was just feedback and she had gone away and got upset like, I can't do this oooorrrr, well you can do it and this is the environment to be wrong, and so…yeah, I did feel a bit bad but it was delivered in the right way. It wasn't that I made her feel small or that it was done in a group situation, it was done to her, there was positives and negatives, it was just that she had obviously got a bit frustrated and taken it personally but you can't be responsible for how someone, if its delivered in a nice way, how

> someone's is going to react, like everyone reacts in a different way…So I just pulled out the positives and said "look there's loads of positives that you have done and listed them and said look, these are really minor things and you can do it, tell me HOW you can do it" and made her write it all down and said right, go away and practice, you do know your stuff it's just these are tiny little bits and from that she seemed to be a bit better. I just said to her "like we have all been in that situation where you have had some feedback and you think Ugh, I just wanna be good at this, why am I not good." Yeah, it's the nature of the course isn't it, you're there to learn, not to be perfect, otherwise why would you be there. (Lucy)

Olivia and Nicola also conveyed this when problems occurred on courses:

> I apologise to them, yeah and hopefully that they understand that it is not necessarily my fault so that they don't take it out on me but then I say well I apologise on England Netball's behalf because then England Netball are not going to get loads of phone calls complaining, I think it just puts them at ease and then they think, aw well Olivia is trying her best to solve this problem, it's not her and it just settles people a bit. (Olivia)

> I think if you go on a course and you are trying to progress yourself and if you feel you have got that support and you know, someone is interested in you and they are listening to you then actually it just, even if it just puts you a fraction at ease, it's a fraction more that you were so, yeah definitely. (Nicola)

These displays of empathetic understanding provided a safe environment for the distressed individual by "enabling ventilation and validating feelings and concerns a similar other is "there" emotionally for the distressed individual, reducing his or her physiological arousal directly and indirectly bolstering his or her possibly weakened self-regard" (Thoits, 2011: 154).

Despite often working to allay and alter fear, nerves and anxiety, the coach educators illuminated how they deliberately acted to elicit a negative emotional response from a coach learner. This highlighted an antithetic (Ward and McMurray, 2016) approach to emotion management which have been employed in the work of bill collectors (Hochschild, 1983) where the intention was to regularly instil fear, surprise or intimidation among workers. The coach educators' antithetic emotion management was adopted in a much more nuanced, selective and infrequent way with an intended positive outcome. As Nicola and Olivia noted:

> I think in a situation where I wasn't worried about the candidate's delivery it was the portfolio and there was literally only so many times that I can probe you and I think it went from being oh have you thought about this to right so you really need to think a bit more or you're not going to make it through this and she opened up a bit more that it wasn't her sport and then gave it more, I did it with good intentions to get her to a pass standard… By just changing my tone and how I phrased it I had put her under pressure and made her worried enough about perhaps not passing the course that she did engage more and upped her effort and actually fully filled out the portfolio. From that she successfully completed the course which was good for her and for me too.
>
> I think that to get the learner to realise that they have done something wrong or they need to do something or haven't done something that you needed them to do I would purposely be negative or show frustration and I think that they would listen to you and that they would do it as best they could but also they could have questions from it and say right well I don't really understand what you mean so from there that's why you don't know how to do it because you don't know how to do it or you weren't listening so from there I think it becomes a better situation. (Olivia)

I could relate to Nicola's approach when I had purposefully attempted to evoke a less than positive emotional response from a coach learner who had been particularly difficult and uninterested in the assessment and the content of the course which I wanted her to pass. The "controlling and managing our feeling in this way can put a temporary stop to the 'easiness' of social interactions to make things difficult, awkward and demanding" (Ward and McMurray, 2016: 15). As my autoethnographic account highlighted:

> For 15 minutes I had observed this unenthusiastic and ill-informed coaching session. I felt bored to tears and the participants looked it too. I ground my teeth in annoyance and frustration, it was as if this girl hadn't even been here for the last two days, the plan held no resemblance to what I had just watched and I looked at the blanks on my assessment check list, struggling to find many of the elements being met, what a waste I thought as Sam concluded the session and joined me to reflect on her session. Slumped next to me on the bench with her arms defiantly crossed I became even more annoyed as she answered each of my questions perfectly in a flat and irritated manner, she clearly couldn't care less. I wanted a reaction, I wanted her to care, "not many people fail this course I began but you are borderline" her face dropped and I felt a satisfaction at the panic as she started to point to her plan and fumble through her paperwork. "your lack of effort in the actual coaching session was poor, there was limited evidence to go on and that makes this difficult" I continued. So, she does care I thought…after a further five minutes of anxious and stumbled through explanations I interrupted her, "you need

> to add more detail like you have just explained to me to your paperwork and you will have JUST passed."

This demonstrated the choice for the coach educator to manage emotion to draw a negative emotional response from a learner for whom there was expected to be a longer-term benefit.

7.3. Managing coach educators' emotions

In certain situations, the coach educators not only managed the emotions of the coach learners but the other coach educators' emotions. The intervening emotion management of the other coach educator related to situations where they were displaying emotions towards the coach learners that the other coach educator perceived as unacceptable and, in effect, was breaking the display rules that were conveyed in chapter four. These actions by the coach educators can be understood within the concept of interpersonal management which "is an attempt to bring not one's own emotions but *others'* emotions in line with existing feeling or display rules" (Lively and Weed, 2014: 203). It could also be suggested that reciprocal emotion management occurred where the emotions of a similar other are managed for their and your benefit to maintain good relationships with the learners and protect our employment by limiting the negative consequences and potential risk of complaints (Lively, 2000). It would also be expected that there would be reciprocity if the situation was reversed. This occurred primarily when a fellow coach educator displayed anger:

> I have witnessed a tutor speaking inappropriately to a learner, in like headteacher mode and I have had to have a word because it is not appropriate due to the type of learners that they are, they are older, they don't really need to be spoken to like that. She was getting quite angry because somebody wasn't doing what she had asked them to do. She was starting to be a bit patronising and stuff so she did get angry but angry is not gonna solve it, the person didn't understand what she was trying to do so like her getting angry made her not want to do it anyway and then she started to get angry and then other people started looking and like oh what's happening here. (Olivia)

When asked to expand on the situation, Olivia said:

> Erm, I had to have a word with the tutor afterwards because at the time I didn't know what it was about, I couldn't have walked over and gone what's going on here? I sort of brought everybody in and just continued with my bit what I was doing and then afterwards I spoke to the tutor and then I also went and spoke to the learner and just found out what was going on, erm, it was this person who was the tutor who was an older lady and was a teacher and was quite you know, this is the way you do it and wasn't very flexible, and doesn't tutor any more for England Netball but just sort of rubbed people up the wrong way so it was a case of trying to speak to the candidate and say you know I do apologise if you took it the wrong way and discuss whatever the issue was with the person to calm her down and then also which, I don't really like conflict but if in a situation it has to be sorted out I'll sort it out so then I had to go and speak to the tutor as well and say you know we need to get to know the people on the course and you know we can't be speaking to people like that.

Nicola echoed Olivia's approach about how she would expect someone would intervene if she displayed anger to the coach learners:

> Kind of like diffuse the situation maybe and maybe flip it so that it was constructive feedback rather than like anger, I suppose if that was me and a co-tutor was getting really angry I would look to step in and say have you thought about this and kind of flip and re-shape what they are trying to say in a more calm way.

The accounts of managing the coach educator you were working alongside resonated with one of my own reflections. There was an occasion when I found myself intervening in a situation when another coach educator was displaying anger towards a group of coach learners.

> The coach learners finished delivering the warm-ups and gathered round looking expectantly at Melissa and I. As I opened my mouth to speak Melissa got there first, her harsh tone startled me. "It's just not good enough, lots of you are still wearing jewellery," as she waved her hands directly at the offending coach learners, "the person coaching needs to actually check at the start that it is removed and when you are asked to remove it, you actually need to take it off!" she ranted. "If you do that on assessment day you will cause someone to fail, you need to sort yourselves out." The coach learners shuffled uncomfortably in front of her, one or two folded their arms and another began to glare back. Crikey, I shuffled on the spot uncomfortably, embarrassed and aware of the slightly hostile atmosphere building around us. Whilst I agreed with the point, I could feel myself wincing inside at the bluntness and harshness of her

> words. I hurriedly cut in, "Melissa, why don't you go and put the warm-up principles sheet up on the wall and then the group can check it during the break" hoping to diffuse the situation. I needed to rescue the situation and save Melissa from escalating this point into a bigger issue than it actually was. In a calm tone I explained the importance of ensuring everyone was safe and avoiding injury by removing jewellery, hoping it would plaster over Melissa's outburst and rectify the tone and atmosphere that was developing. We were only halfway into day one and I was concerned that we were going to lose the learners. Melissa had gone over the top with her verbal barrage, they were only learning. I didn't want to make the course any harder or for there to be complaints regarding her or me for that matter to Head Office on Monday. I'd heard of two other coach educators whose work opportunities had diminished following complaints from learners and I didn't want that for me or Melissa.

Managing the emotional performance of the other coach educator in line with the display rule of not displaying anger to the learners represents a power dynamic in the relationship between the coach educators. It also reveals how the lead tutor adopts the responsibility to reinforce and control the enactment of emotional displays according to the display rules. Foucault (1983: 221) defined power as a relationship whereby the actions of some help to guide or direct "the possible field of action of others". Here, the acts of management of the other coach educator's emotions by the lead coach educator could be understood via Foucault's (1977) conceptualisation of power as relational, involving a set of actions upon other actions. It could be understood that assuming the role of the lead coach educator places upon them a perception of responsibility for their fellow coach educators' emotional displays and subsequently they act to attempt to shape and control their emotional displays when they are breaking the display rules from Chapter Four.

Drawing further upon Foucault's (1995) work of disciplinary techniques and technologies of power, which propose individuals operate in terms of a detailed structuring of space, time and relations through hierarchical observation and normalising judgements, the individual uses to conduct his or her own conduct. It is arguable that disciplinary control of the emotions is enforced by the emotion that the coach educators are permitted to display and this internalisation and self-regulation

is reflective of the discourses and regimes of power and knowledge that are at play (Rose, 1998) in coach educators' work and associated emotional display. Not only does this offer a deeper insight into relations of power, it also illustrates how coach educators and learners function as part of a panoptic mechanism: as "a way of making power relations function in a function, and of making a function through these power relations" (Foucault, 1995: 207). Conceptualised in this way, coach educators and learners all work as a visible but unknown force in maintaining the production of specific emotional displays by the coach educators that are distantly guided by the organisation. These findings echo mainstream educational research that has examined the discursive and power ridden influences on teachers' emotional displays. In particular, Zembylas' (2002) genealogy exposed how science teachers' emotions were influenced by social and power relations values in the school. The emotional rules and the expression of certain emotions were shaped by constraints, possibilities and conventions of the school in relation to political and institutional factors and existing interpersonal relationships (Zembylas, 2002). A variety of cultural, social, political and institutional factors influenced her experiences and ultimately produced the discourse around the expression of her emotions.

This chapter offers new knowledge to the sociology of sport regarding the inter-emotion management strategies of coach educators. It responds to calls to provide further insight into how not only emotion of the self are managed, but also the strategies involved in the management of others' emotions (Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). It extends understanding of emotion management beyond the extant literature on intra-emotion management in coaching (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Magill et al., 2017) and coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019) by identifying the strategies of coach educators in the emotion management of others. It offers novel insights into the ways that coach

educators manage the emotions of both coach learners and other coach educators and highlights the contextual and relational nature of these strategies.

Chapter 8: Motivations, benefits and costs of emotion management

8.1. Introduction

This chapter explores why coach educators attempt to manage their emotions before unpacking the benefits and costs associated with emotion management. The chapter represents the breaking of new ground in the coaching literature, since to date no specific consideration of the motivations, benefits and costs in this area has been undertaken and consequently theoretical and empirical understanding of why coach educators engage in emotion management remains limited.

8.2. There's more than one reason for emotion management

It was clear that the coach educators employed a range of emotion management strategies, as presented in Chapters Six and Seven, but there was also a need to understand why coach educators employed emotion management. There is limited theoretical and research work addressing why employees manage their emotions (Bolton, 2005; Glaso, Ekerholt, Barman and Einarsen, 2006; von Gilsa et al., 2014). Initial research exploring the emotional experiences of coaches has concluded that engagement in emotion management was intended to achieve desired objectives (Nelson et al., 2013), avoid repercussions (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016), and for coach educators, to ensure they portrayed themselves in a professional and role-related way (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). However, to date there has been no considered focus by coaching scholars as to the specific and numerous underlying motives for engagement in emotion management by coach educators.

Bolton's (2005) conceptualisation of emotion management offers a typology which considers the motivations for emotion management beyond the commercial motives that Hochschild's (1983) pioneering study proposed. This provided a useful

starting point for considering the motivations behind the various emotion management strategies coach educators employed. Without the motives aligned with emotion management, the impression that the employee happily and complicity adheres to display rules is conveyed (Bolton, 2005). However, "without an attempt to understand the motivations that lie behind employees' performances only a 'depthless' picture of working life emerges" (Bolton, 2005: 3). Bolton (2005) proposed that motives for emotion management can be varied and multiple and attached to instrumental, altruistic, status, ontological, security and gift reasons. Several motives for engaging in emotion management were identified from the interviews with the coach educators and my own autoethnographic accounts.

8.2.1. Emotion management to get the learners through the course

One reason for coach educators' engagement in emotion management was to motivate and influence the coach learner. The coach educators, including myself, recognised that emotion management was adopted to engage learners and enable them to pass the course. Drawing upon Bolton's (2005) typology, the coach educators could be considered as instrumentally motivated in this sense. Whilst not explicitly a product of market demand, in the case of coach education courses instrumental motivation can be linked with the emotional labour process where quantifiable and measurable targets are commonly equated with achievement (Bolton, 2005). In the case of the coach educators, the key target is for learners to pass the course. As Lucy, Nicola and Katie illustrated:

> If I didn't manage my emotions I just think like the candidates wouldn't warm towards you and then I think it would make for like a very long weekend, they might not get out as much of the course as they should, they might be fearful to come and talk you and ask further questions, they might disengage, they might not pass, the pass rate might drop so it might just snowball from there. (Lucy)
>
> I think that you consciously recognise how you are feeling but you just know that it is not acceptable to display it, and I think it is context

> dependent and learners and everything, if you're, if something is going wrong and it is their assessment then you would make a real effort to suppress them because you don't want them to have a knock on effect to them passing or for them to be stressing… some of them might be really keen to learn and others might have been put on it because they have to do it and I think if you're not and they disengage, I think if they disengage it is then harder to get the learning out of them and it kind of just plateaus. (Nicola)

> You don't want to show it to the learners those negative emotions, cos I mean with kids if you show that they are going to wind you up even more and maybe with some adult learners they will do the same. So you want to show them that you can cope with it and keep that flat line if you like by keeping them in check in order to get them to take part and pass the course. (Katie)

There was a large overlap between my own and other coach educators' motives for emotion management. Ultimately, I needed to get the coach learners to subscribe to and engage with the course and the best way of doing this was to get them and keep them onside. These approaches would range from ensuring that they were involved and enjoying the course, but there were times when I employed emotion management to resolve problems when they occurred for the same purpose. As the example below illustrated:

> I arrived for day 2 feeling upbeat and anticipated a straightforward day ahead, the coach learners had been fantastic on day one of the course, offering lots of ideas, interacting and supporting each other as they learnt with an ease and enthusiasm that I had not had on recent courses and were happy. They had grasped the concepts for progressing sessions and the components of effective coaching on Day 1 and I felt confident that they would have no problems with the assessment, making it an enjoyable day for me until I stepped into the sports hall. There was a sudden drop in temperature as I moved from the warm corridor to the icy air that hit me as I moved round the now freezer like sports hall, it hadn't been like this on day one, it was only then the facility manager informed me that the heating system was broken and unlikely to be fixed that day. Great! the coach learners are not going to like it this afternoon being in here for six hours and neither am I, so much for an easy day. As the learners filtered in and started to prepare for the assessment several commented on how cold it was and one or two began to question whether they should be working in these conditions and complained about the idea of being in there all afternoon for assessments and that they were cold. Silently I was thinking just get on with it, you would coach outside in conditions worse than this but that wouldn't resolve the problem or help in them completing the course and leaving happy. Worried that some of them might refuse to complete the assessment or affect each other's assessments I had no

> alternative but to smile and say that it was not that bad as they would be active and warm. I smiled and worked hard to place a positive angle on it, being upbeat about the situation as I hypocritically stood there in coat and hat shivering whilst I smiled and enthused about their coaching performance. I stood there watching assessment after assessment. I did the best I could to encourage them to pick up the pace in their sessions to keep each other warm. I cheerfully scheduled breaks to take them out of the cold to get warm in the hope that they would not only deliver their own sessions to the best of their ability, applying what they had learnt from the course in order to pass and also take part in each other's sessions with full commitment and energy rather than the situation affect the course, their experience and achievements.

These extracts highlight the strategic reasons that the coach educators used emotion management and were similar to the motives revealed in leader-subordinate interactions where emotions were managed strategically to achieve or avoid something (Glasø et al., 2006). Similarly for the achievement of teaching outcomes, teachers needed to perform emotional labour (Isenbarger and Zembylas, 2006) and that of teachers and coaches to achieve organisational goals (Lee, Chelladurai and Kim, 2015).

The managing of emotions to adhere to the display rules and meet the expectations of the customer can lead to smoother interactions and subsequently enhance the belief that tasks can be fulfilled, and overall effectiveness increased (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993). The benefits are double-edged in terms of the coach learner and educator. As Oliva and Katie noted:

> I think the benefits of not breaking the rules is that from the learner's perspective are that the course was positive and it ran smoothly and that candidates were non the wiser of any problems. (Olivia)

> Because I'm not upsetting the learner, I don't want to upset them, you want them to have a positive frame of mind to say well yeah ok I accept what you are saying and I'll improve it. It's like when you ask them and we say to them when they are giving feedback, questioning, you want the learners to think and feedback on their own performance and you can tie it in with a message that you are giving about something negative that you have seen, like you know when you are doing the shooting um, Ok so your standing shooting was fine, what did you notice about when you stepped forward to shoot and then hopefully you get a Oh I wasn't balanced before I shot and then you say right how can you improve that and they say take a second to balance first before I shoot, that's it. That

> is all giving feedback is really, it's getting them to realise and put it right themselves, not you telling them and saying Oh for heaven's sake, balance before you shoot, which is the same message but given a different way, it makes them and me happier doing it that way. (Katie)

An associated gain of this is that, as the extracts above highlighted, the coach educators' compliance with display rules facilitated task accomplishment (if the target of the display perceived it to be authentic) (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989). The coach educators' accounts highlighted benefits to following the display rules which included helping the coach learners to learn, setting the tone for positive interactions on the course, and inciting effort from the coach learners so that they engaged with and successfully completed, the course.

For the coach educators there was a consistent understanding that breaking the display rules and not managing emotions would impact negatively upon their interactions with coach learners and which would limit learning. As highlighted by Katie and Nicola, it was felt that the coach learners would not listen to them or engage with the course and learn if the rules were broken:

> You would try not to go against the display rules because you want them to be enthused and your not going to do that if you are coming across as bored out of your skin are you? Same as angry really, too extreme then. I mean it could be, oh we have got to do defending now but aww, oh great, defending now, it's not my favourite but we will see what we can do because you want to set the tone. If boredom creeps in you are not going to have happy learners and they are not going to learn from you and you might as well pack your bag and go home really. You have got to be, you have got to show enthusiasm right throughout the course, if you start showing the wrong emotions then they won't learn as effectively and they won't respond as effectively. So you have got to keep them hooked otherwise it might take them a little bit out of the learning environment. (Katie)

> Because nobody wants to spend the day with a grumpy person do they, you know, again, same as angry I think. It's professionalism, you can't sit there in your corner moaning about things, it's like right the computer is not working you have just got to get on with it, like have a moan to yourself on the way home after. I just think, I dunno, I just think I wouldn't listen to a grumpy tutor because I wouldn't feel inspired, I wouldn't feel enthused I'd just be like I'm counting down to go home. (Nicola)

The coach educators identified other reasons for managing their emotions, suggesting that their motivations were far from singular and encompassed a greater level of complexity. Another instrumental based motive of a more commercial nature (Bolton, 2005) identified in the interviews was that they managed their emotions to give the coach learners' what they had paid for. Aligned with this was the coach educators' awareness of the need to manage emotion to produce customer contentment to secure return and repeat business. The reasons for emotion management undertaken by the coach educators are comparable to service industry employees in the pursuit of customer satisfaction (Bolton, 2005: Tsai, 2009) and favourable judgements of service quality (Pugh, 2001). As Nicola, Lucy and Olivia illuminated:

> I suppose for them like with level one you ultimately want them to go on and do their level two so if you can help them manage their emotions and get through it and do well and get some feedback then they might go on to consider my level 2 as that wasn't as bad as I thought it would be. Even if they just did it for the experience, they might then go on to help out in a session then I think that is a good benefit and job done. (Nicola)
>
> I think there's like, there's a benefit for me kinda sharing the way I feel with her in terms of making, it might like make her say to other people, go and do it, actually it's quite good. Or if she sees me at like another course she might feel a bit more confident or that confidence might be at the level she left the previous course, because she's seen me. Or she might think these tutors aren't all that bad (laugh) so yeah, hopefully keep her in the system rather than kind of putting her off. (Lucy)

When asked why she wanted to manage her emotions, Lucy responded:

> Erm, because like I said, they have paid a lot of money to be there and it's not for them. Them knowing wouldn't have made it any better for me or for them. If anything they would have probably put a complaint in (laughter). So er there was just no point.
>
> Erm, just through, well I used to work in a supermarket for about ten years so I went on customer service and things like that, obviously I work in a college where you know you do apologise to people for being late or keeping them waiting and things like that, I think it is just a thing that I just know. I haven't had like a customer service course from England Netball, it is just for me, this is what I expect if I was a customer, so if, I wouldn't expect turning up late, like I wouldn't rock up late to the session, I wouldn't

> be unprepared, I wouldn't not know what I was delivering, the technology would work so this is what I would expect as a learner. If it wasn't happening I would expect somebody to be coming up and saying listen, sorry but we are running a bit late because of, or we need to move room because of, is it alright if we do this, you know, have a conversation with the learners cos they are the one's giving their time up and paying a lot of money to be on a course and if it's crap or it's not you know, they walk away and say well I'm not coming back for the next weekend it will effect England Netball's figures cos if they don't pass then they obviously want everyone to go through and pass and reflect positively. (Olivia)

8.2.2. Living up to the role and gaining trust in the learners' eyes

The coach educators explained how following the display rules enabled them to provide the best experience of the course for the coach learners. That experience was framed around the course being enjoyable, inspiring and having a belief in the coach educator. As Lucy and Nicola elaborated:

> I think it's just not, you don't want to show that you don't know what you're talking about. At the end of the day the candidates have paid a lot of money to be there, so they want confidence in the person that is tutoring them knows what they are talking about. I think if you're new to something content wise, I always revise or read up on it anyway, but you're slightly apprehensive anyway but following the display rules means the candidates won't know that and will have a positive experience of the course. (Lucy)

> I think if they have had a positive experience, like I am in my role because I have had positive experiences along the way I have enjoyed what I have done and I thought I really want to go and do that, like I enjoyed going on my coach education courses and I was like I really want to be a tutor, so I went and did my tutoring and now I am like, Oh, I really like how that assessor works with that coach, I want to do that, so I now want to go and do my assessing so I think that my positive experiences have made me want to go and do it…I think that when you first deliver your course you're going to be uncertain, your uncertain of the group you are going to have, you don't know how they are going to interact, I think there is always going to be uncertainty but I think it's not explicitly saying it or making it obvious by sticking to the display rules because if not then I think it puts doubts in the group's mind as to what you are delivering and the experience they are having, um, which obviously you don't want that, you want them to enjoy it and do it again. (Nicola)

These extracts highlighted how following the rules enabled the coach educators to provide learners with a high-quality experience. The evaluation of service quality

involves a comparison of customer expectations with customer perceptions of actual service performance (Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1985).

The conception of providing an experience was not something that I had really considered when addressing the benefits of following the display rules whilst delivering courses. Whilst it was important to me that the coach learners got what they required from the course, and following the display rules helped to achieve that, when I considered why, it was ultimately a part of the bigger picture that related to me and how this would reflect on my work, ability to deliver and reputation. Thinking about the rules, and following them, provided a formula to achieving this. The emphasis on providing a high- experience to ensure that the coach learners kept retuning was something that until now had just not been on my radar, I simply did not view it that way. The benefits for me were more self-referenced and coach learner focused, whereas Nicola held a high awareness of the benefits to the organisation's salient outcomes (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987). Following the display rules had wider organisational benefits: the first related to making a positive impression for the organisation, and the second in terms of securing repeat business. As Nicola emphasised:

> You're the first link, apart from when you go through the booking process, you're their link, one of the first people they will come in to contact that is associated with the governing body so obviously you want to create an experience. For me I think that the expectation would be that you are creating an experience where people want to come back and do more and go and do coaching and want to progress on that journey and for me that is part and parcel of going that extra mile in providing that experience, whether that is expected from someone else I don't know because that is just something that I would do. (Nicola)

> Yeah, I am a big believer in that if they enjoy their courses and feel inspired then they will go out and be more active, if they feel like it is just a tick box process then they will probably go back to their own settings and then how kind of motivated might they be to do more and get involved or change what they do, so I feel like the courses are an opportunity to capture that enjoyment and that inspiration for coaching and I think that is the tutors' role as well as the learning is to have twenty coaches leave inspired to want to go and do more which is at risk if the rules are not followed, it's really hard. (Nicola)

The accounts above highlighted the coach educators' understanding of encore gains where "the emotions conveyed by role occupants also have long-term effects on the organisation" (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987: 30). The longer-term organisational benefits of adhering to the display rules were extending the coach learners' involvement with England Netball and developing coaches further via the coach learners returning to undertake future courses and progress along the coaching pathway.

The coach educators equally considered the management of their emotions as necessary to ensure they were perceived positively and as giving off the right impression of themselves to the coach learners in their pedagogical delivery. This meant conforming to the stated emotion rules (Chapter Four). Lucy demonstrated why it was necessary to employ emotion management thus:

> I don't really know, I have never really thought about it like that, probably I think that I would want them to think positively of me because they have obviously paid to come and that it is a taught thing, I think I would want them to think that it was being delivered to them in a professional way. I don't think I have ever really thought about it that way to be honest. (Lucy)

These points were echoed by Katie:

> I think it is keeping a lid on in terms of the learners because you know, all the time they are the ones who have paid to go on the course. They are the ones who deserve the best I can give them and if I start to get frustrated or angry and start reacting to it, it's going to affect them in a negative way and their view of me.

Nicola also explains that:

> I think, my natural traits are that I don't really like making mistakes, everyone makes mistakes but it doesn't sit well with me, I'm quite a reflective person and that is not always, not always done in a positive way, so I reflect a lot, oh I wish I had done that better, I wish, or I could have done that, rather than drawing on what I did do well. So I was nervous about making a mistake but also that showing it, creating the wrong experience or not, I don't know what word I'm looking for but I was nervous about how the coach learners would feel as well. I suppose that they didn't know what to expect either, so if I had made a mistake they wouldn't have known anyway.

The coach educators often referred to maintaining professionalism as a motive for emotion management. These extracts illuminated how the coach educators' reasons for engaging in emotion management were also driven by status motives and placing "emotional investment into living up to the requirements of professional roles and their associated idealised images" (Bolton, 2005: 95). Coach educators' desire to live up to the role and maintain a professional image by meeting the expectations they believed learners and the organisation had of them led to their employment of emotion management. The coach educators clearly placed importance on meeting others' expectations of them as a professional (Bolton, 2005) otherwise it would question the coach educators' ability to deliver the course. As highlighted Olivia and Lucy remarked:

> If I showed my emotions they probably just wouldn't trust me and might not trust what I was saying and then they have got an assessment at the end of it, so probably think aw I'm not going to pass my assessment if the tutor doesn't know what she is talking about. Then you have got things like internal verifiers as well and you think like, yeah you need to know what your talking about really. Yeah it's about professionalism and also I think I'd hate someone at England Netball to be like Oh Yeah, Oh God yeah Lucy, she's that rubbish tutor. I think I'd rather just, if I was consistently rubbish and I just couldn't seem to get the hang of it and prove myself, I think I would just be like, well, I'll knock it on the head before they do. (Lucy)

> Um, candidates wouldn't listen to you, they wouldn't enjoy the course, they probably wouldn't pass the course, they would, if it is something negative it always gets reported back, if it's positive it's very rare that you hear anything positive from England Netball, it's always if someone has done something wrong… it would come to England Netball and I would be disciplined and I might get the courses taken off me. (Olivia)

The coach educators believed that being perceived positively and as a professional was important for avoiding negative feedback and complaints which could compromise future employment. As all the coach educators explained:

> I think candidates wouldn't have sort of wanted to join in, it would have been a negative atmosphere, they would have probably come up to us

> and complained, you know, how we were reacting and England Netball would have probably had a complaint from some people. (Olivia)

> Um, I think like, I don't think I would probably get employed again because if I looked like I was scared of something then there is not going to be much confidence in me as a coach educator but it is not good for the students either because if I am fearful then they are going to think well what I have I got to be fearful of because if the person that is supposed to know it all is scared then I don't have much of a chance at all because I don't even know it all yet and I am going to be tested on it maybe…Yeah I think it would be fed back to England netball, I don't know how much by the students as I don't know how well they feed stuff back, but definitely by the tutors, I think some tutors might not care but I think others are pretty keen at feeding everything back. So you have got to be pretty careful because I'm sure it would get reported back if my emotions went against those rules we have talked about. (Lucy)

> They would probably discipline us and say that I wouldn't be tutoring any more courses or not ask me to do any more courses. But then I think they would give us the opportunity to explain why but then we normally feed back to them anyway after the course and just say, such and such and these people should have done their level one and that coaches weren't experienced coaches, these aren't coaching and things like that, but within the course you would never sort of show them that emotion you would just sort of deal with it and figure out how to actually cater for everybody in your group and then be pissed off after every one has gone with the other tutor (Laughs). (Olivia)

> Definitely, they would get rid of me or maybe offer further training. I don't know if they even do actually offer further training, I don't know what they do, I think that they would just stop using you without really consulting you. I don't think from my understanding they don't have time to invest in re-training and I don't think they have re-training that I am even aware of. I don't know you could just be dropped. By displaying empathy the benefit is that it keeps them involved and again the whole rapport thing and feel valued so they work hard at the course. (Katie)

The coach educators also held the perception that breaking the rules and not managing their emotions would have wider implications for the coach educator's reputation as well as the organisation, as Lucy explained:

> Breaking the rules and showing different emotions will just stop him or anyone else asking I think and then you know, at the end of the day we have got to try and get people through and pass the course, so for example if I show my anger and everyone is scared to ask me, if they don't understand then everyone will fail and, or not do very well and that doesn't bode very well on me as a tutor or on England Netball as an organisation I suppose.

This ultimately signalled for wider impacts on the reputations of the coach educators and how they were perceived by both the coach learners and the organisation, an aspect raised previously in work exploring coach educators (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019).

8.2.3. Acting professionally (individually and collectively) in the perceptions of the learners'

At other times the coach educators employed emotion management to present a united front between themselves and the other coach educator in front of the coach learners to ensure that they did not witness conflict or disputes stemming from displays of negative emotions of anger or frustration. As Katie explained an instance where she was contradicted by the other coach educator whilst delivering:

> So, I was giving the current message, and the other tutor who was a bit full of her own importance because she was a verifier and assessor countermanded me on that in front of the learners and I said it's not that. It upset me really, it made me look a fool when I knew I was giving the right message. I felt hot inside, you know, disappointed, angry really, but I didn't show that to the learners because it's not their fault.

When asked if she displayed it, she elaborated:

> No, because learners shouldn't be you know, I don't know what the word is but they shouldn't hear that message. If you have got a disagreement or a question or whatever, that is the thing for tutors to discuss. And you know, if it is done in front of learners you know, it then makes them apprehensive and do they know what they are talking about? So I just sort of stepped back and stood there waiting for her to finish. It was difficult actually because the relationship wasn't good with the other tutor. She kept stressing that she was an internal verifier so you know, put me on the back foot really. It wasn't good. I felt that she is checking up on me. It made me feel uncomfortable actually. She kept dropping it in as well and I kept thinking well you may be the internal verifier but on this course your co-tutor, so it was difficult. I think I relinquished some of my lead tutoring was taken away from me. That was the main frustration, it wasn't really the learners it was the other tutor.

In another situation Lucy worked at demonstrating agreeance and support with the other coach educator despite experiencing frustration towards her for prolonging the course delivery beyond its allotted time as she described:

> Probably, when I tutored with a tutor who goes on way past when we should be finishing and you can sense that the whole room wants to leave and you want to leave and you're trying to, I think speed them up and basically they didn't recognise the social cues and I think that was probably the only point when, I wouldn't say I was angry but frustrated and I thought for goodness sake just hurry up. Um, but I didn't say it or verbalise it and I still smiled and agreed with her um, but yeah, I think that was the only instance where I have felt 'Oh my gosh'.

Upon follow up as to whether she displayed it at all, Lucy elaborated:

> Erm not really because she was like the lead tutor and it was Level 2 so it was like in the early days of me doing the Level 2. I didn't really want to kind of disrupt the peace, do you know what I mean, so I didn't really know her well enough to say oh what's all this, but I didn't know the course well enough to be like 'Oh what's all this'. So I didn't really say anything, I just knew that that wasn't in the pack, in the appendices of what we should have had. I just kind of left it, I think if I saw her again and she did it again I'd be like say something to her but I think it is hard tutoring. It's not like when you're in a school or at work, you know those people you've like built that level of rapport to be able to go what are you doing, what's all this. When you don't know someone and you're not maybe 100% sure yourself, for me it was maybe not being comfortable enough to kind of challenge it really cos I was still learning on the job a little bit myself.
>
> Yeah I tidied up the room and packed up um, and what else would I have done, probably moved around a bit more and been a bit more agitated. But I knew I couldn't actually display that or actually say I think we need to stop now. I think that's what I did, emotionally I wouldn't have shown any negative emotion but definitely would have been a bit more fidgety and under my breath be like come on, but I know that is not acceptable to show it. I think it's just an implicit, I'm not sure. I think if I get a bit agitated but in a professional setting I wouldn't do anything or say anything, I'd just get on with it. It depends though, it depends if there is an audience or not, because with tutoring you have obviously got a group of twenty people who are always visible, like if it was just me and my boss at work and I disagreed with something and be like come on we need to wind it in then I would say something because there is no audience and it's just between you two.

Olivia also provided an example of managing the emotions she experienced in relation to a co-tutor who was difficult to work with:

> It would be horrible if you were working with somebody who you didn't get along with and you couldn't talk to them about stuff and how you felt, I think that would be quite hard, I have never had that before. Well, I have had it once, I didn't really know somebody and I'd ask certain things and I wouldn't get anything back in return and I would be like, well I must just be doing it this way then, they would do their thing a certain way and I would be like well no I think you should try it like this as this would work better. There are certain people who I have said in the past I don't want to work with, you're not one of them by the way (Laughs), because they are just so old fashioned in what they do and candidates were saying to me, she has done that wrong, that's not how you do it and I am like I am

> thinking well no it's not but I am not going to say that the other tutor is wrong and I am going to try and spin it and say right maybe have a look at it like this. I would never show a tutor up and say that they are wrong I would just try to say right this is maybe the alternative that you could do so it is quite hard to watch somebody do something wrong and think oh no and then have to change it and try not to slag them off in the process. (Olivia)

The examples of emotion management above suggest that the coach educators managed their own experienced emotions to maintain the delivery of the course and be professional. Therefore, the emotion management undertaken by the coach educators to present a united front between themselves and the other coach educator prioritises the emotional culture of being professional. The work of Zembylas (2005) exploring emotion in teaching highlighted "professionalism" to be a disciplining conception within their notion of a teacher identity and reflected emotion management strategies aligning to the dominant discourse in the school. This exploration of the practice of subjectification in science teaching revealed the way "in which emotions are inextricably bound with certain ways of exercising power and, in turn, with teachers' relations with themselves and others" (Zembylas, 2005: 37). Here the emotion management by the coach educator could be interpreted to be related to their relationship both with the coach educator and the coach learners. A further interpretation could usefully made in consideration of Goffman's (1959) theorising and dramaturgical analysis of workplaces. Here Goffman explains the concept of team performance in terms of which the performers (employees) are linked by a set of shared boundaries which tie them into a routine type of activity that creates a social establishment. Therefore "within the walls of a social establishment we find a team of performers who co-operate to present an audience a given definition of the situation" (Goffman, 1959: 238). In the accounts above within the delivery of the course the coach educators work at managing their emotion to uphold the performance and emotional displays that prevail in line with the rules outlined in Chapter Four. In effect the coach educators are working as a performance team defined as "any set of individuals who cooperate in staging a single routine" (Goffman, 1959: 79). So by

aligning their emotional displays emotion management is undertaken to control the performance. The coach educators' own emotion management to fall in line with the performance and emotional display that should be presented to the coach learners is reflective of dramaturgical circumspection (1959) where the coach educators prioritise the focus of the best environment for the coach learners. There is also a sense of upholding the quality and feel of the course by displaying the appropriate emotions and that they are obliged to do that for the course highlighting also elements of dramaturgical loyalty in their emotion management.

On another level the coach educators' emotion management to present a united front, where they acquiesce the other tutor's actions in acknowledgement of the elevated position of the lead tutor or internal verifier could be understood that the coach educators managed their own emotions based upon their perceived experience and understanding of appropriately expressed emotions according to perceived norms. This Foucault (1988) proposed to be a 'technologies of the self' where an individual experiences, understands and expresses their emotions appropriately based upon an actual or imagined authority. Therefore, the coach educators perceived hierarchical position with their colleague shapes the perception of what emotion can or should be displayed, resulting in the management of their frustration and anger. This finding is in keeping with other exploratory work regarding status of work role and anger where lower status individuals are more likely to inhibit their expressions of anger (Sloan, 2004). Callister, Geddes and Gibson's (2017) findings with alumni business graduates indicated that in their positioning as a subordinate worker, expressions of anger were regulated and that fear of sanctions through being perceived as a troublemaker or unprofessional indicated a limited freedom and lack of emotional privilege to express their anger. Thus, highlighting the impact of both emotion display norms associated with status and the organisational emotion displays at work in the management of the coach educators' anger.

8.2.4. Prioritising the learner through the use of emotion management

The other reasons for emotion management alluded to by the coach educators were also linked to prioritising the learners' needs, experience of the course and, to a certain extent, wellbeing. This could be understood via a further aspect of Bolton's (2005) typology which proposed altruistic-based motives for emotion management, where an individual is "genuinely motivated to care for or serve people in a public service profession" (Bolton, 2005: 95). In these instances, the coach educators engaged in managing their own emotions for the benefit of the coach learner(s), a finding consistent with studies of the work of FE lecturers who demonstrated care and patience to their students' needs despite competing demands (Chowdhry, 2014).

> It's nice when you know that you have helped them get from where they were, even if it's just that little bit of confidence which is more than what they came with, yeah, that's why I like tutoring and managing emotions is important to ensure that can happen. (Katie)

> I don't want people to leave feeling bad after a course, I think it's not a nice way to feel is it, when you have a bad experience, you feel sad or like your self-esteem might be knocked and less enjoyment so I think it's not a nice way to leave someone feeling. So, I can try to control that by managing my emotions and the environment so that even if they leave thinking the course wasn't really for me but the tutor was nice or the group was nice so it's not that bad. (Lucy)

> People coming on the courses are often quite nervous, so I think it is being empathetic to where they are at in their learning journey, so what's their motivation of being on the course, what are they wanting to achieve from it, you know, how are they feeling about it, if you have got somebody who is struggling to take it all in and put it into practice. So, it is just being understanding of that and having the emotional intelligence I suppose to differentiate your approach to the different learners and not leave them behind. Not kind of making them feel bad about themselves if they are not able to keep up because as I said, everyone approaches it at a different rate, the same if you have got someone who is not being challenged enough so yeah, I think it is the emotional intelligence and understanding where you might need to sit down with someone over lunch because they need that extra support and understanding that role and being ok, that's fine, we will just sit down and do it. (Nicola)

The examples above highlight how the coach educators managed emotions based on recipients' needs (Cranford and Miller, 2013), reflecting "a needs based

motivation to build a respectful, working relationship between workers and clients" (Cranford and Miller, 2013: 794). This highlighted the relational service and coach educator's ability to anticipate and adjust their emotion management to the individual coach learner.

8.2.5. Emotion management for self-benefit and personal gain.

The coach educators managed their emotions for their own emotional benefit and for the good of their self. Lucy referred to managing her emotions to build a relationship with the learners and gain enjoyment on the course for herself. She explained:

> I just think it makes my job a bit more enjoyable if I'm liked and I can have a laugh with the candidates, the day goes quicker, I enjoy going back, where as if they're scared of me or fearful of me or they don't, I can't build a rapport with them, it makes for a very long and tedious weekend. I think you gain a greater respect from people if you can show a bit of interest in like their personal life as well, erm and build a relationship that way. I think it's important, like you don't want to be feared when you go into work or into a course, some people do but it's just not my style, I'd rather get enjoyment out of it.

Similarly, Katie alluded to the excitement and enjoyment that she gained through the management of emotions in the delivery of a course:

> Why do I manage my emotions? Well I mean it just makes you feel happy and pleased, it makes you feel that it has all been worthwhile and that what you set out to do you have managed to do. I've done it my way and it has worked, yeah, it confirms what you do and gives you the buzz like we were saying earlier for the next course that comes along you are going along with that buzz. It reinforces why you do it. I've always said, you know I have said on one or two courses, you know, the best thing about doing this course is that one I enjoy doing it and two England Netball pay me as well for enjoying myself, it's great and part of that is managing my emotions so that it feels that way.

Nicola similarly identified the benefits it brought her:

> I feel really enthused by it, I really enjoy it and I come away quite proud that I have done it because yeah it is out of my comfort zone, but I want to do it and I want to get better at it. Part of that is linked to keeping my emotions in check by them matching up to those rules we have talked about. So when I have done one, I come away and I'm like proud of myself that I have done that and that is really satisfying and like on the drive home you are like, yeah, well done you. It is just learning, for me I see it all as like a learning opportunity.

I found my motives reflected self-referenced and personal benefits of pride and satisfaction as I reflected on courses I had delivered and that these were like those of Katie and Nicola:

> It's the end of another course and as I stand on the periphery of the classroom like an outsider looking in, the coach learners are exchanging numbers, making plans to work and meet up outside, taking selfies and generally buzzing about what to do next, I take pride in listening to the enthusiasm in the room, I have helped create that buzz.

Thinking about my motives and holding the interviews with coach educators has helped me recognise that I manage my emotions and that of others to secure positive evaluations from others and ensure future opportunities for work, and because of personal pride. The coach educators managed their emotions to gain personal satisfaction from the outcome too, often in a similar way to how the paralegals did in responding to coping with stressful demands (Lively, 2001), or empowerment and self enhancement via the management of others' emotions (Stenross and Kleinman, 1989; Leidner, 1993).

The empirical research, although limited, has briefly considered the outcomes of failing to follow institutional display rules and revealed varied consequences, including allocation of the least favourable shift patterns for undergraduate staff administrators who did not display the required emotions and received negative feedback (Saunders, 2013). In the context of coach education, Allanson, Potrac and Nelson's (2019) recent work indicated a reduced work allocation for coach educators

not conforming to dominant occupational display rules. As demonstrated in the interview extracts, breaking the display rules risked complaints from the coach learners and subsequently reduced allocation of or opportunities to deliver courses, as Olivia and Lucy described:

> I think candidates wouldn't have sort of wanted to join in, it would have been a negative atmosphere, they would probably have come up to us and complained, you know, how we were reacting and England Netball would have probably had a complaint from some people. (Olivia)
>
> If I came across as fearful that I didn't know my content they might be then like well, why are we paying all this money for someone who's just not capable of standing up in front of us. So yeah, I think it was definitely like a bit of a squirmy few days to not be fearful…Well for me it puts the pressure on to make sure that the learners don't know that I am anxious and worried or not happy, because if they pick up on it they either won't listen or they will go and complain to England Netball which could impact on them choosing me to deliver courses in the future if the learners are complaining about me. (Lucy)

These extracts reveal how an aspect of Thoits' (2004) theorising regarding emotional socialisation could arguably be at play, where there is pressure to conform to the learnt emotional rules and that such conformity is reproduced either via the need to gain social approval and rewards or the motivation to avoid sanctions (Thoits, 2004). The sanction for the coach educators' non-conformity to the display rules was complaints and could be interpreted as a mechanism to monitor, control and discourage the coach educators from breaking the display rules. In considering the coach educators emotional displays, I believe that a prevailing discourse of which emotions to display and hide through implicit governance by England Netball and monitoring by coach learners when rules are broken have shaped and constrained the coach educators' understanding of the emotion display rules. Indeed, it has created a complex web of power relations that socially and culturally promote a prevailing discourse (Zembylas, 2005) that is reflected in the emotion display rules linked to coach educators' course delivery and interactions with learners.

A further understanding of the consequences of breaking the display rules may be gained in relation to poststructuralist theorisation, and particularly Foucault's (1977) conception of governmentality, where specific conditions are regulated and controlled. The coach educators' understanding of the consequences of breaking the display rules suggests an inherent level of emotional governance and power by the coach learners through course evaluations and negative feedback to England Netball who arguably occupay a significant position of power over coach educators that can lead to the normalisation of the display of certain emotions as appropriate and others as not. For example, colleagues breaking display rules and receiving complaints have been allocated reduced amounts of coach education work by the staff on the workforce team. Whilst not explicitly stated, it could be suggested that adherence to the display rules is governed primarily by the coach learners who monitor the emotional displays of the coach educators and influence the "normalised" behaviour that we feel obliged to display. This governance extended to the governing body as it was also understood by the coach educators that there would be wider consequences of receiving negative feedback in terms of future opportunities of employment and course delivery if they break the display rules. As Olivia and Katie explained:

> They would probably discipline us and say that I wouldn't be tutoring any more courses or not ask me to do any more courses. But then I think they would give us the opportunity to explain why but then we normally feedback to them anyway after the course and just say, such and such and these people should have done their level one and that coaches weren't experienced coaches, these aren't coaching and things like that. (Olivia)
>
> If I go against the rules and for example am angry towards a learner, there's a chance that that stays with them for the whole course and could result in them feeding back negatively on evaluation forms or even to head office. I don't want that, I enjoy delivering the courses and don't want the workforce manager doubting me or being hesitant to allocate me courses in the future. (Katie)

My experiences and understandings of the consequences of breaking the rules completely aligned with those presented by the other coach educators. Whilst I had

always held the same beliefs regarding the potential risks of complaints and decreased allocation of work, what I had not considered was the degree to which the coach learners were in a position of power and effectively being used as a tool for constant monitoring. The conceptualisation of the discourse has made me aware of how often I privilege the discourse over my own individual emotions and led me to question "Do I always need to stick to the rules?" The concept of pushing the boundary to see what happens is alluring, but I do not know if I want to take that risk, clearly as my account suggests, I'm not there yet! Perhaps I need to try it out in a safer environment first where the consequence is not so great. Therefore, I believe it is the expectation of appropriate emotion behaviour displays and is what colleagues and coach learners will evaluate the coach educator against, whilst also being a cultural expectation. In turn this reflects the dominant discourse that no matter how well or badly things are going, or how I may feel as an individual, it is important to privilege conveying the display rules and to the coach learners to appear professional and competent as a coach educator and that anything else is a risk or may be evaluated negatively.

> I wished I could just let my annoyance and anger fly at Craig right there and then in front of everyone and show him up to the point that it might just shame him into shutting up and not causing problems at every turn and opportunity on the course. However, past experience has taught me that if I did I could end up looking like a fool, displaying anger to pupils who wanted to act up and refused to engage in my past as a teacher achieved little but further disruption to what I was trying to achieve and wasted time that could be invested into others. Not only that but Craig is an adult, there's a risk we could end up in a full blown argument or that he or one of the other coach educators could complain about me. Let alone that it does not give a very professional impression in front of the whole group. A negative evaluation either way could also impact upon my future employment opportunities as a coach educator. Therefore in all honesty it would be quicker and easier to stay calm and move on.

The understandings of the consequences of breaking the display rules arguably demonstrates the coach educators, myself included, had developed a micropolitical literacy in our work (Kelchtermans and Ballet, 2002a; 2002b). The coach educators

and I were all aware that the organisation held the casting decision over who was allocated work and future opportunities for employment on courses. Indeed, as my own autoethnographic reflection captured, and as is hinted in the earlier consequences by the coach educators, our organisational interests (Kelchtermans and Ballet, 2002b) of continued opportunities and future allocation of work as coach educators aligned with socio-professional interests (Kelchtermans and Ballet, 2002b) of establishing and projecting a positive reputation (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019; Huggan, Nelson and Potrac, 2014). There were also instances where not following the display rules could lead to being perceived negatively by head office or fellow coach educators. The pressure to conform was created via the potential of complaints to England Netball and threat of reduced work opportunities as mechanisms to monitor, control and encourage the coach educators to conform to the display rules.

The coach educators were not solely motivated to manage their emotions in relation to a single motivational focus. Their motivations for emotion management were more complex and contradictory, for they were motivated to manage emotions in the interest of their self and future employment but also for the needs of the learner. Clearly the coach educators' motives for emotion management were multiple in that they could be any combination of instrumental, altruistic, status or self-based. Katie and Lucy and Nicola's motives spanned across all these, Olivia's emotion management was underpinned by instrumental, status and self-based motives, and my own motivations were instrumental, altruistic and self-based.

8.3. Costs of engaging in emotional management

The examination of the cost of emotion management for the coach educators revealed several costs to the coach educators and in some instances, they were prepared to accept the costs or at other points acted to minimise them. The costs also

varied according to the coach educator's individual circumstances and backgrounds. Several of the coach educators initially struggled to verbalise what managing emotions when delivering a course was like. Following some time to reflect, they referred to a mixture of conscious and unconscious elements, as Olivia, Nicola and Katie explained:

> I think it is just something that I consciously do because obviously when I coach and things go wrong when I'm coaching or when things go wrong at work you just get on with it really. Obviously, I have worked for England Netball for a long time and there are lots of things that can go wrong and obviously I am prepared for every eventuality that is thrown at us and there is nothing you can do to change it, you just have to get on with it so just manage it. (Olivia)

> I think, I don't really know because I don't really kind of notice it I just think part of it is conscious, like the normal nerves and things you have to supress, like I think you do that subconsciously because you just have to get on with it but if things go wrong and then there is like that anxiety where you feel like oh my gosh I have got to readjust everything, then that is like more conscious, I have now got to get over that, figure it out and carry on with my conduct so that they don't know anything is wrong, so if things happen on the spot that are not meant to then you are conscious but in terms of managing general emotions I think that is more subconscious. (Nicola)

> Yeah, I mean at the end of the day you get to where you are going and you can feel really down. It's hard work, it makes the course harder than it should be. It's emotions really all the time, you are sort of walking on, or you feel like you are walking on a knife edge all the time. Am I doing the right thing, am I going to get criticised for this or whatever. (Katie)

The examples provided by the coach educators illuminated a level of exhaustion in an emotional, mental or physical sense that they equated as a cost of managing their emotions. This reflected not only Hochschild's (2000 [1983]) summation that emotion management – via surface acting – can result in a sense of burnout or loss of the sense of self but also resonated with teaching (Lee, 2017) and coaching (Nelson et al., 2013; Lee and Chelladurai, 2016) roles where surface acting was associated with burnout and emotional exhaustion. The wider literature has also indicated emotional costs in terms of feelings of inauthenticity and alienation from self (Brotheridge and Lee, 2002) and diminished well-being (Grandey, 2003). The specific costs associated with emotion management for coach educators have yet to be

considered. For teachers, the costs of higher emotional exhaustion and lower personal accomplishment when surface acting to fake both positive and negative emotional expression have been highlighted (Barber et al., 2011). In managing their emotions, Lucy and Nicola highlighted the personal costs of exhaustion with regards to surface acting:

> I think it is draining when you are almost trying to be a bit false with someone, definitely, probably tiring to me but I think, to them the ramifications are it might make them engage a bit more on the course because actually if I ask them to do something they might think oh actually she is alright, we have like built a bit of a rapport with them it's a bit better in the end. (Lucy)
>
> Oh yeah I'm shattered! I go home after every course and just crash on the sofa, I'm absolutely exhausted at the end of every one… Yeah, I don't eat. At the end of the day I will ache cos I will have been tense, I really love it though, I do enjoy it. (Nicola)

The feeling of being mentally and emotionally exhausted was something that I could relate to at points during and at the end of a day delivering, and was a common occurrence in my experience of working as a coach educator:

> The coach learners filed out of the classroom towards the sports hall to undertake a health and safety assessment, I relaxed a little, took a deep breath and had a drink for the first time in the two busy hours since I had arrived at the venue and started delivery. I had been putting on my high energy, all smiling, enthusiasm and interest with the group. As the room emptied I reflected on the first hour of the course. They were fine I thought, they had spoken with each other while I had set up, the ice breakers had done their job and I was happy with how they had responded to the tasks and discussions in module one, I could take my foot of the pedal a bit and come down a level or two from the effort I had placed into making sure they felt at ease and introduced into the course.

The costs of extended emotion regulation are associated with negative psychological outcomes particularly emotional exhaustion (Brotheridge and Grandey, 2002; Brotheridge and Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2003). More recently, in a coaching context, the psychological cost to maintain the required emotional displays has impacted upon job motivation (Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016). In contrast the nature of the coach educator role involves a more intermittent level of emotional display with a

particular group of coach learners enables the coach educators to maintain the emotional stamina to sustain the required display and the time for recovery between courses possibly reduces some of the costs of emotion management experienced by other roles.

The coach educators referred to the varying costs of working on managing their emotions. This was based on their perceptions of the duration and amount of emotion management that they undertook whilst delivering the course in response to the group of coach learners they were working with. As they explained below:

> Yeah, yeah yeah yeah, when it's a hard work group and a tutor I don't know the fake happiness elevates and I'm probably slightly neurotic by the end (laughs). Like engage in a bit more conversation to try and force it out of them, I wouldn't just not talk to them, do you know what I mean? By the end I think I'm more drained, again mentally and physically I'm probably absolutely shattered and definitely mentally more drained. It's tiring, by the end it is tiring, but no I would say that it is only going to positively impact you in terms of the wider and long-term benefits are positive maybe than that you are going to get a bit exhausted with it all but that goes after the course. Like the wider benefit of them enjoying the course make it easier for you and you build rapport a lot better, that far outweighs the fact that I am tired at the end of the day and it gets them to come back and also maybe concentrate and listen a bit more with you. (Lucy)

> I just think when the course delivery is a difficult one it makes you have to do more work because I write post-its of what I need to do and then when I go home on an evening, I'm sort of making sure I have gone over the notes to make sure I have covered what I should cover. So maybe giving us a little bit more stress, making sure I go over the notes and say right, I need to make sure we do this a little bit more and make sure that we definitely do that, but to be fair, I dunno, I don't take it out on them, its' just what you have to do. Sometimes you go on a course and it's spot on and you're delivering it and then they say, well can we have a bit more content on this and you put more effort into this and it's effortless and other times you take things out and have to make the learners think that it is routine by not showing what you're really feeling and thinking a lot of the time. I understand that things change and you just have to be flexible with it, I think if you don't laugh you will go insane (laughs). (Olivia)

> I think I'm working hard to be approachable and positive, I mean the last two courses I have done have been complete opposites, so the first course they were all chatting away, they were all having banter with one another, they were interacting at lunchtime, doing loads which made my job easier and on the other course they were silent so I had to do more. (Nicola)

They perceived that a hard work course increased the cost to them and required a greater degree of emotion management. This was linked to the circumstances of delivery surrounding the course, the learners and at points the other coach educator being worked alongside. Despite the costs to themselves, the coach educators were accepting of and prepared to experience the costs in exchange for the benefits they perceived it brought in terms of successfully delivering and getting the coach learners through the course. This could be understood in relation to Zembylas' extension of the idea of negative and positive emotional labour. This is explained as where the worker was "willing to do the emotional labour that involved some suffering because the emotional rewards were gratifying" (Zembylas, 2005c: 148). In Katie's experience, the emotion management was of limited cost and resulted in excitement for delivering the course and could be perceived as positive emotional labour (Zembylas, 2005c) where the "gratification in teaching seems to make up for some of the negative repercussions of emotional labour" (Zembylas, 2005c: 316). As Katie described:

> No real costs to me, I think it is just done naturally, what gives me the buzz is learners' response, it always has done, as a teacher and now, that's why I do the job and managing my emotions to get that is part of it. If I was just doing it for the money or for something to do, I wouldn't get the buzz, probably wouldn't be bothered to do it. (Katie)

The costs of emotion management experienced by the coach educators occurred during and immediately at the end of a course and they dealt with and recovered from the costs in different ways. Olivia attempted to move beyond the costs of emotion management by trying to motivate herself during delivery:

> For me I have had to motivate myself a bit more thinking, Oh, and then thinking no come on you just you know, just change it and do that and obviously being tired as well um, it's you just have to motivate yourself and your other partner just has to motivate you as well and say right we are going to change it like this and that and just think like that really.

Nicola recovered from the costs by keeping them to herself and sleeping:

> Um, I think it is quite personal, because I think it is quite hard to explain to someone that you do something and that it makes you extremely anxious but you love it, and people look at you like what? So it's hard to chat that through with somebody who hasn't done it or does it. So yeah, like don't eat all day, makes me extremely nervous but I come home buzzing. Yeah, sometimes I'll share it at home but I just come home shattered and then I just want to sleep. That's draining in itself, delivering and just managing my emotions. (Nicola)

Lucy alluded to getting over it at the end of the day:

> I think probably it's more draining at the end of the day. With level one I think when you know it, it's more of a, it's more enjoyable because you're not having to think the same if that makes sense. Urm, where as with level two cos you don't know you're constantly reading, maybe flapping a bit, like behind the scenes, so I think probably by the end of the day I was ready to sit down and be like Oh God. (Lucy)

The changeover in the group of learners from course to course limited the requirement for sustained emotional management for Katie:

> Not at all, I really look forward to doing them and each time I am ready there is no impact from managing my emotions on the last course. The excitement builds back up because it's a whole new group of learners, I mean I had a message this morning about a new learner joining the next course who I know well from county so it is another link that I have already got. It's the buzz of working with new people each time and the ones who have come back as well, you know, I did my level one with you and you have already got the link there so that is great. It's, I think on one hand it is actually changing mindsets to game sense and a new approach to coaching, come along there with probably pre-conceived ideas of what coaching is and I want to learn to be a coach so, I've played for so long, I want to be a coach or I want to coach because I like teams. It's you know, being able to get them from that starting point to when they do their final assessments and having success. (Katie)

From my perspective, I could relate to the costs immediately at the end of the course and felt these diminished between one course and another.

> I slumped into the seat of my car as the feeling of exhaustion hit my body and I felt myself relax, my face ached from smiling, my legs ached and my head was fuzzy and buzzing as I sat in a numb silence watching the clock on the dashboard change 18.24, 18.25…18.30, I shook myself and started the engine, switched off the radio and drove home. I drove home in silent satisfaction that all 20 coach learners had passed the course and it was over. As I walked in the door Simon tried to start a conversation with me, 'fine I think' was my short reply and headed into the kitchen, I

> couldn't and didn't want to engage with anyone right now and dropped onto the sofa with a tea and a bar of chocolate, slowly the numbness and fuzz disappeared, an hour of mindless tv watching later I went to find Simon to tell him about my day.

Whilst the circumstances were varied for each of the coach educators, in different ways the importance placed on the coach educator role reduced the potential costs because they were not reliant on it and doing it by choice. There was a clear sense of a limit of the costs to Lucy from the amount of emotion management that she was both prepared to do and able to invest in, as she explained:

> Um, yeah, I think my emotions probably when I go to the tutoring are let's just try and make it an enjoyable two days or four days depending on the type of course, rather than really take to heart, Oh, this person's not listening. Like I'll deal with it but there's only so much level of dealing with that you can do, where as if I'm at work it's a totally different story because I either manage them or they impacting on the company that I work with so you think well, I need to make a difference and I care, I'm more invested into it, it's my job and I'm there full time, I'm there a lot of hours like I wanna make their environment positive and my own. I still share the same values like I wouldn't want anyone to feel isolated or not enjoy being there, but I probably don't invest anywhere near the same amount of time or dedication, I probably don't even share the same amount of enthusiasm for England Netball as I do my work but it's just because I physically can't. You can't, how can you really be, how can you have equal passion for your job and something you might do six days in a year.

When asked why she cannot do it, Lucy alluded to competing conflicts from her main work role:

> Sometimes as well it depends on the year, and the week you've had at work. Like there's certain time periods in my work that are really busy and really stressful and if it just so happens a course falls on, of course I'm like right fresh head this is about them but sometimes you might still have stuff in the back of your head going well cos, it's like budget year and I've got to write like God knows how many budgets and I'm a bit stressed with all this and my boss is putting pressure on me it just reflects differently doesn't it really.

I could relate completely to this and during the interview found myself agreeing that this is what I was doing to deal with the demands of delivering a course and related costs of the emotion management. For Lucy and I, this demonstrated a

prioritisation of the level and extent of emotion management towards our full-time roles, as it was simply not possible to achieve or sustain the same level of intra- or inter-emotion management in both roles. One way of understanding this would be to suggest that we both were engaging in role retreatism (Massengale, 1977), where one occupational role is prioritised at the expense of the other. This occurs when pressures or time constrictions force the individual to prioritise one role over another (Millslagle and Morley, 2004) as well as it being the role that the individual perceives as the most valuable, rewarding and that they are most accountable for (Conner, 2020). Arguably, Lucy and I did this in our emotional management.

The reverse appeared to be the case for Olivia where there was almost a role reverse and reversal between her investment and emotional management between the coach educator role and her primary occupation:

> If I am needed anywhere to deliver a course I will go. I certainly don't do it for the money, I just do it because it is something that I am going to do probably for a few more years yet, until I get too old. I would love to do it full time, you know, I love coaching and I love making more coaches, passing the knowledge on, yeah so I know that it's a weekend and that means I work quite a lot but I would put my name down to work every weekend if I needed to. That is just me, I absolutely love delivering level two courses and level one courses, at work I can just go into robot mode, I come into work and sometimes on the Monday I come to work for a rest, even though I'm teaching all day, I do love delivering the courses because I am really passionate about coach development and I love passing like me knowledge on and learning from other people and working with other people and I'm, the thing is I know on a course if I sit down, I have stopped so I like to keep going for the full day and I'm quite a bit of a control freak and like when you have little bits to do, I still need to be up and about doing things and things like that.

The circumstances of her coach educator role limited the costs of emotion management for Katie because of her choice to fulfil the role and that the benefits for her outweighed the costs:

> Well, I have not got those costs to managing my emotion you see, this is MY job now and personally I think it is the best job I have ever had and I love doing it so I'm excited and enthused to do it. You know, I get a big buzz out of someone coming along and not having a coaching

> qualification at all and them leaving having changed the way they coach and their perceptions etc. So, if I have got another course to do that's great. It's like my other half says, why do you do it, you don't have to do it, give it up if you want, I couldn't because I get so much out of it. It keeps me active; it keeps my brain active, I think it keeps me young as well. (Katie)

The circumstances surrounding each coach educator's involvement with the coach educator role and subsequent costs of emotion management was impacted upon by their wider occupational roles. For Lucy and myself, we had to take steps to vary the degree of emotion management. For Olivia and Katie, they personally benefitted from the involvement in the role despite the ascribed emotion management costs at points, but they were the ones who appeared to engage in genuine emotion management on a more frequent basis in their role. It must also be recognised that individual identity and commitment to each role may vary, which can also impact the degree to which differences are experienced. (Richards and Templin 2012: 168).

In this chapter I identify the motives for emotion management to be complex, multiple and varied. The coach educators' motives to manage their emotions in their pedagogical interactions with coach learners were at times instrumental and strategic on several levels. Firstly, they did so to encourage learners to engage with and complete the course and secondly to give learners what they had paid for. The coach educators also managed their emotions to align with the display rules for status-based motives that linked to gaining the trust of coach learners and fulfilling the role that they perceived the coach learners expected of them in a professional manner. These reasons for the management of emotion assisted in the meeting of not only the coach educators' objectives, but also wider organisational goals. At other points motives were altruistic and centred on managing emotion for the personal benefit of the coach learner. At other points, however, the coach educators managed emotion for their own personal benefit and gain. The coach educators also engaged in emotion management to uphold the display rules identified in chapter four in to secure positive

appraisals from coach learners and colleagues and secure their future employment. The chapter also highlighted the emotional costs of emotion management for coach educators. The indication that the cost of emotional management varied depending on the course delivered and the relationships with the individuals hints those costs of emotional management for coach educators are influenced by relational, contextual and temporal factors. Arguably the nature of coach education employment also contributed to the limited costs of emotion management with them being short lived and coach educators willing to accept them either because it was rewarding, or they were accepted and secondary to other roles.

Chapter 9: Conclusion

The aim of this chapter is to present the main empirical findings of this study and the contribution that this makes to extending the existing understanding of emotions in sport coaching scholarship. Firstly, I will present what I consider to be the primary empirical and theoretical contributions of this research in advancing knowledge and understanding of the emotional practices and experiences of coach educators and its contribution to enhancing understanding of coach educators' pedagogical work. Following this, I offer suggestions for directions of future research and critical inquiry into the emotional nature of coach education before discussing the generalisability and practical applications of my findings.

9.1. Summary of major findings and contribution to coaching knowledge

The purpose of this thesis was to contribute to understanding surrounding the emotional aspects and realities of coach educators' work. This thesis sought to explore and make sense of the emotional experiences and practices of my own and four other England Netball coach educators. Despite a gradual uncovering of the emotional nature of sports coaching within the literature (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Magill et al., 2017), the emotional practices of coach educators remain largely unconsidered (Potrac et al., 2017; Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). This thesis presents a significant extension of understanding in coach education, specifically in relation to emotion display rules, learning of emotion rules, emotion management strategies as well as motives and impact relating to emotion management. I believe that the use of empirical sources, sociologically informed theoretical concepts and frameworks to assist in the sense-making of the coach educators' accounts and my own autoethnographies, have yielded novel insights and original theoretical contributions to the existing knowledge base of emotion and coach education.

Previous research has considered how practitioners have managed emotion in their interactions with key stakeholders in response to feeling rules in coaching (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Potrac et al., 2017) and coach education (Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019), however the emotion rules that inform these displays are yet to be explored. This study makes an original contribution to existing knowledge by being the first to explicitly investigate sport practitioners understanding of emotion rules which inform emotion management. By using Hochschild's (1983) theorising of display rules as the basis for exploring coach educators' understanding of emotional displays in their work, this study identified four specific emotion display rules relating to happiness, fear, disappointment and anger that guided coach educators' emotion displays in their pedagogical interactions with coach learners. The coach educators' perceived display rules were made sense of in relation to empirical research outside of sports coaching, via consideration of display rules relating to specific emotions in other occupations (Hochschild, 1983; Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987; Lively, 2001; Scott and Myers, 2007; Diefendorff and Gregauras, 2009; Grandey et al., 2010; Reyers and Matusitz, 2012; Lee, Chelladurai and Kang, 2018; Lindqvist et al., 2019). I would contend that this study makes a novel contribution to the advancement of knowledge and understanding of emotion display rules in coach education and wider sports coaching literature and valuable addition to the broader sociological study of emotion rules.

The findings have also highlighted the nuanced nature of emotion display rules and the pedagogical sensibilities of coach educators (Levering, 2000) in the selective deployment of specific emotions (i.e. disappointment and anger), demonstrating how the emotional displays by coach educators in their work are both relationally and contextually informed. On another level accounts and understandings of emotion display rules have illuminated how, for some emotions (happiness and anger), coach educators' emotional displays were subject to constraints and

boundaries regarding the intensity of emotional display and these were positioned by the coach educators in line with societal and cultural expectations of their role. These novel findings not only introduce the idea of restrictions and boundaries to emotional display rules but also highlight the awareness of coach educators to the modifications of emotion display required. This study I believe contributes novel insights into the nuanced nature of emotional display of coach educators and makes an original contribution and extension to knowledge and understanding in the coaching and wider sociological literature on emotion.

To date research in coaching has failed to consider how practitioners learn the emotion rules. In this study the learning of the display rules by the coach educators was shown to occur in multi-faceted ways, across a range of sources, including: (1). learning from others whilst in the role; (2). from previous experiences in other learning contexts and wider social settings; (3). through varied relational networks; and (4). via cultural norms experienced in neo-liberal service-based contexts. To make sense of the coach educators' accounts of how they learnt the display rules, understanding was developed in relation to Thoits (2004) concept of emotional socialisation, Burkitt's (1997) relational conception of emotion and Zembylas (2005) poststructuralist concept of emotional knowing and theorising of emotion as a discursive practice. This highlighted that learning of the display rules for coach educators was a layered process influenced by social and power relations, interactions, phases of time and cultural norms. Following calls by sports coaching scholars for research to "raise important questions about how emotional rules are socially learnt" (Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017: 7), this study is the first to respond by considering how understanding of emotion rules develops via exploratory insights into how coach educators learnt the emotion display rules. Arguably, these insights provide an original contribution to the coach education literature evidencing the multitude of ways that emotion display rules are learnt and breaking new ground in the understanding of this process.

Research to date has considered sports practitioners management of emotions through surface and deep acting (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Hings et al., 2018; Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). The four coach educators and I managed our emotions to follow the emotion display rules that were understood to guide the emotional practices of our work. This involved emotion management strategies of surface and deep acting when I drew upon Hochschild's ([1983] 2012) theorising of emotional labour as a sense-making framework. The coach educators' intra-emotion management strategies were not just limited to these two concepts, a novel finding of this study was that the coach educators implemented a range of emotion management strategies beyond those of surface and deep acting identified in the empirical studies above. Additional forms of emotion management included presentational and philanthropic emotion management (Bolton, 2005), reciprocal emotion management (Lively, 2000) and authentic emotion management. All of which offered theoretically novel approaches to assist as sense-making tools in the emotion management of coach educators and provided an important additional contribution to the literature. The findings of this study contribute to advancing empirical and theoretical insights and understanding of intra-emotion management strategies to involve a diverse range of approaches and revealed the coach educator to be a multi-skilled emotion manager.

While previous literature in sports coaching has only considered management of practitioner's own emotions, this study makes a significant original contribution to knowledge by being the first to explore emotion management of others in coach education and the wider sports coaching literature. The coach educators' accounts and my autoethnographies offer valuable insights into a range of emotion management strategies that coach educators used to manage the emotions of the coach learners as well as fellow coach educators. Primary sense-making of these actions to manage others was considered in relation to Thoits' (1986; 2004) work on

inter-emotion management and her conceptualisation of active coping assistance (Thoits, 1986; 2011), as well as Denzin's (1984) emotional understanding, antithetic emotion management (Ward and McMurray, 2016), reciprocal emotion management (Lively, 2000) and conceptualisations of power (Foucault, 1977). Clearly, a plethora of inter-emotion management strategies are employed in coach educators' interactions with others in the delivery of a coach education course. In responding to Potrac, Smith and Nelson's (2017) call for insights into emotion management of others, the introduction and illustration of inter-emotion management strategies has extended understanding of emotion management in sports coaching. This thesis, I believe, has revealed the diverse and nuanced nature of coach educators' emotion management strategies and offers a potential starting point for greater future in-depth exploration of emotion management in both coach education and sports coaching.

Previous research has started to accumulate on the motives, costs and benefits of sport practitioners engaging in emotion management (e.g., Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016; Allanson, Potrac and Nelson, 2019). This study highlighted further empirical motivations for emotion management to include a combination of instrumental, status, altruistic and self-based motives. The use of Bolton's (2005) conceptualisation of a typology of emotion management offered a theoretically novel sense-making framework. The motives for coach educators' emotion management also aligned with adhering to the display rules, which I believe showed the discursive and complex power-related nature of coach educators' emotion practices when analysed and informed via a poststructuralist lens (Foucault, 1977; Zembylas, 2005). There was also the indication that further motives for the management of emotion were reflective of the coach educators' micropolitical understanding (Kelchtermans and Ballet, 2002b) of the nature of their employment and adherence to display rules. This study arguably extends understanding and

provided some novel insights into the multiple, complex, varied and strategically informed nature of coach educators' motives for emotion management.

While numerous benefits resulted from the enactment of emotional management, my findings demonstrated that costs also accompanied this aspect of the coach educators' work. This study makes a novel contribution to the very limited existing literature which has started to address the costs of emotion management for sport coaches (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac, Nelson and O'Gorman, 2016), by demonstrating the associated costs for coach educators. Indeed, my research highlighted the perceived costs and consequences of emotion management for coach educators involved a combination of mental and emotional demands that were temporally based and contextual in nature and related to the coach educators' own biography, experiences and current circumstances. For two of the coach educators, emotion management involved both positive and negative emotional labour (Zembylas, 2005c). These findings provided new insights and extended the previously limited research on the costs of emotion management in sport practitioners work by being the first empirical research to explicitly examine motives for emotion management enactment.

In summary, this thesis makes a significant contribution to knowledge by enhancing understanding of the emotional nature of coach educators' work and the emotional practices in their pedagogical delivery of coach education courses. Scholars have called for researchers to pay greater attention to the emotional aspects of coach education (Potrac and Marshall, 2011; Potrac et al., 2013; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017), questioned the representation of coach educators as dispassionate, calculating and rational individuals (Potrac et al., 2013), and implored that inquiry commence into the "structuring and generation of emotion within complex networks of relationships" (Potrac Smith and Nelson, 2017: 2). This thesis begins to address these points by offering detailed accounts of the emotional encounters and practices

in coach educator work and that emotion is central to many tenets of their practice. Indeed, it demonstrates that coach educators' work is emotional and that emotions are experienced and informed in relation to coach learners, other coach educators, organisations and wider social, cultural and power based practices. In its totality this thesis has contributed empirically and theoretically to furthering understanding of emotion in coach education.

9.2. Suggestions for future research

The emotional experiences and practices of coach educators presented in this thesis offer a worthy starting point for the development of future research exploring emotion in coach education. The findings offer considerable support to the challenges surrounding the portrayal of coach education as an unemotional undertaking (Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac et al., 2013; Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017). Despite this work presenting an array of insights and furthering understanding of the emotional practices of coach educators, I strongly believe that there is scope for an extended line of inquiry to be undertaken to paint a fuller picture of the emotional practices involved in coach education. I hope that my own research might encourage others to examine the emotion display rules in coach education and other sport-related work roles (i.e., assessors, internal verifiers, workforce development managers). It also presents an opportunity for examination of the emotion display rules that coach learners in attendance at coach education courses understand to guide their interactions, since little is currently known of their emotional experiences and interactions. This knowledge would help inform coach education developers in the training and preparation of coach educators (Callary and Gearity, 2019). By appreciating the emotional nature of coach educators' work, and the associated constraints, demands and expectations of their role related to the emotion rules, an

appreciation of the potential interactions and greater understanding of the emotion displays of coach learners would now be timely.

In furthering the response for a more nuanced understanding of the emotional aspects of coach educators' work (Potrac, Smith and Nelson, 2017), following on from specific emotions display rules (i.e., happiness, fear, frustration, anger) identified within this study, it would be prudent to explore the emotion rules that inform other sport practitioners' emotions in their respective roles. There is also scope to explore coach educators' emotion management strategies in more depth by considering which emotion management strategies are adopted in interactions with different stakeholders and the simultaneous enactment of numerous strategies (c.f. Magill et al., 2017). This could provide further insights into how emotions are produced and enacted through coaches' interactions and social relations (Jones et al., 2011; Potrac et al., 2013). It is also hoped that scholars will build upon the inter-emotion management strategies introduced in this study to further examine how they are deployed in coach education and across wider sports practitioners' roles. Future consideration could also be given to the differential nature of emotion management, to gain further understanding of how and why emotion management takes place, and the relational, hierarchical and historical nature of coach educators' emotion practices.

In drawing upon sociological theory in the analysis and interpretation of emotion experiences and practices in coach education, the theories were selected on the basis that they offered valuable insights into the emotional practices and understanding of coach educators. It is important to acknowledge that these were the choices I made and that numerous other sociological theories could have been selected. For example, whilst I touched upon the work of Denzin (2001) regarding emotional understanding, this could be used to make further sense of how emotions are managed and further distinguish forms of emotional interpretation. Scholars could

also consider emotional temporality (Denzin, 1984) to understand the links between emotional pasts and current interactions.

Although the work of Thoits (1986; 2004; 2011) was used to understand the socialisation of coach educators to emotion rules and emotional management of others in this study, I believe Thoits (2004) work relating to strategic displays of emotional conformity and emotional deviance (Thoits, 2004) to be worthy of inquiry. By considering emotional deviance (Thoits, 2004), the situations and interactions in which emotions are expressed that break display rules and associated consequences could offer further appreciation of the structures and contexts within which coach educators work and their relationships with other key stakeholders (i.e., colleagues, managers, assessors, coach learners). Whilst the current research explored coach education in face-to-face delivery, there is a lack of work on experiences and emotions in online coach education delivery, and this would be a worthwhile area of investigation as increasingly courses include online elements. This could consider learner emotions in the experiencing of an online coach education course (Zembylas, 2008) or the coach educators and associated emotion management strategies.

In terms of data collection and the capturing of individual's experiences of emotion, I would encourage future use of audio diaries as an additional data collection tool to enhance fieldwork accounts of emotion that may be captured more spontaneously, temporally and reflexively as a process (Cottingham and Erickson, 2020). In combining autoethnography, diary accounts and interviews, I propose that coaching research investigating emotion should seek the continued use of interconnected interpretive practices to bring about a different visibility to the world (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011) in the continual advancement of understanding of emotion in coach education. To this end I believe that coach education researchers should continue as 'bricoleurs' (Denzin, 1994) that enable a freedom and creativity to develop a critical understanding of emotions in coach educator work.

9.3. Generalisability and practical application of findings

Finally, I would like to consider the application of my findings and analyses beyond the present thesis. The methods of generalisability applied to traditional statistical methods are not applicable to qualitative research (Tracy, 2013; Smith, 2018). The goal of this research is not that of abstract or empirical generalisation (Denzin, 2001). A common criticism of qualitative research is the inability to produce generalisations from the findings (Tracy, 2013; Smith, 2018). This is a conception that Smith (2018) makes inroads towards challenging by offering insights into alternative ways of interpreting what this means for qualitative research. In this claim, Smith (2018) presents forms of generalisability that could be considered in qualitative approaches, and that I propose can be potentially considered within this research, namely, naturalistic generalisation and transferability. One way of exploring if the findings have naturalistic generalisation, that is, whether the reader's own individual experiences resonate with that of the research (Smith, 2018). Indeed, interpretivist interactionists "seek to build interpretations that call forth for readers naturalistic generalization" (Denzin, 2001: 47). This is achieved thorough rich, contextual and detailed accounts and layered theoretical expressions (Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Smith, 2018). These layers are nuanced, multiple and at times contradictory (Denzin, 2001). In this sense, I would argue that naturalistic generalisations are a possibility within this thesis and that when read by coach educators a degree of resonance to their own emotional experiences and realities could take place. A second consideration is transferability in the sense of can the reader transfer the findings to their own settings (Smith, 2018). Again, it is proposed that in answering the research questions based on the emotional nature and practices of coach educators that there is scope for this to be understood and offer insight to sports coaches and for other sports workers.

The findings of this thesis indicate the centrality of emotion to the experiences, pedagogical practices, interactions and relationships of coach educators in their delivery of coach education courses. These insights and findings show coach educators to be far removed from the portrayal of them as unemotional, dispassionate, rationale and free from constraints in their relations with others (Potrac et al., 2013), suggesting future scholarship addressing emotion in coach education is warranted. In particular, focused exploration of coach educators' emotion management strategies both of and by others could be further developed and also extended to consider coach learners and wider roles associated with coach education (i.e., assessors, workforce managers). This would assist in elevating the recognition of the emotional practices and complexities of coach educators' daily work.

By establishing a knowledge and understanding of the emotional nature of coach educators' practices, this could increase individuals responsible for the development of coach educators' awareness of the emotional labour, emotion management and associated implications of coach educators' work. It could also prompt developers of coach education to consider how to prepare and equip coach educators for the emotional realities of practice accordingly. Indeed, similar to suggestions in teacher education, coach education training should assist coach educators to understand and pay attention to emotions in the development and fulfilment of their role (c.f. González-Calvo, Varea and Martinez-Álvarez, 2020). In practical terms, training could integrate the identified emotion display rules as a forum for discussion around professional practice as a way to raise coach educators' consciousness and awareness and better prepare them for the emotional nature of their work. This would support them to understand the emotional demands and conflicts that could occur in their work. In terms of emotion management, integration of practical examples, scenarios and autoethnographic accounts of intra and inter emotion management strategies that coach educators can deploy would prepare

them for the role. The inclusion of scenarios to enable coach educators to try out or discuss emotion management techniques with learners could better equip coach educators with context-specific emotional knowledge prior to course delivery and enhance professional practice and relationships with coach learners, rather than waiting for coach educators to learn as they go in the role.

References

ABRAHAM, A. and COLLINS, D., 1998. Examining and extending research in coach development. *Quest.* 50, pp. 59-79.

ADAMS, T.E. and HOLMAN-JONES, S., 2011. Telling stories: Reflexivity, queer theory and autoethnography. *Cultural Studies.* 11 (2), pp. 108-116.

ADAMS, T.E., HOLMAN-JONES, S. and ELLIS, C., 2015. *Autoethnography: Understanding Qualitative Research.* Oxford: University Press.

AGAR, M., 1995. Literary journalism as ethnography. In: J. VAN MAANEN, ed. *Representation in Ethnography.* London: Sage. pp. 112-129.

ALASZEWSKI, A., 2006. *Using Diaries for Social Research.* London: Sage Publications.

ALLANSON, A., POTRAC, P. and NELSON, L., 2019. The career experiences of Football Association coach educators: Lessons in micropolitical literacy and action. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health.* 13 (2), pp. 360-374.

ALLEN-COLLINSON, J., 2005. Emotions, interaction and the injured sporting body. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport.* 40 (2), pp. 221-240.

ALLEN-COLLINSON, J., 2012. Autoethnography: Situating personal sporting narratives in socio-cultural contexts. In: K. YOUNG and M. ATKINSON, eds. *Qualitative Research on Sport and Physical Culture.* Emerald Group Publishing. pp. 191-212.

ALLEN-COLLINSON, J. and HOCKEY, J., 2005. Autoethnography: self-indulgence or rigorous methodology? In: M.J. MCNAMEE, ed. *Philosophy and the Sciences of Exercise, Health and Sport: Critical Perspectives on Research Methods.* London: Routledge. pp.187-202.

ALLEN, J., PUGH, S.D., GRANDEY, A. and GROTH, M., 2010. Following display rules in good or bad faith?: Customer orientation as a moderator of the display rule – emotional labor relationship. *Human Performance.* 23 (2), pp.101 - 115

ALLISON, W., ABRAHAM, A. and CALE, A., 2016. *Advances in Coach Education and Development: From Research to Practice.* Oxon: Routledge.

ANDERSON, L., 2006. Analytic autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.* 35 (4), pp. 373-395.

ANDERSON, L. and GLASS-COFFIN, B., 2013. I learn by going: Autoethnographic modes of inquiry. In: S. HOLMAN JONES, T.E. ADAMS, and C. ELLIS, eds. *Handbook of Autoethnography.* California: Left Coast Press. pp. 57-83.

ARTHUR, S., MITCHELL, M., LEWIS, J. and MCNAUGHTON NICHOLLS, C., 2014. Designing fieldwork. In: J. RITCHIE, J. LEWIS, C. MCNAUGHTON NICHOLLS, and R. ORMSTON, eds. *Qualitative Research Practice.* London: Sage.

ASHFORTH, B.E. and HUMPHREY, R.H., 1993. Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review.* 18, pp. 88-115.

ATKINSON, P.A., 2006. Rescuing autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.* 35 (4), pp. 400 – 404.

AVNER, Z., DENISON, J. and MARKULA, P., 2019. “Good athletes have fun”: a Foucauldian reading of university coaches’ uses of fun. *Sports Coaching Review.* 8 (1), pp. 43-61.

AVNER, Z., JONES, L. and DENISON, J. 2014. Poststructuralism. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM and P. POTRAC. eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* Oxon: Routledge. pp. 42-52.

AVNER, Z., MARKULA, P. and DENISON, J. 2017. Understanding effective coaching: A Foucauldian reading of current coach education frameworks. *International Sport Coaching Journal.* 4 (1), pp. 101-109.

BALL, S.J., 1991. Power, conflict, micro-politics and all that! In: G. WALFORD ed. *Doing Educational Research.* London: Routledge. pp. 166 – 192.

BARBER, L.K., GRAWITCH, M. J., CARSON, R.L. and TSOULOUPAS, C.N., 2011. Costs and benefits of supportive versus disciplinary emotion regulation strategies in teachers. *Stress and Health,* 27 (3), pp.173-183.

BARNETT, N.P., SMOLL, F.L. and SMITH, R.E., 1992. Effects of enhancing coach-athlete relationships on youth sport attrition. *The Sport Psychologist.* 6, pp. 111-127.

BARONE, T., 2002. From genre blurring to audience blending: Reflections on the field emanating from an ethnodrama. *Anthropology and Educational Quarterly.* 33 (2), pp. 255-267.

BARONE, T. and EISNER, E., 2012. *Arts Based Research.* Los Angeles: Sage.

BARTLETT, R. and MILLIGAN, C., 2015. *What is Diary Method?* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

BELLOCCHI, A. and RITCHIE, S.M., 2015. "I was proud of myself that I didn't give up and I did it": Experiences of pride and triumph in learning science. *Science Education.* 99 (4), pp. 638-668.

BERNAYS, S., RHODES, T. and TERZIC, K.J., 2014. Embodied accounts of HIV and hope: Using audio diaries with interviews. *Qualitative Health Research.* 24 (5), pp. 629-640.

BLACKSTONE, A., 2012. *Principles of Sociological Inquiry: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods.* Washington: Saylor Foundation.

BOCHNER, A., 2000. Criteria against ourselves. *Qualitative Inquiry.* 6 (2), pp. 266-272

BOCHNER, A. and ELLIS, C., 1996. Talking over ethnography. In: C. ELLIS and A. BOCHNER eds. *Composing Ethnography: Alternative forms of qualitative writing.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press. pp.13-45.

BOLGER, N., DAVIS, A. and RAFAELI, E., 2003. Diary methods: capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review Psychology.* 54, pp. 579-616.

BOLTON, S.C., 2001. Changing faces: nurses as emotional jugglers. *Sociology of Health and Illness.* 23 (1), pp. 85-100.

BOLTON, S.C., 2005. *Emotion Management in the Workplace.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

BOLTON, S.C. and BOYD, C., 2003. Trolley dolly or skilled emotion manager? Moving on from Hochschild's managed heart. *Work, Employment and Society.* 17 (2), pp. 289-308.

BOURDIEU, P., 1977. *Outline of Theory and Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BOWES, I. and JONES, R., 2006. Working at the edge of chaos: Understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *Sport Psychologist.* 20 (2), pp. 235-245.

BOWLING, A., 2009. *Research Methods in Health: Investigating Health and Health services.* Berkshire: Open University Press.

BRADLEY, E.H., CURRY, L.A. and DEVERS, K.J., 2007. Qualitative data analysis for health services research: Developing taxonomy, themes and theory. *Health Services Research.* 42 (4), pp. 1758-1772.

BRANNICK, T. and COGHLAN, D. 2007. In defence of being “Native”: The case for insider academic research. *Organisational Research Methods.* 10 (1), pp. 59-74.

BRASIL, V.Z., RAMOS, V., MILISTETD, M., CULVER, D. and DO NASCIOMENTO, J.V., 2018. The learning pathways of Brazilian surf coach developers. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching.* 13(3), pp. 349-361.

BRADLEY, G.L., MC-COLL KENNEDY, J.R., SPARKS, B.A. JIMMIESON, N.L. and ZAPF, D., 2010. Service encounter needs theory: A dyadic, psychosocial approach to understanding service encounters. In: W.J. ZERBE, C.E.J. HARTEL, and N.M. ASHKANASY, eds. *Emotions and Organisational Dynamism.* Bingley: Emerald. pp. 221-258.

BRAUN, V. and CLARKE, V., 2013. *Successful Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide for Beginners.* London: Sage.

BRINKMANN, S., 2012. *Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life: Working with Everyday Life Materials.* London: Sage.

BRINKMANN, S. and KVALE, S., 2015. *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing.* 3rd ed. London: Sage.

BROTHERIDGE, C. and GRANDEY, A., 2002. Emotional labor and burnout: Comparing two perspectives of “people work”. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour.* 60, pp. 17-39.

BROTHERIDGE, C.M. and LEE, R.T., 2002. Testing a conservation of resources model of the dynamics of emotional labour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.* 7(1), pp. 57-67.

BROTHERIDGE, C. M. and LEE, R. T., 2003. Development and validation of the Emotional Labour Scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology.* 76 (3), pp. 365–379.

BROWN, G., GILBOURNE, D. and CLAYDON, J., 2009. When a career ends: a short story. *Reflective Practice.* 10 (4), pp. 491-500.

BRYMAN, A., 2012. *Social Research Methods.* 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BURKE, S., 2016. Rethinking 'validity' and 'trustworthiness' in qualitative inquiry: How might we judge the quality of qualitative research in sport and exercise sciences? In: B. SMITH and A.C. SPARKES, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise.* London: Routledge. pp. 330-339.

BURKITT, I., 1997. Social relationships and emotions. *Sociology,* 31 (1), pp. 37-55.

BURKITT, I., 2014. *Emotions and Social Relations.* London: Sage.

BURNIER, D.L., 2006. Encounters with the self in social science research: A political scientist looks at autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.* 35 (4), pp. 24-33.

BURRELL, W.G. and MORGAN, G., 1987. *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London: Heinemann.

BYRNE, D., 2017. Do all social scientists use the same methodology? [Online] *Project Planner.* Available from: https//:doi: 10.4135/9781526408495. [Accessed 28th September 2018].

CALLARY, B. and GEARITY, B., 2019a. Coach developer special issue: Global perspectives in coach education for the coach developer. *International Sport Coaching Journal,* 6 (3), pp. 261-262.

CALLARY, B. and GEARITY, B., 2019b. Voices from the field: Q and A with coach developers around the world. *International Sport Coaching Journal.* 6 (3), pp. 366-369.

CALLARY, B. and GEARITY, B., 2020. *Coach education and development in sport: Instructional strategies.* London: Routledge.

CALLARY, B., WERTHNER, P. and TRUDEL, P. 2012. How meaningful episodic experiences influence the process of becoming an experienced coach. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health.* 4 (3), pp. 420-438.

CALLISTER, R., GEDDES, D. and GIBSON, D.F., 2017. When is anger helpful or hurtful? Status and role impact on anger expression and outcomes. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research.* 10 (2), pp. 69-87.

CAMPBELL, T. and SULLIVAN, P., 2005. The effects of a standardised coaching education program on the efficacy of novice coaches. *AVANTE.* 11 (1), pp. 38-44.

CARVER, C.S. and SCHEIER, M.F., 1990. Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. *Psychological Review.* 97 (1), pp. 19-35.

CASHMORE, A., GREEN, P. and SCOTT, J., (2010). An ethnographic approach to studying the student experience: The student perspective through free form video diaries. A practice report. *The International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education.* 1(1), pp. 106-111.

CASSIDY, T., 2016. The role of theory, interpretation and critical thought within qualitative sport and exercise research. In: B. SMITH, and A.C. SPARKES, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise.* London: Routledge. pp.397-408.

CASSIDY, T., JONES, R.L. and POTRAC, P., 2009. *Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice.* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

CASSIDY, T., JONES, R. L. and POTRAC, P., 2016. *Understanding Sports Coaching : The Pedagogical, Social and Cultural Foundations of Coaching Practice*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

CASSIDY, T., POTRAC, P. and MCKENZIE, A., 2006. Evaluating and reflecting upon a coach education initiative: The CoDe of rugby. *The Sport Psychologist.* 20, pp. 145-161.

CAULLEY, D.N., 2008. Making qualitative research reports less boring: The techniques of writing creative nonfiction. *Qualitative Inquiry.* 14(3), pp. 424-449.

CHARMAZ, K., 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

CHELLADURAI, P., 1999. *Human Resource Management in Sport and Recreation.* Champaign IL: Human Kinetics.

CHELLADURAI, P. and KUGA, D., 1996. Teaching and coaching: Group and task differences. *Quest.* 48, pp. 470-485.

CHENEY, T.A.R., 2001. *Writing Creative Nonfiction: Fiction Techniques for Crafting Great Nonfiction.* Berkley CA.: Ten Speed Press.

CHESTERFIELD, G., POTRAC, P. and JONES, R., 2010. Studentship and impression management in an advanced soccer coach education award. *Sport, Education and Society.* 15 (3), pp. 299-314.

CHOWDHRY, S., 2014. The caring performance and the ‘blooming student’: exploring the emotional labour of further education lecturers in Scotland. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training.* 66 (4), pp. 554-571.

CHURCH, K., (1995). *Forbidden narratives: Critical autobiography as social science.* Newark: Gordon and Breach.

COATSWORTH, J.D. and CONROY, D.E., 2006. Enhancing the self-esteem of youth swimmers through coach training: Gender and age effects. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise.* 7, pp. 173-192.

COHEN, L., MANION, L. and MORRISON, K., 2018. *Research methods in education.* 8th ed. London: Routledge.

COFFEY, A., 1999. *The Ethnographic Self.* London: Sage.

COLLINGRIDGE, D. and GANTT, E.E., 2008. The quality of qualitative research. *American Journal of Medical Quality.* 23 (5), pp. 389-395.

CONNER, C.J., 2020. Role retreatism of social studies teacher-coaches: An unequal balancing act. *Journal of Social Studies Research.* 44 (1), pp. 185-194.

CONROY, D.E. and COATSWORTH, J.D., 2004. The effects of coach training on fear of failure in youth swimmers: A latent growth curve analysis from a randomised, controlled trial. *Applied Developmental Psychology.* 25, pp. 193-214.

CORTI, L., 1993. Using diaries in social research. *Social Research Update* [Online]. Available from: http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU2.html [Accessed 14 November 2018].

COTTINGHAM, M.D. and ERICKSON, R., 2020. Capturing emotion with audio diaries. *Qualitative Research.* 20 (5), pp. 549-564.

COWIE, N., 2003. The emotional lives of experienced EFL teachers. In: JALT2003 *at Shizouka Conference Proceedings.* [Online] pp.256-261. Available from:

https://jalt-publications.org/archives/proceedings/2003/E079.pdf [Accessed 27 May 2018].

CRANFORD, C.J. and MILLER, D., 2013. Emotion management from the client's perspective: the case of personal home care. *Work, Employment and Society.* 27 (5), pp. 785-801.

CRESWELL, J.W., 2003. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

CRESWELL, J.W., 2012. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*: *Choosing among five approaches.* 3rd ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

CRESWELL, J.W., 2013. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design* 4th ed. London: Sage.

CRESWELL, J.W. and CRESWELL J.D. 2018. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches.* 5th ed. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

CRESSWELL, J.W. and PLANO-CLARK V.L., 2011. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Method Research.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

CROTTY, M., 2003. *The Foundations of Social Research.* London: Sage.

CULVER, D. and TRUDEL, P., 2006. Cultivating coaches' communities of practice: Developing the potential for learning through interactions. In: R.L. JONES, ed. *The Sports Coach as Educator: Re-conceptualising sports coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 97 – 112.

CUSHION, C., 2007. Modelling the complexity of the coaching process. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching.* 2 (4), pp. 395-401.

CUSHION, C., 2019. Observing coach behaviours: developing coaching practice and coach education? In: R. THELWELL, and M. DICKS, eds. *Professional Advances in Sports Coaching: Research and Practice.* London: Routledge. pp. 358-376.

CUSHION C., ARMOUR, K.M. and JONES, R., 2003. Coach education and continuing development: Expertise and learning to coach. *Quest.* 55, pp. 215-230.

CUSHION, C.J., GRIFFITHS, M. and ARMOUR, K., 2019. Professional coach educators in-situ: a social analysis of practice. *Sport, Education and Society.* 24 (5), pp. 533-546.

CUSHION, C. and NELSON, L., 2012. Coach education and learning: Developing the field. In: W. GILBERT, J. DENISON and P. POTRAC, eds. *Handbook of Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 359 -374.

CUSHION, C., NELSON, L., ARMOUR, K., LYLE, J., JONES, R., SANDFORD, R. and O'CALLAGHAN, C., 2010. *Coach Learning and Development: A Review of Literature.* Leeds: Sports Coach UK.

DAY, C., 2004. *A Passion for Teaching.* London : Routledge.

DAY, M. and THATCHER, J., 2009. 'I'm really embarrassed that you're going to read this…' : Reflections on using diaries in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 6, pp. 249-259.

DELAMONT, S., 2009. The only honest thing: autoethnography, reflexivity and small crises in fieldwork. *Ethnography and Education.* 4(1), pp. 51-63.

DELMAR, C., 2010. "Generalizability" as recognition: Reflections on a foundational problem in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies.* 1(2), pp. 115-128.

DEMERS, G., WOODBURN, A.J. and SAVARD, C., 2006. The development of an undergraduate competency-based coach education programme. *The Sports Psychologist.* 20(2), pp. 162-173.

DENISON, J., 2002. Writing a 'true' sports story. *Auto/biography.*10, pp. 131-137.

DENISON, J., 2006. The way we ran : Reimagining research and the self. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues.* 4, pp. 333-339.

DENISON, J., 2016. Social theory and narrative research: A point of view. *Sport, Education and Society,* 21(1), pp. 7-10.

DENISON, J. and AVNER, Z., 2011. Positive practices for athlete development. *Quest.* 63(2), 209-227.

DENISON, J. and RINEHART, R., 2000. Imagining sociological narratives. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 17(1), pp. 1-4.

DENZIN, N.K., 1984. *On Understanding Emotion.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

DENZIN, N.K., 1989. *Interpretive Interactionism.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DENZIN, N.K., 1992. *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies : The Politics of Interpretation.* Cambridge: Blackwell.

DENZIN, N.K., 1994. Romancing the text : The qualitative researcher-writer-as-bricoleur. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education.* 122, pp. 15-30.

DENZIN, N.K., 1997. *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DENZIN, N.K., 2001. *Interpretivist Interactionism* 2nd ed. London: Sage.

DENZIN, N., 2010. *The Qualitative Manifesto: A Call to Arms,* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press

DENZIN, N.K., 2011. *On Understanding Emotion.* London: Transaction Publishers.

DENZIN, N.K., 2014. *Interpretive Autoethnography.* 2nd ed. London : Sage.

DENZIN, N.K. and LINCOLN, Y.S., 2003. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.

DENZIN, N.K. and LINCOLN, Y.S., 2008. Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In: N.K. DENZIN and Y.S. LINCOLN, eds. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research.* 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications. pp.1-34.

DENZIN, N. K. and LINCOLN, Y.S. 2011. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research.* 4th. ed. London: Sage Publications.

DICICCO-BLOOM, B. and CRABTREE, B. F., 2006. The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education,* 40(4), pp. 314-321.

DIEFENDORFF, J.M., CROYLE, M.H., and GOSSERAND, R.H., 2005. The dimensionality and antecedents of emotional labor strategies. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour.* 66, pp. 339-357.

DIEFENDORFF, J.M. and GOSSERAND, R.H., 2003. Understanding the Emotional Labor Process: A Control Theory Perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 24(8), pp. 945–959.

DIEFENDORFF, J.M. and GREGURAS, G.J., 2009. Contextualizing Emotional Display Rules: Examining the roles of targets and *discrete* emotions in shaping display rule perceptions. *Journal of Management.* 34(4), pp. 880-898.

DIEFENDORFF, J.M. and RICHARD, E.M., 2003. Antecedents and Consequences of Emotional Display Rule Perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*. 88(2), pp. 284–94.

DIVERSI, M., 1998. Glimpses of street life: Representing lived experience through short stories. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 4(2), pp.131-147.

DOUGLAS, K., 2009. Storying my self: negotiating a relational identity in professional sport. *Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*. 1(2), pp. 176-190.

DOUGLAS, K., 2014. Challenging interpretive privilege in elite and professional sport: one [athlete's] story, revised, reshaped and reclaimed. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health.* 6(2), pp. 220-243.

DOUGLAS, K. and CARLESS, D., 2017. My eyes got a bit watery there: using stories to explore emotions in coaching research and practice for injured, sick and wounded military personnel. *Sports Coaching Review.* 6(2), pp. 216-232.

DWYER, C.S. and BUCKLE, J.L., 2009. The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 8(1), pp. 54-63.

EDWARDS, R. and HOLLAND, J., 2013. *What is qualitative interviewing?* London: Bloomsbury.

ELLIOTT, H., 1997. The use of diaries in sociological research on health experience. *Sociological Research* [online]. 2(2). Available from: http://www.socresonline.org.uk/2/2/7 [Accessed 10 April 2019].

ELLIS, C., 1991. Sociological introspection and emotional experience. *Symbolic Interaction.* 14(1), pp. 23-50.

ELLIS, C., 1995. Emotional and ethical quagmire in returning to the field. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.* 24, pp. 68-98.

ELLIS, C., 1999. He*art*ful Autoethnography. *Qualitative Health Research.* 9(5), pp. 669-683.

ELLIS, C., 2004. *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography.* Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

ELLIS, C., ADAMS, T. and BOCHNER, A., 2011. Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research.* 12(1), pp. 1-18.

ELLIS, C. and BOCHNER, A., 2000. Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject. In: N. DENZIN and Y. LINCOLN, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 733-768

ELLIS, C.S. and BOCHNER, A.P., 2006. Analyzing analytic autoethnography: An autopsy. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 35(4), pp. 429-449.

FETTERMAN, D.M., 2008. A walk through the wilderness: Learning to find your way. In: W. SHAFFIR and R.A. STEBBINS, eds. *Experiencing fieldwork: An inside view of qualitative research.* London: Sage. pp. 87-97.

FIELDING-LLOYD, B. and MEÂN, L., 2011. 'I don't think I can catch it': Women confidence and responsibility in football coach education. *Soccer and Society.* 12 (3), pp. 345-364.

FILMER, P., JENKS, C., SEALE, C., THOBURN, N. and WALSH, D., 2004. Developments in Social Theory. In: C. SEALE, ed. *Researching Society and Culture.* 2nd ed. London: Sage pp. 33-46.

FLEMING, J., 2018. Recognizing and resolving the challenges of being an insider researcher in work-integrated learning. *International Journal of Work-Related Learning,* Special Issue. 19(3): pp. 311-320.

FLICK, U., 2018. *An Introduction to qualitative research.* 6th ed. London: Sage.

FONTANA, A. and FREY, J.H., 1994. Interviewing: The art of science. In: N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* London: Sage. pp. 361-376.

FOUCAULT, M., 1977. Intellectuals and power. In: D.F. BOUCHARD, ed. *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interview by Michael Foucault.* New York: Cornell University Press. pp. 120-142.

FOUCAULT, M., 1988. Technologies of the self. In: L.H. MARTIN, H. GUTMAN, and P.H. HUTTON, eds. *Technologies of the self.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. pp. 16-49.

FOUCAULT, M., 1983. The subject and power. In: H.L. DREYFUS and P. RAINBOW, eds. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* 2nd ed. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press. pp. 58-72.

FOUCAULT, M., 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* London: Penguin.

FRANK, A.W., 1995. *The Wounded Storyteller: Body, Illness and Ethics.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

GALE, L., IVES, B., POTRAC, P. and NELSON, L. 2019. Trust and distrust in community sports work: Tales from the 'shop floor'. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 36(3), pp. 244-253.

GARDINER, M., 2000. *Critiques of Everyday Life: An Introduction.* London: Routledge.

GARRICK, J., 1999. Doubting the philosophical assumptions of interpretive research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* 12(2), pp. 147-156.

GEARITY, B., 2014. Autoethnography. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM and P. POTRAC, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 205-216.

GEARITY, B. T., CALLARY, B. and FULMER, P., 2013. Learning to coach: A qualitative case study of Phillip Fulmer. *The International Sport Coaching Journal.* 6(2), pp. 65-86.

GEDDES, D. and CALLISTER, R., 2007. Crossing the line(s): A dual threshold model of anger in organizations. *Academy of Management Review.* 32(3), pp. 721-746.

GIBSON, D.E. and CALLISTER, R.R., 2010. Anger in Organizations: Review and Integration. *Journal of Management.* 42(1), pp. 66–69.

GILBOURNE, D., 2011. 'Just in Time': a reflective poetic monologue. *Reflective Practice,* 12 (1), pp. 27-33.

GLASØ, L., EKERHOLT, S., BARMAN, S. and EINARSEN, S., 2006. The instrumentality of emotion in leader-subordinate relationships, *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion.* 1(3), pp. 255 – 276.

GLOMB, T.M. and TEWS, M.J., 2004. Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* 64, pp. 1-23.

GOFFMAN, E., 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* London: Penguin Books.

GONZÁLEZ-CALVO, G., VAREA, V. and MARTÍNEZ-ÁLVAREZ, L., 2020. 'I feel, therefore I am': unpacking preservice physical education teachers' emotions. *Sport, Education and Society.* 25(5), pp. 543-555. Available from: doi: 10.1080/13573322.2019.1620202

GRANDEY, A.A., 2000, Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labour. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology.* 5(1), pp. 95-110.

GRANDEY, A.A., 2003. When "the show must go on": Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Academy of Management Journal.* 46 (1), pp. 86-96.

GRANDEY, A.A., FISK, G.M., MATTILA, A.S., JANSEN, K.J. and SIDEMAN, L.A., 2005. Is service with a smile enough? Authenticity of positive display during service encounters. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes.* 96, pp. 38-55.

GRANDEY, A., RAFAELI, A., RAVID, S., WIRTZ, J. and Steiner, D., 2010. Emotion display rules at work in the global service economy: the special case of the customer. *Journal of Service Management.* 21(3), pp. 388-412.

GRANDEY, A.A., TAM, A. and BRAUBURGER, A., 2002. Affective states and traits of young workers: A diary study. *Motivation and Emotions.* 26, pp. 32-35.

GRAY, B. and SMITH, P. 2009. Emotional labour and the clinical settings of nursing care: The perspectives of nurses in East London. *Nurse Education in Practice.* 9, pp. 253-261.

GUBA, E.G. and LINCOLN, Y.S., 1982. Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. *Educational Communication and Technology.* 30 (4), pp. 233-252.

GUBA, E.G. and LINCOLN, Y.S., 2008. Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In: N.K. DENZIN and Y.S. LINCOLN, eds. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research.* 3rd ed. London: Sage. pp.255-286.

GUEST, G., NAMEY, E. E. and MITCHELL, M. L., 2013. *Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

HALEEM, H., JONES, R. and POTRAC, P., 2003. Investigating the coach-athlete relationship: the case for auto-ethnography. In: J. WRIGHT, ed. *Researching in Sport, Physical and Health Education.* Australia: University of Woollongon Press. pp. 93-104.

HALL, E.T. and GRAY, S., 2016. Reflecting on reflective practice: a coach's action research narratives. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health.* 8 (4), pp. 365-379

HAMMERSLEY, M., 2013. *What is qualitative research?* London and New York: Bloomsbury.

HANIN, Y.L., 2010. Coping with anxiety in sport. In: A.R. NICHOLLS, ed. *Coping in Sport: Theory, Methods and Related Constructs.* New York: Nova Science Publishers. pp. 159-175.

HARDIN, R., 2002. *Trust and Trustworthiness.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

HARDIN, R., 2006. *Trust.* Polity, Cambridge.

HARGREAVES, A., 1998. The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 14(8), pp. 835-854.

HARGREAVES, A., 2000. Mixed emotions: teacher's perceptions of their interactions with students. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 16, pp. 811-826.

HARGREAVES, A., 2001a. "Emotional geographies of teaching". *Teachers College Record.* 103(6), pp. 1056-1080.

HARGREAVES, A., 2001b. The emotional geographies of teachers' relations with colleagues. *International Journal of Educational Research.* 35(5), pp. 503-527.

HASTIE, P. and GLOTOVA, O., 2012. Analysing qualitative data. In: K. ARMOUR and D. MACDONALD, eds. *Research Methods in Physical Education and Youth Sport.* London: Routledge. pp. 309-320.

HASTIE, P. and HAY, P., 2012. Qualitative approaches. In: K. ARMOUR and D. MACDONALD, eds. *Research Methods in Physical Education and Youth Sport*. London: Routledge. pp.79-94.

HEBSON, G., EARNSHAW, J. and MARCHINGTON, L., 2007. Too emotional to be capable? The changing nature of emotion work in definitions of 'capable teaching'. *Journal of Education Policy,* 22(6), pp. 675-694.

HEIDEGGER, M., 1927/1962. *Being and time.* Oxford: Blackwell publishing.

HERYATUM. Y. and SEPTIANA, T.I., 2020. Pre-service teachers' emotion in teaching practicum. *English Review: Journal of English Education. 9*(1), pp. 61–68.

HINGS, R.F., WAGSTAFF, C.R.D., THELWELL, R.C., GILMORE, S. and ANDERSON, V. 2018. Emotional labor and professional practice in sports medicine and science. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports.* 28(2), pp. 704-716.

HOBBS, D. and WRIGHT, R., 2006. *The SAGE Handbook of Fieldwork*. London: Sage.

HOCHSCHILD, A., 1979. Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology.* 85, pp. 551-575.

HOCHSCHILD, A.R., 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialisation of Human Feeling.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

HOCHSCHILD, A.R., 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Parents and the Revolution at Home.* New York: Viking Press.

HOCHSCHILD, A.R., 2000. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. 2nd ed. London: University of California Press.

HOCHSCHILD, A.R., 2003. *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from home and work.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

HOCHSCHILD, A.R., 2012. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. 3rd ed. London: University of California Press.

HODKINSON, P., ANDERSON, G., COLLEY, H., DAVIES, J., DIMENT, K., SCAIFE, T., TEDDER, M., WAHLBERG, M. and WHEELER, E., 2007. Learning cultures in further education. *Educational Review*. *59*(4), pp. 399–413.

HODKINSON, P., BIESTA, G. and JAMES, D., 2007. Understanding learning cultures. *Educational Review.* 59, pp. 415-427.

HODKINSON, P., BIESTA, G. and JAMES, D. 2008. Understanding learning culturally: Overcoming the dualism between social and individual views of learning. *Vocations and Learning.* 1(1), pp. 27-47.

HOLLOWAY, I., 1997. *Basic Concepts for Qualitative Research.* London: Wiley-Blackwell.

HOLMAN –JONES, S. 2005. Autoethnography: Making the personal political. In: N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 763-791.

HOLT, A., 2010. Using the telephone for narrative interviewing: A research note. *Qualitative Research.* 10, pp. 113-121.

HOLT, N.L., 2001. Beyond technical reflection: Demonstrating the modification of teaching behaviors using three levels of reflection. *Avante,* 7(2), pp. 66-76.

HOWELL, K.E., 2013. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Methodology.* London. Sage Publications.

HUGGAN, R., NELSON, L. and POTRAC, P., 2014. Developing micropolitical literacy in professional soccer: a performance analyst's tale. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health.* 7(4), pp. 504-520.

HUMPHREY, R.H., ASHFORTH, B.E. and DIEFENDORFF, J.M., 2015. The bright side of emotional labor. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour.* 36(6), pp. 749 -769.

HUNT, C., and SAMPSON, F., 2006. *Writing: self and reflexivity.* Hampshire: Palgrave.

HUSSAIN, A., TRUDEL, P., PATRICK, T. and ROSSI, A., 2012. Reflections on a novel coach education program: A narrative analysis. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching.* 7 (2), pp. 227-240.

HYLAND, M.E., 1996. Diary assessments of quality of life. *Quality of Life Newsletter.* 16, pp.8-9.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL for COACHING EXCELLENCE. 2014. *International Coach Developer Framework.* Version 1.1. Human Kinetics.

IRWIN, G., HANTON, S. and KERWIN, D., 2004. Reflective practice and the origins of elite coaching knowledge. *Reflective Practice.* 5(3), pp. 425–442.

ISENBARGER, L. and ZEMBYLAS, M., 2006. The emotional labour of caring in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 22, pp. 120-134.

JACELON, C.S. and IMPERIO, K., 2005. Participant diaries as a source of data in research with older adults. *Qualitative Health Research.* 15 (7), pp. 991 – 997.

JARVIS, P., 2006. *Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Human Learning.* London: Routledge.

JARVIS, P., 2007. *Globalisation, Lifelong Learning and the Learning Society: Sociological perspectives.* London: Routledge.

JARVIS, P., 2009. *Learning to be a Person in Society.* London: Routledge.

JONES, R.L., 2006. Dilemmas, Maintaining "Face," and Paranoia: An Average Coaching Life. *Qualitative Inquiry.* 12 (5), pp. 1012-1021.

JONES, R., 2007. Coaching redefined: An everyday pedagogical endeavour. *Sport, Education and Society.* 12 (2), pp. 159-174.

JONES, R.L., 2009. Coaching as caring (the smiling gallery): accessing hidden knowledge. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy.* 14, pp. 377-390.

JONES, R. and ALLISON, W., 2014. Candidates' experiences of elite coach education: A longitudinal study ("Tracking the journey"). *European Journal of Human Movement.* 33, pp. 110-122.

JONES, R.L., ARMOUR, K. and POTRAC, P., 2003. Constructing expert knowledge: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society.* 8, pp. 213-229.

JONES, R.L., ARMOUR, K. and POTRAC, P., 2004. *Sports Coaching Cultures: From Practice to Theory.* London: Routledge.

JONES, R.L., MORGAN, K. and HARRIS, K., 2012. Developing coaching pedagogy: Seeking a better integration of theory and practice. *Sport, Education and Society.* 17(3), pp. 313-329.

JONES, R., POTRAC, P., CUSHION, C. and RONGLAN, L.T., 2011a. *The Sociology of Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge.

JONES, R.L., RONGLAN, L.T., POTRAC, P. and CUSHION, C., 2011b. Concluding thoughts and ways forward. In: R.L. JONES, P. POTRAC, C. CUSHION and L.T. RONGLAN, eds. *The Sociology of Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp.179-186.

JONES, R.L. and TURNER, P., 2006. Teaching coaches to coach holistically: Can problem-based learning (PBL) help? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 14 (3), pp. 267-284.

JONES, R.L. and WALLACE, M., 2005. Another bad day at the training ground: Coping with ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society.* 10 (1), pp. 119-134.

JONES, R.L. and WALLACE, M., 2006. The coach as 'orchestrator'. More realistically managing the complex coaching context. In: R.L. Jones, eds. *The Sports Coach as Educator,* London: Routledge. pp.51-64.

JONES, A. and WOOLLEY, J., 2015. The e-mail diary: a promising research tool for the 21st century? *Qualitative Research.* 15(6), pp. 705-721.

JOSSELSON, R., 2013. *Interviewing for Qualitative Inquiry: A Relational Approach.* New York: The Guildford Press.

KAROUSIOU, C., HAJISOTERIOU, C., and ANGELIDES, P. 2021. Teachers' emotions in super-diverse school settings. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society.* 29(1), pp. 61-77.

KELTCHERMANS, G., 1996. Teacher Vulnerability: understanding its moral and political roots. *Cambridge Journal of Education.* 26(3), pp. 307-323.

KELTCHERMANS, G., 2005. Teachers' emotions in educational reforms: Self-understanding, vulnerable commitment and micropolitical literacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 21, pp. 995-1006.

KELTCHERMANS, G., 2009. Career stories as a gateway to understanding teacher development. In: S. ROLLS, H. PLAUBORG, M. BAYER, and U. BRINKKJAER Eds. *Teachers' Career Trajectories and Work Lives.* Dordecht: Springer. pp. 29-47.

KELCHTERMANS, G. and BALLET, K., 2002a. Micro-political literacy: reconstructing a neglected dimension in teacher development. *International Journal of Educational Research.* 37(8), pp. 755-776.

KELCHTERMANS, G. and BALLET, K., 2002b. The micro-politics of teacher induction: a narrative biographical study of teacher socialisation. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 18(1), pp. 105-120.

KENTEN, C., 2010. Narrating oneself: Reflections on the use of solicited diaries with diary interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research [online]. 11(2),* Available from *http://dx.doi.org/10.17169/fsq-11.2.1314 [Accessed 8 July 2017]*

KING, N. and HORROCKS, C., 2010. *Interviews in Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

KINMAN, G., WRAY, S. and STRANGE, C., 2011. Emotional labour, burnout and job satisfaction in UK teachers: The role of workplace social support. *An International Journal of Experimental Psychology.* 31(7), pp. 843-856.

KITCHING, K., 2009. Teachers' negative experiences and expressions of emotion: being true to yourself or keeping you in your place? *Irish Educational Studies.* 28(2), pp.141-154.

KLEINMAN, S. and COPP, M.A., 1993. *Emotions and Fieldwork.* California: Sage.

KNOWLES, Z., BORRIE., A., and TELFER, H., 2005. Towards the reflective sports coach: issues of context, education and application. *Ergonomics.* (11-14), pp.1711-1720.

KNOWLES, Z., GILBOURNE, D., BORRIE, A. and NEVILL, A., 2001. Developing the reflective sports coach: A study exploring the processes of reflective practice within a Higher Education coaching programme. *Reflective Practice*, 2(2), pp. 185–207.

KRAMER, M.W. and HESS, J.A., 2002. Communication rules for the display of emotions in organizational settings. *Management Communication Quarterly.* 16(1), pp. 66-80.

KUKLICK, C. R. and KASALES, M., 2019. Reflective practice to enhance coach development and practice. In: B. CALLARY and B. GEARITY, eds. *Coach Education and Development in Sport* pp. 74-88. London: Routledge.

LAVE, J. and WENGER, E., 1991. *Situated Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

LAVE, J. and WENGER, E., 1996. Practice, person, social world. In: H. Daniels, ed. *An Introduction to Vygotsky.* London: Routledge. pp. 143-150.

LAVE, J. and PACKER, M., 2008. Towards a social ontology of learning. In: K. NIELSEN, S. BRINKMANN, C. EMHOLDT, L. TANGGAARD, P. MUSAEUS, and G. KRAFT, eds. *A Qualitative Stance: In Memory of Steiner Kvale, 1938-2008.* Aarhus: Aarhus University Press. pp. 17-47.

LAVE, J., 2009. The practice of learning. In: K. ILLERIS ed. *Contemporary Theories of Learning.* Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 200-208.

LEDUC, M., CULVER, D.M. and WERTHNER, P., 2012. Following a coach education programme: Coaches perceptions' and reported actions. *Sports Coaching Review,* 1 (2), pp. 135-150.

LEE, Y., 2017. Emotional labor, teacher burnout, and turnover intention in high-school physical education teaching. *European Physical Education Review.* [Online] 25 (1), pp. 236-253. Available from: doi10.1177/1356336X17719559. [Accessed on 17th October 2019].

LEE, Y. and CHELLADURAI, P., 2016. Affectivity, emotional labor, emotional exhaustion and emotional intelligence in coaching. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology.* 28, pp. 170-184.

LEE, Y.H., CHELLADURAI, P. and KANG, C., 2018. Emotional labor in the dual role of teaching and coaching. *Psychological Reports.* 121(5), pp. 952-973.

LEE, Y., CHELLADURAI, P. and KIM, Y., 2015. Emotional labor in coaching: Development of a model. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching.* 10, pp. 561-575.

LEEDER, T. and SAWIUK, R., 2020. Reviewing the sports coach mentoring literature: a look back to take a step forward. *Sports Coaching Review.* 10(2), pp.129-152.

LEIDNER, R., 1993. *Fast Food, Fast Talk: Service Work and the Routinization of Everyday Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

LEMYRE, F., TRUDEL, P. and DURAND-BUSH, N., 2007. How youth-sport coaches learn to coach. *The Sport Psychologist.* 21(2), pp. 191-209.

LEVERING, B., 2000. Disappointment in teacher-student relationships. *Journal of Curriculum Studies.* 32(1), pp. 65-74.

LEWIS, C.J., ROBERTS, S.J. and ANDREWS, H., 2018. ‘Why am I putting myself through this?’ Women football coaches’ experiences of the Football Association’s coach education process. *Sport, Education and Society.* 23(1), pp. 28-39.

LINCOLN, Y. and GUBA, E., 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

LINDEBAUM, D. and FIELDEN, S., 2011. “It's Good to Be Angry”: Enacting Anger in Construction Project Management to Achieve Perceived Leader Effectiveness. *Human Relations*. 64(3), pp. 437–458.

LINDEBAUM, D., JORDAN, P.J. and MORRIS, L., 2016. Symmetrical and asymmetrical outcomes of leader anger expression: A qualitative study of army personnel. *Human Relations.* 69 (2), pp. 277-300.

LINDLOF, T. and TAYLOR, B. 2011. Sensemaking: Qualitative data analysis and interpretation. In: T. LINDLOF, and B. TAYLOR eds. *Qualitative Communication Research Methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 240-281.

LINDQVIST, H., WEURLANDER, M., WERNERSON, A. and THORNBERG, R., 2019. Boundaries as a coping strategy: emotional labour and relationship maintenance in distressing teacher education situations. *European Journal of Teacher Education.* 42(5), pp. 634-649.

LISTON, D. P. and GARRISON, J. W., 2004. *Teaching, Learning, and Loving: Reclaiming Passion in Educational Practice*. New York: Routledge.

LIU, Y., 2016. The emotional geographies of language teaching. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development.* 20(4), pp. 482-497.

LIVELY, K.J., 2000. Reciprocal emotion management: Working together to maintain stratification in private law firms. *Work and Occupations.* 27 (1), pp. 32-63.

LIVELY, K.J., 2001. Occupational claims to professionalism: The case of paralegals. *Symbolic Interaction.* 24(3), pp. 343-365.

LIVELY, K.J. and POWELL, B., 2006. Emotional expression at work and at home: Domain, status or individual characteristics? *Social Psychology Quarterly.* 69(1), pp. 17-38.

LIVELY, K.J. and WEED, E.A., 2014. Emotion management: Sociological insight into what, how, why and to what end? *Emotion Review.* 6(3), pp. 202-207.

LOFLAND, J. and LOFLAND, L.H., 1995. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis.* 3rd ed. London: Wadsworth.

LYLE, J., 2002. *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches' Behaviour*. London: Routledge.

LYLE, J., 2007. A review of the research evidence for the impact of coach education. *International Journal of Coaching Science.* 1(1), pp. 17-34.

LYLE, J. and CUSHION, C.J., 2017. *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaching Practice,* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

LYLE, J. and VERGEER, I., 2013. Recommendations on the methods used to investigate coaches' decision making. In: P. POTRAC, W, GILBERT, and J. DENISON, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 121-132.

MACDONALD, D.J., CAMIRÉ, M., ERICKSON, K. and SANTOS, F. 2020. Positive youth development related athlete experiences and coach behaviours following a targeted coach education course. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching.* 15 (5), pp. 621 – 630.

MACDONALD, D., KIRK, D., METZLER, M., NILGES, L., SCHEMPP, P. and WRIGHT, J., 2002. It's all very well in theory: a review of theoretical perspectives and their applications in contemporary pedagogy research. *Quest.* 54(2), pp. 133-156.

MAGILL, S., NELSON, L., JONES, R. and POTRAC, P., 2017. "Emotions, Identity, and Power in Video-Based Feedback Sessions: Tales from Women's Professional Football," *Sports Coaching Review*. 6(2), pp. 216–232.

MALETE, L. and FELTZ, D.L., 2000. The effect of a coaching education program on coaching efficacy. *The Sport Psychologist.* 14, pp. 410-417.

MALLET, C.J. and TINNING, R., 2014. Philosophy of Knowledge. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM, and P. POTRAC, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London, Routledge. pp. 9-17.

MANN, S., 1999. Emotions at work: to what extent do we express or supress them? *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology.* 8(3), pp. 347-369.

MARKHAM, T. and COULDRY, N., 2007. Tracking the reflexivity of the (dis)engaged citizen: Some methodological reflections. *Qualitative Inquiry.* 13: pp. 675- 695.

MARKULA, P. and DENISON, J., 2005. Sport and the personal narrative. In: D.L. ANDREWS, D. S. MASON, and M.L. SILK, eds. *Qualitative Methods in Sports Studies.* Oxford: Berg. pp. 165-184.

MARKULA, P., GRANT, B. and DENISON, J., 2001. Qualitative research and aging and physical activity: Multiple ways of knowing. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity.* 9(3), pp. 245-264.

MARKULA, P. and SILK, M., 2011. *Qualitative Research for Physical Culture,* London: Palgrave.

MARTIN, M., 1999. *The Uses of Understanding in Social Science Verstehen.* Transaction Publishers.

MARTINELLI, L. A., DAY, M. C. and LOWRY, R. 2017. Sport coaches' experiences of athlete injury: The development and regulation of guilt. *Sports Coaching Review.* 6(2), pp. 162–178.

MASSENGALE, J.D., 1977. Occupational role conflict and the teacher/coach. *The Physical Educator.* 34(2), pp. 64-69.

MCCALL, G.J., 2006. The Fieldwork Tradition. In: D. HOBBS, and R. WRIGHT, eds. *The SAGE Handbook of Fieldwork.* London: Sage. pp. 3-16.

MCCLOUGHEN, A., LEVY, D., JOHNSON, A., NGUYEN, H. and McKenzie, H., 2020. Nursing students' socialisation to emotion management during early clinical placement experiences: A qualitative study. *Journal of Clinical Nursing.* 29, pp. 2508-2520.

MCCULLICK, B., BELCHER, D. and SCHEMPP, P., 2005. What works in coaching and sport instructor certification programs? The participants' view. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy.* 10(2), pp. 121–137.

MCGREGOR, J., 2006. Diaries and case studies. In: V. DESAI and R. POTTER, eds. *Doing Development Research.* London: Sage. pp. 200-207.

MCMAHON, J., 2016. Creative analytical practices. In: B. SMITH and A. SPARKES, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise* London: Routledge. pp. 302-315.

MCMAHON, J. and MCGANNON, K.R., 2016. Whose stories matter? Revising, reflecting and rediscovering a researcher's embodied experience as a narrative inquirer. *Sport, Education and Society.* 21 (1), pp. 96-113.

MCNEILL, K., DURAND-BUSH, N. and LEMYRE, P.N., 2017. Understanding coach burnout and underlying emotions: a narrative approach. *Sports Coaching Review.* 6(2), pp. 179-196.

MCQUADE, S. and NASH, C., 2015. The role of the coach developer in supporting and guiding coach learning. *International Sport Coaching Journal.* 2, pp. 339-346.

MERCER, J., 2007. The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: Wielding a double-edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas. *Oxford Review of Education.* 33(1), pp. 1-17.

MERRIAM, S.B., 2009. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

MERRIAM, B.S., 2014. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation.* 2nd ed. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

MERRIAM, S. and TISDELL, E. 2016. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation,* 4th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

MILLIGAN, C., BINGLEY, A. and GATTRELL, A., 2005., Processes, relationships, settings, products and consumers: the case for qualitative diary research. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal.* 8(2), pp. 142-156.

MILLS, J. and DENISON, J., 2014. Discourse analysis. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM and P. POTRAC, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London, Routledge. pp. 9-17.

MILLSLAGLE, D.G. and MORLEY, L., 2004. Investigation of role retreatism in the teacher/coach. *The Physical Educator.* 61, pp. 120-130.

MINICHIELLO, V., ARONI, R., TIMEWELL, E. and ALEXANDER, L., 1990. *In-depth Interviewing: Researching People.* Melbourne, Longman.

MLIGO, E.S., 2013. *Doing Effective Fieldwork.* CA: Resource Publications.

MOEN, F., OLSEN, M. and BJØRKØY, J.A., 2020. Investigating Possible Effects from a One-Year Coach-Education Program, *Sports* [online]. 9(1), Available from: https://doi: 10.3390/sports9010003 [Accessed 22 November 2020].

MOON, J., 2001. *Short courses and modules: Improving the impact of learning, training and professional development.* London: Kogan Page Limited.

MOON, J., 2004. *A Handbook of Reflective and Experiential Learning- Theory and Practice.* London: Routledge.

MONROUXE, L.V., 2009. Solicited audio diaries in longitudinal narrative research: a view from inside. *Qualitative Research.* 9, pp. 81-103.

MORGAN, K., JONES, R.L., GILBOURNE, D. and LLEWELLYN, D., 2013. Innovative approaches in coach education pedagogy. In: P. POTRAC, W, GILBERT and J. DENISON, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 486-497.

MORGAN, J. and KRONE, K., 2001. Bending the rules of “professional display”: emotional improvisation in caregiver performances. *Journal of Applied Communication Research.* 29(4), pp. 317-340.

MORRIS, A., 2015. *A Practical Guide to In-depth Interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MUNCEY, T. 2010. *Creating Autoethnographies.* London: Sage Publications.

MUNZ, P., 1985. *Our Knowledge of the Growth of Knowledge: Popper or Wittgenstein?* London: Routledge and Keegan Paul.

MYKHALOVSKIY, E., 1996. Reconsidering Table Talk: Critical thoughts on the relationship between sociology, autobiography and self-indulgence. *Qualitative Sociology.* 19(1), pp. 131-152.

NASH, C. and SPROULE, J., 2011. Insights into Experiences: Reflections of expert and novice coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching.* 6 (1), pp. 149-161.

NASH, C. and SPROULE, J,. 2012. Coaches’ perceptions of their coach education experiences. *International Journal of Sports Psychology* 43, pp. 33-52.

NAYLOR, D. and NYANJOM, J., 2021. Educators’ emotions involved in the transition to online teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research and Development*

[online]. 40(6), pp. 1236-1250. Available from: doi: 10.1080/07294360.2020.1811645 [Accessed 3rd November 2021].

NELSON, L., CUSHION, C. and POTRAC, P., 2013. Enhancing the provision of coach education: the recommendations of UK coaching practitioners. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy.* 18 (2), pp. 204-218.

NELSON, L., GROOM, R. and POTRAC, P., 2014. *Research Methods In Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge.

NELSON, L., POTRAC, P. and GROOM, R., 2014. The place of theory. In: L. Nelson, R. Groom and P. Potrac, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp.76-85.

NELSON, L., POTRAC, P., GILBOURNE, D., ALLANSON, A., GALE, L. and MARSHALL, P., 2013. Thinking, feeling, acting: The case of a semi-professional soccer coach. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 30 (4), pp. 467-486.

NICHOLL, H., 2010. Diaries as a method of data collection in research. *Paediatric Nursing.* 22(7), pp. 16-20.

NORTH, J., 2013. A critical realist approach to theorising coaching practice. In: P. POTRAC, W. GILBERT and J. DENISON, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 133-144.

NORTH, J., 2017. *Sport Coaching Research and Practice: Ontology, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Realism.* London: Routledge.

NOYES, A., 2004. Video diary: A method for exploring learning dispositions. *Cambridge Journal of Education,* 34 (2), pp. 193-209.

NYLANDER, P., LINDBERG, O. and BRUHN, A., 2011. Emotional labour and emotional strain among Swedish prison officers. *European Journal of Criminology.* 8 (6), pp. 469-483.

OATLEY, K., 1992. *Best Laid Schemes: The Psychology of Emotions.* Cambridge University Press.

OATLEY, K., 2009. Communications to self and others: Emotional experience and its skills. *Emotion Review.* 1 (3), pp. 206-213.

OGBONNA, E. and HARRIS, L.C., 2004. Work intensification and emotional labour among UK university lecturers: An exploratory study. *Organization Studies.* 25 (7), pp. 1185-1203.

OPLATKA, I., 2009. Emotion management and display in teaching. Some ethical and moral considerations in the era of marketization and commercialization. In: P.A., SCHUTZ and M. ZEMBYLAS, eds. *Advances in Teacher Emotion Research.* Springer. pp. 55-71.

OPLATKA, I. and IGLAN, D., 2020. The emotion of fear among schoolteachers: sources and coping strategies. *Educational Studies.* 46 (1), pp. 92-105.

PARASURAMAN, A., ZEITHAML, V.A. and BERRY, L.L., (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing,* 49 (4): pp. 41-50.

PATTERSON, A., 2005. Processes, relationships, settings, products and consumers: the case for qualitative diary research. *Qualitative Market Research.* 8 (2), pp. 142-156.

PATTON, M.Q., 2002. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods.* 3rd ed. London: Sage.

PATTON, M.Q., 2015. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice.* 4th ed. London: Sage.

PAUWELS, L,. 2010. Visual sociology reframed: An analytical synthesis and discussion of visual methods in social and cultural research. *Sociological Methods and Research.* 38 (4), pp. 545-581.

PEKRUN, R. and LINNENBRINK-GARCIA, L.. 2014. *International Handbook of Emotions in Education.* London: Routledge.

PELIAS, R.J., 2013. Writing autoethnography: The personal, poetic and performative as compositional strategies. In: S.J. HOLMAN-JONES, T.E. ADAMS, and C. ELLIS, eds. *Handbook of Autoethnography.* California: Left Coast Press. pp. 384-405.

PICKARD, A. J., 2013. *Research Methods in Information*. 2nd ed. London: Facet.

PICKERING, K., 2018. Learning the emotion rules of communicating within a law office: An intern constructs a professional identity through emotion management. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly.* 81 (2), pp. 199-221.

PIGGOTT, D., 2012. Coaches' experiences of formal coach education: a critical sociological investigation. *Sport, Education and Society.* 17 (4), pp. 535-554.

PIERCE, J., 1995. *Gender trials: Emotional lives in contemporary law firms.* Berkeley, CA: University of Berkeley Press.

PILLOW, W.S., 2010. Dangerous reflexivity: Rigour, responsibility and reflexivity in qualitative research. In. P. THOMPSON and M. WALKER, eds. *The Routledge Doctoral Student's Companion.* New York: Routledge. pp. 270-282.

POLE, C. and HILLYARD, S., 2016. *Doing Fieldwork.* London: Sage.

POPPER, K.R., 1972. *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge.* London: Routledge.

POTRAC, P. and JONES, R.L., 2009a. Power, Conflict and Cooperation: Towards a Micropolitics of Coaching. *Quest.* 61 (2), pp. 223-236.

POTRAC, P. and JONES, R.L., 2009b. Micropolitical workings in semi-professional football. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 26, pp. 557-577.

POTRAC, P., JONES., R., GILBOURNE, D. and NELSON, L., 2012. Handshakes, BBQs, and bullets: A tale of self-interest and regret in football coaching. *Sports Coaching Review.* 1, pp. 79-92.

POTRAC, P., JONES, R. and NELSON, L. 2014. Interpretivism. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM, and P. POTRAC, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 31-41.

POTRAC, P., JONES, R., PURDY, L., NELSON, L. and Marshall, P., 2013. Coaches, coaching, and emotion: A suggested research agenda. In: P. POTRAC, W. GILBERT, and J. DENISON, eds. *The Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 235-246.

POTRAC, P., MALLETT, C., GREENOUGH, K. and NELSON, L., 2017. Passion and paranoia: an embodied tale of emotion, identity, and pathos in sport coaching, *Sports Coaching Review.* 6 (2), pp. 142 -161.

POTRAC, P. and MARSHALL, P. 2011. Arlie Russell Hochschild: The managed heart, feeling rules and emotional labour: Coaching as an emotional endeavour. In: R.L. JONES, P. POTRAC, C. CUSHION, and L.T. RONGLAN, eds. *The Sociology of Sports Coaching* London: Routledge. pp. 54-66.

POTRAC, P., NELSON, L. and O'GORMAN, J., 2016. Exploring the everyday realities of grass-roots football coaching: towards a relational perspective. *Soccer and Society.* 17 (6), pp. 910-925.

POTRAC, P. and SMITH, A., 2014. Call for Papers: Emotions in Sports Coaching Special Issue of Sports Coaching Review. *Sports Coaching Review.* 3 (1), pp. 98-99.

POTRAC, P., SMITH, A. and NELSON, L., 2017. Emotions in sport coaching: an introductory essay. *Sports Coaching Review.* 6 (2), pp. 129-141.

PUGH, S. D., 2001. Service with a smile: Emotional contagion in the service encounter. *Academy of Management Journal.* 44 (5), pp. 1018-1027.

PURDY, L., 2014. Interviews. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM, and P. POTRAC, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp. 161-170.

PURDY, L. and JONES, R., 2011. Choppy waters: Elite rowers' percepRaf

REED-DANAHAY, D.E., 1997. Introduction *Auto/Ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social.* Oxford, Berg.

REICHERTZ, J., 2014. Induction, Deduction, Abduction. In: U. FLICK, K. METZLER and W. SCOTT, eds. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis.* Los Angeles: Sage. pp. 123-135.

REYERS, A. and MATUSITZ, J., 2012. Emotional regulation at Walt Disney World: An impression management view. *Journal of Workplace Behavioural Health.* 27 (3), pp. 139-159.

ROGERS, J.K., 1995. Just a temp: experience and structure of alienation in temporary clerical employment. *Work and Occupations*. 22, pp. 137-166.

RICHARDS, K.A.R. and TEMPLIN, T., 2012. Toward a multidimensional perspective on teacher-coach role conflict. *Quest.* 64 (3), pp. 164-176.

RICHARDSON, L., 2000. New Writing Practices in Qualitative Research. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 17, pp. 5-20.

RICHARDSON, J., 2010. Managing flexworkers: Holding on and letting go. *Journal of Management Development.* 29 (2), pp. 137-147.

RICHARDSON, L. and ST. PIERRE, A.E., 2008. Writing: A method of inquiry. In: N.K. DENZIN, and Y.S. LINCOLN, Y.S. eds. 3rd ed. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* London: Sage Publications

RIESE, J., 2019. What is ‘access’ in the context of qualitative research? *Qualitative Research.* 19 (6), pp. 669-684.

RITCHIE, S.M., HUDSON, P., BELLOCCHI, A., HENDERSON, S. and KING, D., 2016. Evolution of self-reporting methods for identifying discrete emotions in science classrooms. *Cultural Studies of Science Education,* 11 (3), pp. 577-593.

ROMO, L.K., 2017. College student-athletes’ communicative negotiation of emotional labor. *Communication and Sport.* 5(4), pp. 492-509.

ROSE, N., 1998. *Inventing Ourselves: psychology, power and personhood.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROULSTON, K., 2010. *Reflective Interviewing: A Guide to Theory and Practice.* London: Sage.

RUIZ, M. and HANIN, Y., 2011. Perceived impact of anger on performance of skilled karate athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise.* 12, pp. 242-249.

SARANTAKOS, S., 2013. *Social Research*. 4th ed. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

SAUNDERS, B., KITZINGER, J. and KITZINGER, C., 2015. Anonymising interview data: challenges and compromise in practice. *Qualitative Research.* 15(5), pp. 616-632.

SAVIN-BADEN, M. and MAJOR, C., 2013. *Qualitative research: The essential guide to theory and practice.* London: Routledge.

SAWIUK, R., LEWIS, C.J. and TAYLOR, W.G., 2021. “Long ball” and “balls deep”: A critical reading of female coach-learners’ experiences of the UEFA A Licence. [online] *Sports Coaching Review*. 10 (1), pp.110–127. Available from: doi: 10.1080/21640629.2021.1874688. [Accessed on 3 July 2021].

SCHEMPP, P. and GRABER, K., 1992. Teacher socialisation from a dialectical perspective: Pretraining through induction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education.* 11 (4), pp. 329-348.

SCHUTZ, P.A. and ZEMBYLAS, M. 2009. *Advances in Teacher Emotion Research.* New York: Springer.

SCHWARTZ-SHEA, P. and YANOW, D., 2012. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and processes.* New York: Routledge.

SCOTT, B.A. and BARNES, C.M., 2011. A multilevel field investigation of emotional labor, affect, work withdrawal, and gender. *Academy of Management Journal.* 54 (1), pp. 116-136.

SCOTT, C. and MYERS, K.K., 2005. The socialization of emotion: Learning emotion management at the fire station. *Journal of Applied Communication Research.* 33 (1), pp. 67-92.

SEEFELDT, V. and BROWN, E.W., 1990. *Program for Athletic Coaches Education (PACE).* Carmel: Benchmark Press.

SEYMOUR, D. and SANDIFORD, P., 2005. Learning emotion rules in service organisations: socialization and training in the UK public-house sector. *Work, Employment and Society.* 19 (3), pp. 547-564.

SHARMA, U. and BLACK, P., 2001. Look good, feel better: Beauty therapy as emotional labour. *Sociology.* 35 (4), pp. 913-931.

SHEBLE, L., THOMSON, L. and WILDEMUTH, B.M. 2016. Research diaries. In: B.M. WILDEMUTH, ed. *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science.* 2nd ed. California: Libraries Unlimited. pp. 228-238.

SLOAN, M., 2004. The effects of occupational characteristics on the experience and expression of anger in the workplace. *Work and Occupations.* 31, pp. 38-72.

SMITH, J.A., 2009 *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods.* 2nd ed. London: Sage.

SMITH, B., 2018. Generalizability in qualitative research: Misunderstandings, opportunities and recommendations for the sport and exercise sciences. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health.* 10(1): pp. 137-149.

SMITH, J. and DEEMER, D. 2000. The problem of criteria in the age of relativism. In: L. SMITH, D. DEEMER, N. DENZIN and Y. LINCOLN, *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 877-896.

SMITH, B. and MCGANNON, K.R., 2017. Developing rigor in qualitative research: problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology.* 11(1): pp.101-121.

SMITH, R.E., SMOLL, F.L. and BARNETT, N.P., 1995. Reduction of children's sport performance anxiety through social support and stress-reduction training for coaches. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology.* 16, pp. 125-142.

SMITH, R.E., SMOLL, F.L. and CUMMING, S.P., 2007. Effects of a motivational climate intervention for coaches on young athletes' sport performance anxiety. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology.* 29, pp. 39-59.

SMITH, R.E., SMOLL, F.L. and CURTIS, B., 1979. Coach effectiveness training: A cognitive-behavioural approach to enhancing relationship skills in youth sport coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology.* 1, pp. 59-75.

SMITH, R.E., SMOLL, F.L. and HUNT, E., 1977. A system for the behavioural assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly.* 48, pp. 401-407.

SMITH, B. and SPARKES, A., 2008. Contrasting perspectives on narrating selves and identities: an invitation to dialogue. *Qualitative Research.* 8 (1), pp. 5-35.

SMITH, B. and SPARKES, A., 2009. Narrative analysis and sport and exercise psychology: What can it mean, and why might we do it? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise.* 10, pp. 1-11.

SMITH, B. and SPARKES, A.C., 2016. Interviews: Qualitative interviewing in sport and exercise sciences. In: B.M. SMITH, A.C. SPARKES, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise.* London: Routledge. pp. 103-123.

SMITH, B., SPARKES, A. and CADDICK, N., 2014. Judging qualitative research. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM, and P. POTRAC, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp.192-201

SMOLL, F.L., SMITH, R.E., BARNETT, N.P. and EVERETT, J.J., 1993. Enhancement of children's self-esteem through social support training for youth sport coaches. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 78, pp. 602-610.

SPARKES, A.C., 1992. The paradigms debate: an extended review and celebration of difference. In: A. Sparkes, ed. *Research in Physical Education and Sport: Exploring Alternative Visions.* London: Falmer Press. pp. 9-60.

SPARKES, A., 1996. The fatal flaw. *Qualitative Inquiry.* 2(4), pp. 463 -494.

SPARKES, A.C., 1998. Validity in qualitative inquiry and the problem of criteria: Implications for Sports Psychology. *The Sport Psychologist.* 12, pp. 363-386.

SPARKES, A.C., 2000. Autoethnography and Narratives of Self: Reflections on Criteria in Action. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 17, pp. 21-43.

SPARKES, A.C., 2002a. Autoethnography: Self-indulgence or something more. In: A.P. BOCHNER, and C. Ellis, eds. *Ethnographically speaking: autoethnography, literature and aesthetics.* Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press. pp. 209-232.

SPARKES, A.C., 2002b. Fictional Representations: On Difference, Choice and Risk. *Sociology of Sport Journal.* 19, pp. 1-24.

SPARKES, A.C., 2002c. *Telling Tales in Sport and Physical Activity: A Qualitative Journey.* Leeds, Human Kinetics.

SPARKES, A.C. and SMITH, B., 2009. Judging the quality of qualitative inquiry: criteriology and relativism in action. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise.* 10, pp. 491-497.

SPARKES, A.C. and SMITH, B., 2014. *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise and Health: From Process to Product*. London, Routledge.

SPOWART, L. and NAIRN, K., 2014. (Re)performing emotions in diary-interviews. *Qualitative Research.* 14(3), pp. 327-340.

SRIVASTAVA, P. and HOPWOOD, N., 2009. A practical iterative framework for qualitative data analysis. *The International Journal of Qualitative Methods.* 8(1), pp. 76-84.

STETS, J. E., and TURNER, J. H., 2007. *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*. New York: Springer.

STODTER, A. and CUSHION, C. J., 2014. Coaches' Learning and Education: A Case Study of Cultures in Conflict. *Sports Coaching Review*. 3(1), pp. 63–79.

STREAN, W., 1998. Possibilities for qualitative research in sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist.* 12, pp. 333-345.

STENROSS, B. and KLEINMAN, S., 1989. The highs and lows of emotional labor: Detectives' encounters with criminals and victims. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.* 17 (4), pp. 435-452.

STODTER, A., COPE, E. and TOWNSEND, R.C., 2021. Reflective conversations as a basis for sport coaches' learning: a theory-informed pedagogic design for educating reflective practitioners. [Online] *Professional Development in Education.* Available

from: https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1902836. [Accessed on 9 October 2021].

STODTER, A. and CUSHION, C.J., 2014. Coaches' learning and education: a case study of cultures in conflict. *Sports Coaching Review.* 3 (1), pp. 63-79.

STOSZKOWSKI, J. and COLLINS, D., 2014. Communities of practice, social learning and networks: Exploiting the social side of coach development. *Sport, Education and Society.* 19 (6): pp. 773-788.

SUTTON, R.I., 1991. Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 36, pp. 245-268.

SUTTON, R., 2005. Teachers' emotions and classroom effectiveness. *The Clearing House,* 78, pp. 229-234.

TAYLOR, J., 2011. The intimate insider: negotiating the ethics of friendship when doing insider research. *Qualitative Research.* 11 (1), pp. 3-22.

TAYLOR, W., 2014. Analysis of qualitative data. In: L. NELSON, R. GROOM, and P. POTRAC, eds. *Research Methods in Sports Coaching.* London: Routledge. pp.181-191.

TAYLOR, A., 2020. The effect of emotional labour on English teachers in Japan. *Issues in Educational Research.* 30 (4), pp. 1539-1557.

TAYLOR, B. and GARRATT, D., 2010. The professionalization of sports coaching: definitions, challenges and critique. In: J. LYLE, and C. CUSHION, eds. *Sports Coaching: Professionalization and Practice.* Edinburgh: Elsevier. pp. 99-119.

THANH, N. and THANH, T., 2015. The interconnection between interpretivist paradigm and qualitative methods in education. *American Journal of Educational Science.* 1 (2), pp. 24-27.

THEODOSIUS, C., 2008. *Emotional Labour in Health Care: The Unmanaged Heart of Nursing.* London: Routledge.

THOITS, P.A., 1984. Coping, social support, and psychological outcomes: The central role of emotion. In: P. Shaver, ed. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology.* Vol, 5. California, Sage. pp. 219-238.

THOITS., P.A., 1986. Social support as coping assistance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 54, pp. 416-423.

THOITS, P.A., 1989. The Sociology of Emotions. *Annual Review of Sociology.* 15, pp. 317-342.

THOITS, P.A., 2004. Emotion norms, emotion work, and social order. In: A. MANSTEAD, N. FRIJDA, and A. FISCHER, eds. *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium.* New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 359-378.

THOITS, P.A., 2011. Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour.* 52(2), pp. 145-161.

THOMAS, R. and HOLLAND, J., 2005. 'Thanks for the memory': memory books as a methodological resource in biographical research. *Qualitative Research.* 5 (2), pp. 201-219.

TIMMERS, M., FISCHER, A.H., and MANSTEAD, A.S.R., 1998. Gender differences in motives for regulating emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.* 24, pp. 974-985.

TOLICH, M., 2004. Internal confidentiality: when confidentiality assurances fail relational informants. *Qualitative Sociology.* 27 (1), pp. 101-106.

TONER, J., NELSON, L., POTRAC, P., GILBOURNE, D. and MARSHALL, P., 2012. From 'blame' to 'shame' in a Coach-Athlete Relationship in Golf: A Tale of Shared

Critical Reflection and the Re-Storying of Narrative Experience. *Sports Coaching Review*. 1 (1), pp. 67–78.

TOWNSEND, R.C. and CUSHION, C., 2017. Elite cricket coach education: a Bourdieusian analysis. *Sport, Education and Society.* 22 (4), pp. 528-546.

TRACY, S.J., 2005. Locking up emotion: Moving beyond dissonance for understanding emotion labor discomfort. *Communication Monographs,* 72 (3), pp. 261-283.

TRACY, S.J., 2013. *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact.* London, Wiley-Blackwell,

TRACY, S.J., 2018. A phronetic, iterative approach to data analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Qualitative Research.* 19 (2), pp. 61-76.

TRACY, S.J., 2019. *Qualitative Research Methods: Collecting Evidence, Crafting Analysis, Communicating Impact.* London, Wiley-Blackwell.

TRACY, S.J., and TRACY, K. 1998. Emotion labor at 911: A case study and theoretical critique. *Journal of Applied Communication Research.* 26 (4), pp. 390-411.

TSAI, W., 2001. Determinants and consequences of employee displayed positive emotions, *Journal of Management.* 27, pp. 497-512.

TURNER, J. and STETS, J., 2005. *The Sociology of Emotions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VAN KLEEF, G.A., DEDREU, C.K.W. and MANSTEAD, A.S.R., 2006. Supplication and appeasement in conflict and negotiation: The interpersonal effects of disappointment, worry, guilt and regret. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 91 (1), pp. 124-142.

VAN MAANEN, J. and KUNDA, G., 1989. "Real feelings": Emotional expressions and organisational culture. In: B.M. STAW and L.L. CUMMINGS eds. *Research in Organisational Behavior.* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

VEAL, A.J. and DARCY, S., 2014. *Research Methods in Sport Studies and Sport Management: A practical guide.* London: Routledge.

VOLDBY, C.R. and KLEIN-DØSSING, R., 2020. I thought we were supposed to learn how to become better coaches: Developing coach education through action research. *Educational Action Research.* 28 (3), pp. 534-553.

VON GILSA, L., ZAPF, D., OHLY, S., TRUMPOLD, K. and MACHOWSKI, S., 2014. There is more than obeying display rules: Service employees' motives for emotion regulation in customer interactions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology.* 23 (6), pp. 884-896.

WALL, S. 2006. An autoethnography on learning about autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Research Methods.* 5 (2), pp. 146-60.

WALFORD, G., 2005. Research ethical guidelines and anonymity. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education.* 28 (1), pp. 83-93.

WARD, J. and MCMURRAY, R., 2011. The unspoken word of general practitioner receptionists: A re-examination of emotion management in primary care. *Social Science and Medicine.* 72 (10), pp. 1583-1587.

WARD, J. and MCMURRAY, R., 2016. *The Dark Side of Emotional Labour.* Abingdon: Routledge.

WARD, J., MCMURRAY, R. and SUTCLIFFE, S., 2019. Working at the edge: Emotional labour in the spectre of violence. *Gender, Work and Organization.* 27 (1), pp. 82-97.

WATTS, D.W. and CUSHION, C.J., 2017. Coaching Journeys: Longitudinal Experiences from Professional Football in Great Britain. *Sports Coaching Review*. 6 (1), pp. 76–93.

WATTS, D, CUSHION, C, and CALE, L., 2021. Exploring professional coach educators' journeys and perceptions and understandings of learning. *Sport, Education and Society*. Available from: https://10.1080/13573322.2021.1887115. [Accessed on 21 August 2021].

WEBB, K. and LEEDER, T.M., 2021. Dispositions and coaching theories: understanding the impact of coach education on novice coaches' learning. *Sport, Education and Society.* Available from: https://doi:10.1080/13573322.2021.18878846 [Accessed on 19 September 2021].

WENGER, E., 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WERTHNER, P. and TRUDEL, P., 2009. Investigating the idiosyncratic learning paths of elite Canadian coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching.* 4 (3), pp. 433-449.

WHARTON, A.S., 1993. The affective consequences of service work: Managing emotions on the job. *Work and Occupations.* 20 (2), pp. 205-232.

WILLIAMS, M., 2000. Interpretivism and generalisation. *Sociology.* 34 (2), pp. 209-224.

WILLIG, C., 2001. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology: Adventures in Theory and Method.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

WILLIG, C., 2008. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology: Adventures in Theory and Method.* 2nd. ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.

WILLIG, C., 2013. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology: Adventures in Theory and Method.* 3rd. ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.

WILLIS, J.W., 2007. *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive and critical approaches.* London: Sage.

WINOGRAD, K., 2003. The functions of teacher emotions: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Teachers College Record.* 105 (9), pp. 1641-1673.

WOLCOTT, H.F., 2005. *The Art of Fieldwork.* Walnut Creek CA: AltaMira Press.

WOLCOTT, H.F., 2008. Ethnography: A Way of Seeing. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

WRENCH, J.S., PUNYANUNT-CARTER, N. and WARD, M., 2015. *Organizational Communication: Theory, Research, and Practice.* Washington, D.C. Flat World Knowledge.

WRIGHT, T., TRUDEL, P. and CULVER, D., 2007. Learning how to coach: The different learning situations reported by youth ice hockey coaches. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy.* 12 (2), pp. 669-717.

YEO, A., LEGARD, R., KEEGAN, J., WARD, K., MCNAUGHTON NICHOLLS, C. and LEWIS, J., 2014. In-Depth interviews. In: J. RITCHIE, J. LEWIS, C. MCNAUGHTON NICHOLLS, and R. ORMSTON, eds. 2nd ed. *Qualitative Research Practice.* London: Sage. pp.177-210.

YIN, H. and LEE, J.C., 2012. Be passionate, but be rational as well: Emotional rules for Chinese teachers' work. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 28, pp. 56-65.

YOON, B. and ULIASSI, C., (2022). “Researcher-As-Instrument” in qualitative research: The complexities of the educational researcher’s identities. *The Qualitative Report,* 27(4), pp. 1088-1102.

ZEMBYLAS, M., 2002. Constructing genealogies of teachers' emotions in science teaching. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching.* 39 (1), pp. 79–103.

ZEMBYLAS, M., 2004. The emotional characteristics of teaching: An ethnographic study of one teacher. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 20, pp.185-201.

ZEMBYLAS, M., 2005a. Beyond teacher cognition and teacher beliefs: the value of the ethnography of emotions in teaching. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* 18 (4), pp. 465-487.

ZEMBYLAS, M., 2005b. Discursive practices, genealogies, and emotional rules: A poststructuralist view on emotion and identity in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 21, pp. 935-984.

ZEMBYLAS, M., 2005c. *Teaching With Emotion: A Postmodern Enactment.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

ZEMBYLAS, M., 2007a. Theory and methodology in researching emotions in education. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*. 30:1, pp. 57-72.

ZEMBYLAS, M. 2007b. 'Emotional ecology: The intersection of emotional knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge in teaching'. *Teaching and Teacher Education.* 23 (4), pp. 355-367.

ZEMBYLAS, M., THEODOROU, M. and PAVLAKIS, A., 2008. The role of emotions in the experience of online learning: challenges and opportunities. *Educational Media International.* 45 (2), pp. 107-117.

ZEITHAML, V.A. and BITNER, M.J., 2000. *Services Marketing.* McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA.