

1 **Investigating Policy Enactment in Community Sport Coaching:**
2 **Directions for Future Research**

3 Ben Ives^{a,b*}, Dawn Penney^c, Jimmy O’Gorman^d, Adam J. Nichol^e, Paul
4 Potrac^e, and Lee Nelson^d

5 *^aManchester Metropolitan University Institute of Sport, Manchester, UK; ^bDepartment*
6 *of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Musculoskeletal Science and Sports Medicine Research*
7 *Centre, Faculty of Science & Engineering, Manchester Metropolitan University,*
8 *Manchester, UK; ^cSchool of Education, Edith Cowan University, Perth, Western*
9 *Australia, AU; ^dDepartment of Sport and Physical Activity, Edge Hill University, UK;*
10 *^eThe Department of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation, Northumbria University,*
11 *Newcastle, UK.*

12 *Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ben Ives, Manchester
13 Metropolitan University, Room 1.02, Institute of Sport Building, 99 Oxford Road,
14 Manchester, M1 7EL. Email: b.ives@mmu.ac.uk

15 **Biographical Note**

16 **Ben Ives** is a Senior Lecturer in Sport Coaching for the Department of Sport and
17 Exercise Sciences at Manchester Metropolitan University, UK. Twitter: @BenIves1;
18 ORCID: 0000-0002-7262-0693

19 **Dawn Penney** is a Professor in the School of Education at Edith Cowan University,
20 AU. Twitter: @profdpenney; ORCID: 0000-0002-2000-8953

21 **Jimmy O’Gorman** is a Senior Lecturer in Senior Lecturer in Sports Development,
22 Management and Coaching in the Department of Sport and Physical Activity at Edge
23 Hill University, UK. Twitter: @DrJimmyOGorman; ORCID: 0000-0002-2524-3223

24 **Adam Nichol** is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sport, Exercise and
25 Rehabilitation at Northumbria University, UK. Twitter: @AdamNichol14; ORCID:
26 0000-0002-9319-9703

27 **Paul Potrac** is a Professor in the Department of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation at
28 Northumbria University, UK. ORCID: 0000-0001-9616-6491

29 **Lee Nelson** is a Reader in Sport Coaching in the Department of Sport and Physical
30 Activity at Edge Hill University, UK. Twitter: @XX; ORCID: 0000-0002-7491-2382

31

32

33 **Investigating Policy Enactment in Community Sport Coaching:**
34 **Directions for Future Research**

35 This article calls for a sophisticated investigation of policy enactment in sport-
36 related environments, with community sport coaching used as an example case.
37 Emphasis is placed on the need for in-depth empirical research into and
38 theorisation of: 1) political skills involved in the enactment of policy; 2)
39 performative and fabricated aspects of policy enactment; 3) emotion management
40 when enacting policy; and 4) impacts of policy enactment for the health and
41 wellbeing of workers. In doing so, this article challenges scholars to move
42 beyond the study of policy actor types and to develop more nuanced
43 understandings of the political, economic, organisational, interpersonal, and
44 intrapersonal forces influencing those involved in policy enactment. It is hoped
45 that this article will encourage original and high-quality research into how sport,
46 physical activity, and physical education policies are enacted by its workforce
47 and provide a stimulus for professional learning about policy work across
48 sporting communities.

49 **Keywords:** Policy enactment; coaching; political skill; fabrications; emotion
50 management; wellbeing

51

52 **Introduction**

53 While policy enactment has garnered significant academic attention in educational
54 settings (e.g., Ball, 1993; Ball et al., 2012; Evans et al., 2019), there is still much to be
55 learned about how organisations and workers translate, interpret, reinvent, and enact
56 policy in sport-related environments (Hammond et al., 2020; O’Gorman et al., 2021;
57 Penney & Alfrey, 2022). Indeed, it is our position that the enactment of policy in
58 sporting contexts remains under-investigated and under-theorised. This article therefore
59 offers empirical and theoretical ideas to help scholars conduct original and high-quality
60 research into how sport, physical activity, and physical education policies are enacted
61 by their respective workforces. Specifically, this article calls for a more sophisticated
62 application of Stephen Ball and colleagues’ (e.g., Ball, 1993; Ball et al., 2012)
63 theorisation of policy enactment and proposes additional heuristic frameworks (e.g.,
64 Goffman, 1959, 1974; Harris, 2015; Hartley et al., 2015; Thoits, 2011) to help
65 researchers better consider how workers interpret, experience, and deal with the
66 multiple, and sometimes contradictory, demands of their policy work (e.g., unrelenting
67 flood of initiatives, changes, and reforms). This is achieved via consideration of policy
68 enactment in community sport coaching work as an example case. In doing so, this
69 article makes an original contribution to scholarship concerned with policy enactment in
70 sporting contexts by calling for research that addresses how personal, intra-, inter-, and
71 extra-organisational forces a) shape the use of various, strategic practices and b) impact
72 the health and wellbeing of the community sport coaching workforce.

73 ***From Policy Implementation to Policy Enactment***

74 The investigation of sport policy is not new, with a growing body of research evaluating
75 “how well” policies are realised in practice (Chen, 2018). Much of this work has,
76 however, continued to position policy as a linear process in which policy is developed

77 in one arena and then passed down to others for implementation (Penney et al., 2022). It
78 has focused on opposing theoretical, empirical, and methodological ideas centred on the
79 value of either top-down or bottom-up schools of thought (Hupe, 2014). Stephen Ball
80 and colleagues' (Ball, 1993; Ball et al., 2012), in the context of education, have
81 challenged the value and appropriateness of such functionalist representations of the
82 policy process. They argued that policies are *enacted* rather than *implemented* and that
83 these enactments encompass acts of interpretation, translation, practice, and
84 performance, which "take place in many moments, in various sites, in diverse forms, in
85 many combinations and interplays [and] bring together contextual, historic, and
86 psychosocial dynamics into a relation with texts and imperatives to produce actions and
87 activities that are policy" (Ball et al., 2012, p. 71).

88 In response to these observations, researchers in sport, physical activity, and
89 physical education have started to examine how organisations and workers enact, rather
90 than implement, policy. For example, Penney and Alfrey (2022) used Ball's writings to
91 reimagine the policy process in physical education contexts. They noted that "the (re-)
92 conceptualisations of policy processes and relations" progressively developed through
93 Ball's research centring on enactment, have "largely rendered the language of policy
94 *making* and *implementation* as dated if not entirely redundant" (p. 3 *original emphasis*).
95 Reference to enactment is thus integral to changing perceptions of *who* is involved in
96 policy, in *what ways*, under *what conditions*, and in various contexts. It also
97 fundamentally challenges what we understand policy to be. Enactment foregrounds
98 process and argues that policy remains in a constant state of re-negotiation through the
99 actions and interactions of the many individuals who are invested, implicated, and
100 impacted in and by policy (Penney & Alfrey, 2022).

101 Ball and colleagues' theorisation of how schools and teachers "do" educational
102 policy has generated concepts that seek to bring to fore the fluidity and adhocery of
103 policy, the influence of multifaceted policy contexts, and the complex discursive and
104 power-relations at play in policy work and positionings of various policy actors (Ball,
105 1993; Ball et al., 2012). These policy actor types include, for example: a) policy
106 narrators and translators, who give meaning to policy in particular contexts through
107 guidance or statements outlining implications and the actions that are, or are not,
108 possible within the bounds of policy; b) policy enthusiasts who model enactment in
109 their own practice and who are advocates and influencers; c) policy entrepreneurs who
110 creatively explore the opportunities that policy presents; d) policy critics who pursue
111 ways to resist policy directions and/or imperatives; e) policy transactors whose policy
112 work centres on mechanisms, systems, and investments to monitor, facilitate, and report
113 on enactment; and f) policy receivers who seek guidance and direction and are often
114 focused on compliance in responding to policy (Ball et al., 2012). Research by Penney
115 and colleagues has usefully served to demonstrate the utility of Ball's concepts for
116 understanding how physical education teacher educators (Lambert & Penney, 2020),
117 physical education teachers (Wilkinson et al., 2021), and coaches (Hammond et al.,
118 2020) variously adopt multiple and hybrid policy actor positions when enacting policy.

119 ***Policy Enactment in Community Sport Coaching: Moving Beyond Policy Actor***
120 ***Types***

121 While additional research into policy actor types is warranted and necessary, in this
122 article we encourage those interested in the investigation of sport, physical activity, and
123 physical education policy to extend their analytical gaze beyond this consideration. We
124 argue that researchers need to consider how policy actors (e.g., senior managers, middle
125 managers, and coaches) strategically navigate their policy work in response to political,

126 economic, organisational, interpersonal, and intrapersonal influences. Research also
127 needs to take better account of the impacts of policy work on the health and wellbeing
128 of its workforce. In the current article, these arguments are presented in relation to the
129 study of community sport coaching. However, we believe that the empirical and
130 theoretical ideas proposed hold utility for the study of policy enactment across
131 performance, community, and educational contexts. The decision to formulate our
132 writings around community sport coaching was driven by the importance state agencies
133 have placed on this workforce to address policy objectives and societal concerns
134 relating to physical and mental wellbeing, as well as individual, community, economic,
135 and social development (Smith et al., 2022). However, the level of scholarly attention
136 devoted to community sport coaching has yet to match the significance policy makers
137 have attached to this workforce. We hope this article will therefore encourage the field
138 to rectify this position.

139 The lack of academic inquiry dedicated to policy enactment in community sport
140 coaching can perhaps be explained by the fact that many practitioners and coaching
141 scholars do not readily associate everyday coaching practice with matters of policy
142 (Penney et al., 2022). Invariably, policy tends to be regarded as something distinct from
143 the act of coaching itself. In this article we contest this position. We contend that
144 workers in the field of community sport coaching are not merely the subjects or
145 recipients *of* policy, they are active players *in* policy, shaping the meanings and
146 experiences of policy in these settings. It is also important to recognise that these
147 workers, like all social actors involved in the enactment of policy, have aspirations,
148 hopes, fears, and worries and are bound up in networks of relations that are influenced
149 by economic and social forces, institutions, people and interests, and, sometimes, pure
150 chance (Ball et al., 2012; Ives et al., 2016). In this sense, the ways in which policies

151 become interpreted, translated, reconstructed, and enacted by the community sport
152 coaching workforce, are directly connected to local resources – material or human –
153 broader social forces, employment trends and conditions, job satisfaction, coach
154 education and training programmes, and life outside of work. Unfortunately, scholars
155 have yet to adequately consider and fully explore these realities.

156 To inspire concerted scholarly activity to help redress this situation, our article
157 proposes four distinct but overlapping areas we feel are worthy of empirical and
158 theoretical attention. Following this extended introduction, we discuss the macro- and
159 micro-political contexts in which community sport coaching work takes place and argue
160 the need to investigate if, how, when, why, and under which circumstances policy actors
161 deploy political skills. Subsequently, we explore the performative nature of community
162 sport coaching policy work and call for inquiry into how the workforce might use
163 impression management and deceptive impression management strategies. The article
164 then progresses to discuss the emotional features of policy work in this context, inviting
165 scholars to investigate how practitioners manage their own and others' emotions.
166 Finally, the article makes a case for detailed inquiry into the potential health and
167 wellbeing impacts of policy work for the community sport coaching workforce. Across
168 each of these sections, we take stock of existing empirical knowledge, consider research
169 from other occupational settings, and introduce social theory to inspire new lines of
170 academic inquiry and associated sense making. The article ends with a brief conclusion,
171 which summarises the key arguments and reaffirms our call for original, high-quality,
172 and impactful research into the enactment of policy in sport, physical activity, and
173 physical education contexts.

174 **Policy Enactment, Macropolitics, Micropolitics, and Political Action**

175 Researchers have charted how workers in the field of community sport coaching have
176 been affected by the political, economic, and policy climate within which they find
177 themselves (Smith et al., 2022). They argue that community sport coaching work is
178 impacted by a broadening policy landscape, with sport-based initiatives being
179 increasingly identified and used as a vehicle to address a range of non-sporting policy
180 concerns in addition to increasing physical activity levels among underrepresented
181 groups. This has diversified the role of the community coach and requires them to work
182 with a range of organisations and stakeholders, including those in public health, crime,
183 and law and order. Researchers have also explained how workers in community sport
184 coaching are not immune to neoliberal political and economic trends (Coakley, 2022;
185 Ives et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2022), which (Coakley, 2021, p. 14) describes as an
186 “interrelated set of ideas and beliefs organised around a commitment to free markets,
187 political deregulation, privatisation, the pursuit of individual self-interest, and
188 competitive reward structures that are assumed to inspire individual success leading to
189 economic prosperity”. In the United Kingdom, for example, the election of the 1997
190 Labour Government witnessed the introduction of a modernisation agenda, continued
191 by consecutive offices, which delivered a more extensive range of technologies of
192 government (Houlihan & Green, 2009). These included performance management
193 techniques, target-setting, as well as audits and inspections linked to the funding of
194 sport schemes (Houlihan & Green, 2009).

195 Since the 1970s there has also been a general shift in many Western nations
196 towards precarious and insecure employment relations “in which employees bear the
197 risks of work (as opposed to businesses or the government) and receive limited social
198 benefits and statutory protections from the point of view of the worker” (Kalleberg &
199 Vallas, 2018, p. 1). In the context of sport and physical education, Kirk (2020) has

200 argued that neoliberal practices have steadily wormed their way into employment
201 settings meaning that, for many, work is now temporary, insecure, poorly paid, and
202 sporadic. The knock-on effect of such precarity is that workers' everyday lives,
203 including community sport coaches, are unstable, insecure, and uncertain (Kirk, 2020).
204 Community sport coaching in many countries, then, "often takes place within a highly
205 pressurised, politicised, and precarious policy context [...] with tightly 'controlled'
206 targets set by central government in the background" (Smith et al., 2022, p. 19).

207 Against this macropolitical backdrop, practitioners in community sport coaching
208 find themselves working in cooperation and/or conflict with a range of key contextual
209 stakeholders, both inside and outside their organisations, who are driven by differing
210 aspirations, goals, preferences, roles, and responsibilities. The role of micropolitics
211 therefore is an inescapable and generalised part of working life for these individuals
212 (Potrac et al., 2022). For the purposes of clarity, we term micropolitics as:

213 The use of formal and informal power by individuals and groups to achieve
214 their goals. In large part, political actions result from perceived differences
215 between individuals and groups, coupled with a motivation to use power and
216 influence and/or to protect. [...] Both co-operative and conflicting actions and
217 processes are part of the realm of micropolitics [while] the macro and the
218 micro frequently interact (Blase, 1991, p. 11).

219 Importantly, and as the above quotation demonstrates, micropolitics should not
220 be considered separate from macropolitics. Rather, there is a symbiotic relationship
221 between those personal, intra-, inter-, and extra-organisational mechanisms within
222 which community sport coaching work takes place (Ives et al., 2021). For example,
223 researchers have suggested that this precarious and political occupational space may
224 further amplify sport coaches' experience of vulnerability (Corsby et al., 2022; Potrac &
225 Jones, 2009). Drawing on Kelchtermans (2009) theorisation of structural vulnerability

226 in education, Ives et al. (2016) described how vulnerability for community sport
227 coaches stemmed from: 1) not being in control of the environments in which they work
228 (quality control systems, insecure employment conditions, policy demands); 2) being
229 unable to fully prove or guarantee the effectiveness of their choices and actions; and 3)
230 occupying a position in which their decisions can always be challenged or questioned
231 by others. In order to cope with such working conditions, community sport coaches
232 have been found to engage in various micropolitical actions, including impression
233 management, emotional labour, remedial work, and expression games to appear credible
234 and professionally proficient, assess the trustworthiness of others, reconcile
235 relationships following conflict, and to facilitate productive interactions and
236 relationships (Gale et al., 2019, 2023; Ives et al., 2021). These micropolitical practices
237 constituted a response to multifaceted threats to the workers' professional identities,
238 such as coping with insecure employment conditions and audit-driven performance
239 management techniques, as well as a more general determination to maintain individual
240 pride.

241 While the abovementioned studies have offered useful early insights, future
242 research should endeavour to provide a more sophisticated understanding of the
243 interconnections between, and impact of, the macropolitical context in which
244 community sport coaching work is enacted and the set of capabilities – skills,
245 knowledge, judgement, and behaviours – that these workers need. This should include:
246 a) the identification of which political skills they use and in relation to which working
247 others; b) the regularity of their application; c) how these skills are deployed as part of
248 their work; d) which personal, intra-, inter-, and extra-organisational generative forces
249 inform their use; e) how practitioners acquire these skills, including the extent to which
250 formal coach education and in-house training adequately contributed to their

251 development; and f) differences between the political skill levels of workers in this
252 context and how these facilitate and/or constrain attempts to achieve personal,
253 organisational, and policy objectives. When addressing these issues, researchers would
254 also do well to consider how intersectionality (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, social class,
255 etc.) influence the contextual reading and performative responses of social actors in
256 these community sport coaching settings.

257 To extend knowledge in this area, we encourage scholars to draw on, and learn
258 from, published research within the field of organisational management, which has
259 repeatedly demonstrated how acting politically is important for workplace success.
260 Within this body of literature, political acts have been variously termed: “political skill”
261 (Ferris et al., 2005), “political savvy” (Chao et al., 1994), “political acumen” (Perrewé
262 & Nelson, 2004), “political nous” (Baddeley & James, 1990), “socio-political
263 intelligence” (Burke, 2006), “political sensitivity” (Vredenburg & Maurer, 1984), and
264 “political astuteness” (Hartley et al., 2015). As an initial starting point for researching
265 and understanding political acts in community sport coaching contexts, Nelson et al.
266 (2022) have suggested that Ferris et al.’s (2005) political skill framework might prove
267 valuable. According to Ferris et al. (2005, p. 7) political skill refers to how workers use
268 four distinct but interrelated social sensibilities (social astuteness, interpersonal
269 influence, networking, apparent sincerity) “to understand others at work and to use that
270 knowledge to influence others to act in ways that enhance one’s personal or
271 organisational objectives”. Relatedly, Potrac et al. (2022) highlight the potential utility
272 of Hartley’s political astuteness framework, which is concerned with how workers
273 deploy “political skills in situations involving diverse and sometimes competing
274 interests and stakeholders, in order to create sufficient alignment of interests and/or
275 consent in order to achieve outcomes” (Hartley et al., 2015, p. 24). For Hartley, political

276 astuteness comprises five dimensions: 1) strategic direction and scanning; 2) building
277 alignment and alliances; 3) reading people and situations; 4) interpersonal skills; and 5)
278 personal skills. The frameworks of Ferris and Hartley, as well as other organisational
279 management scholars (Burke, 2006; Perrewé & Nelson, 2004), could potentially be
280 used individually or in conjunction to generate a more comprehensive understanding of
281 if, how, why, and under which circumstances workers in community sport coaching act
282 politically when doing policy work.

283 **Policy Enactment, Emotion Norms, and Emotion Management**

284 Like Ball and colleagues (2012, p. 8) we are of the opinion that “policies are suffused
285 with emotions and with psychosocial tensions” and that they “can threaten or disrupt
286 self-worth, purpose, and identity” as well as “enthuse or depress anger”. However,
287 notwithstanding some notable exceptions (Ives et al., 2016; Ives et al., 2022; Potrac et
288 al., 2017; Scott-Bell et al., 2021), emotion remains a largely under-researched
289 component of policy enactment, including in community sport coaching work. To
290 redress this situation, we urge academics to pay more direct attention to the
291 phenomenon of emotion norms, how they are socially (re)learned or revised over time,
292 and how they shape the feelings, expressions, practices, and evaluations of community
293 sport workers when enacting policy. When conducting such research, scholars may wish
294 to draw upon the work of Harris (2015) who stated that emotion norms are usually
295 learned via two types of rule reminders, namely direct socialisation (e.g., where others
296 explicitly tell individuals what the rules are) and indirect socialisation (e.g., where
297 individuals merely infer how to act and feel in particular situations by observing the
298 behaviour of other people). Harris (2015) also explained how individuals are taught to
299 follow emotion norms through the course of their daily interactions, or else face the risk
300 of formal and/or informal sanctioning. Groups, organisations, and whole industries thus

301 have the capacity to shape, change, or even control workers' dispositions or beliefs so
302 that they are inclined to experience and/or display emotions that are in-line with their
303 dominant norms, policies, values, and ambitions. Scholars concerned with policy
304 enactment in community sport coaching have yet to adequately consider and explore
305 these realities.

306 Societal influences, however, do not always produce norm compliance. As
307 Elder-Vass (2010, p. 126) has previously noted, while the "social institution may
308 produce a tendency to comply with the relevant norm", because individual behaviour is
309 "multiply determined, other causal factors – such as other conflicting normative
310 motivations, the belief that a norm could be transgressed without being detected, or
311 strong emotional drives" – may lead to social actors exercising agency, creativity, and
312 autonomy. It is therefore also important to examine if, when, how, why, and under
313 which circumstances workers in community sport coaching do not conform to emotion
314 norms, as well as the consequences of such behaviour (Nichol et al., 2023). When
315 conducting such research, scholars may find it helpful to draw upon the work of
316 Charmaz et al. (2019) who suggest that an individual can commit emotional deviance in
317 at least five different ways (i.e., type, intensity, duration, timing, and placing). These
318 authors further state that individuals may commit emotional deviance for a variety of
319 reasons, including, for example: a) entering a new situation and being ignorant of the
320 rules; b) prior socialisation that differs from the expectations of current situation; c)
321 knowing and wanting to conform to emotion norms, but not being able to do so; d)
322 disagreeing with the morality or wisdom of an emotion norm; f) mental illness; and g)
323 to validate their deviant feelings and persuade others to pursue social change.

324 The concept of emotion norms also raises important questions for how policy
325 actors "work on" their emotions to conform to emotion norms and wider social-political

326 pressures, impress audiences, and/or accomplish other goals. Previous research has
327 largely drawn on Hochschild's (2012) theorisation of emotion norms, surface acting,
328 and deep acting to demonstrate how sport workers manage their emotional experiences
329 and displays in line with occupational expectations (Ives et al., 2022; Magill et al.,
330 2017; Nelson et al., 2013). While we certainly see value in continued applications of
331 Hochschild's theorisation, we also encourage scholars to make use of additional
332 sensemaking frameworks to enable more nuanced understandings of policy workers'
333 emotion management strategies. For example, Harris (2015) contends that social actors
334 use up to five different surface acting strategies to control how they appear to feel
335 during interactions with others. They may strategically select their wording, tone of
336 voice, facial expressions, bodily gestures, and/or clothing. Harris also stated individuals
337 attempt to change the emotions that they experience via three different deep acting
338 techniques, namely 1) bodily deep acting, 2) expressive deep acting, and 3) cognitive
339 deep acting. In addition to the writing of Harris, researchers might also consider the
340 work of Thoits (1990), who suggests that people perform emotion management by
341 changing cognitive or behavioural (or both) components of their subjective emotional
342 experience. That is, a social actor can target situational cues, physiological sensations,
343 expressive behaviours, and/or emotion labels.

344 Another area that remains significantly under-researched and under-theorised is
345 how policy actors in community sport coaching manage the emotions of other
346 stakeholders in the policy process, including participants, parents/carers, funders,
347 external partners, line managers, colleagues, among others. One way to redress this
348 situation would be to draw upon the theoretical ideas of Thoits (1996) who suggested
349 that leaders can deliberately manipulate group members' feelings through several
350 interpersonal strategies. These include: a) managing their own emotions and emotional

351 displays in order to shape how members feel and act; b) using props to incite certain
352 feeling states in other stakeholders; c) individual or group enactments which encourage
353 members to talk about their thoughts and feelings with leaders and/or other members; d)
354 deliberate provocations to generate strong emotional (often negative) reactions in
355 members; e) physical-effort techniques to heighten members' physiological arousal and
356 stimulate desirable emotional states; f) comforting members; and g) encouraging group
357 supportive acts to generate social acceptance, understanding, and positive emotional
358 states.

359 Existing research within the field of sport coaching indicates that emotion
360 management may incite both positive (such as when one's emotional performance
361 improves the lives of others) and negative outcomes (including emotional exhaustion
362 and feeling negative about oneself and work) (Potrac & Marshall, 2011). An agenda for
363 future research, therefore, would be to (more directly) examine the relationship between
364 emotion management and wellbeing among policy actors in community sport coaching.
365 We anticipate that competent emotion management, as determined by actual appraisals
366 (i.e., direct feedback from others), reflected appraisals (i.e., individuals' perception of
367 how they think others' view them), or both, are likely to foster positive subjective
368 wellbeing because one's identity has been confirmed or verified (cf. Burke & Cerven,
369 2019). Whereas emotion management failure will likely undermine one's identity and
370 sense of wellbeing. We would also encourage researchers to examine if, how, and why
371 different frequencies, durations, and types of emotion management have differing
372 consequences for the health and wellbeing of the community sport coaching workforce
373 (cf. Thoits, 1996).

374 **Policy Enactment, Performativity, and Fabrications**

375 Building on the above discussions, we also encourage scholars to more explicitly
376 investigate the relationship between politics, performativity, and fabrications.
377 Consistent with Ball's (2000, 2003) analysis of policy reforms in educational settings,
378 community sport coaches have been found to use a range of strategies to actively
379 respond to the political, policy, and employment context within which their work is
380 located. For example, the work of Ives et al. (2021) reported how community sport
381 coaches offered participants rewards in exchange for their attendance, prioritised the
382 attainment of contact details and completed registers, delivered sport and physical
383 activities that deviated from the original scheme of work to optimise engagement, and
384 managed their bodily and emotional displays when interacting with participants. These
385 practitioners hoped that these actions would allow them to meet organisational
386 expectations and therefore help to safeguard current and future employment. The
387 precarious nature of sport work has also been found to shape wider workplace relations
388 and interactions. For example, Gale et al. (2019) reported how perceived precarity led
389 workers to take a cautious approach to trusting others in the workplace, reserving their
390 trust for those individuals whose decisions and actions encapsulated and supported the
391 achievement of their own workplace interests. The practitioners in this study also
392 explained how they implemented various strategies to assess the intentions, motives,
393 and actions of colleagues. The workers' decisions to (dis)trust coworkers also shaped
394 the regularity and substance of their interactions with these individuals both inside and
395 outside of the workplace.

396 While the above studies did not overtly set out to investigate the use of
397 fabrications by practitioners in sporting workplaces, they certainly point towards their
398 application. In-keeping with Ball (2000, p. 8), who argues that “the fabrications that
399 organisations (and individuals) produce [...] are informed by the priorities, constraints,

400 and climate set by the policy environment”, there may be occasions where policy
401 workers individually and/or collectively perform fabricated versions of themselves
402 when enacting sport, physical activity, and physical education policy. Future
403 investigations should therefore seek to investigate the types of workplace deception that
404 community sport coaches deploy, how they dramaturgically perform these deceptive
405 acts in situ, as well as those personal, intra-, inter-, and extra-organisational variables
406 that inform their uses. Researchers are also encouraged to examine the relationships
407 between contractual status, perceived levels of precarity, and regularity of workplace
408 deception, as well as the similarities and differences between the deceptive practices of
409 individuals and organisations operating within and between the public, private, and third
410 sectors when enacting policy work.

411 It is our belief that the dramaturgical theorisation of Erving Goffman (1959,
412 1974) presents another useful framework for researching the deceptive practices of
413 policy workers. In *Frame Analysis*, Goffman (1974, p. 83) defined fabrications as “the
414 intentional effort of one or more individuals to manage activity so that a party of one or
415 more will be induced to have false beliefs about what is going on”. Future inquiry
416 would do well to better understand those fabrications that policy actors in community
417 sport coaching use in their enactment of policy. Such analyses should acknowledge that
418 performances are not only individual endeavours but are often staged by groups of
419 individuals comprising what Goffman (1959) terms performance teams. It might also be
420 prudent to explore the various types of secrets that practitioners individually and
421 collectively maintain as part of their policy work through fabricated performances. For
422 example, Goffman (1959) identified five types of secrets that actors use during social
423 interactions: 1) dark secrets; 2) strategic secrets; 3) inside secrets; 4) entrusted secrets;
424 and 5) free secrets. To date, researchers have yet to give explicit consideration towards

425 what secrets workers keep when enacting sport-related policy, who they individually
426 and/or collectively conceal these secrets from and why, how they attempt to maintain
427 these secrets from identified others, and what generative forces influence their desire to
428 keep these secrets.

429 While some fabrication attempts will likely dupe their intended target(s) and
430 achieve desired outcomes, it is important to recognise that not all deception attempts
431 will prove successful. Colleagues will, on occasions, identify that another is trying to
432 deceive them. Consideration should therefore be given towards how and why policy
433 actors choose to call out known deceptions or leave them unchallenged, and what the
434 potential (intended and unintended) consequences of doing so are (Gale et al., 2019;
435 Nichol et al., 2023). With regards to the latter, scholars might usefully draw on the work
436 of Shulman (2019) to better understand unchallenged deceptions. According to
437 Shulman's (2019) analyses, unchallenged deception might be explained by: 1)
438 conformity; 2) power inequalities; 3) relationship maintenance; 4) burden of proof
439 issues; and 5) individual ambitions. To date, research has failed to explore potential
440 applications of this sensitising framework when analysing policy enactment in sport-
441 related contexts. If the field is to develop a comprehensive understanding of workplace
442 performances and fabrications in policy work, it would seem important that inquiry not
443 only investigates successful but unsuccessful deception attempts, associated benefits
444 and costs, as well as political, inter- and intra-organisational, interpersonal, and personal
445 influences.

446 **Policy Enactment and Wellbeing**

447 Building on the above argument, greater academic attention should also be given to the
448 health and wellbeing impacts of policy enactment, as there is a paucity of inquiry in this
449 topic area. Some research centred on community sport coaches has begun to examine

450 the impact of enacting government-aligned community sport policy on their wellbeing,
451 albeit indirectly, through the micropolitical investigation of workplace relations (Gale et
452 al., 2019, 2023; Ives et al., 2021). For example, coaches have reported how insecure
453 employment conditions, alongside societal demands for financially and materially
454 visible success, can result in a range of psychological, emotional, and relational issues,
455 and, in some cases, lead to attrition (Ives et al., 2021). A survey conducted by Smith et
456 al. (2020) also reported that a significant proportion of community sport coaches have,
457 and continue to, experience sector-related mental illness. Amid public health challenges
458 in supporting coaches, it is suggested that there is a need for interventions which
459 address the diverse sources of key stressors inside or outside of their organisation.
460 These include the constraints associated with balancing other work and family
461 commitments and negotiating the pressures exerted from significant others. The
462 networks of relations community sport coaches are enmeshed within whilst grappling
463 with the enactment of policy would therefore seem important in shaping their health and
464 wellbeing in work and non-work contexts.

465 In addressing these issues, scholars might usefully respond to Nelson's (2017)
466 call for the utilisation of Thoits' (2011) discussion of seven mechanisms through which
467 the number and nature of social ties in a person's network shapes their wellbeing.
468 Principally focused on the positive influence of social ties on physical and mental
469 health, the stresses and strains of relationships which can often negate ameliorative
470 effects of social support provisions are also acknowledged. For community sport
471 coaches, such ties may consist of work and non-work connections to people in primary
472 and secondary groups. Through the application of Thoits' (2011) theorisation, scholars
473 could seek to investigate if the wellbeing of community sport coaches is positively
474 and/or negatively influenced through the mechanisms of: 1) social influence/social

475 comparison; 2) social control; 3) behavioural guidance, purpose, and meaning; 4) sense
476 of control or mastery; 5) self-esteem; 6) belonging and companionship; and 7)
477 perceived social support. Thoits' (2011) work certainly presents one potentially useful
478 sensitising framework for advancing the investigations of this topic area by encouraging
479 researchers to give greater consideration towards how working and non-working social
480 networks impact on the wellbeing of coaches (Nelson, 2017).

481 Scholars should also seek to investigate how the highly pressurised, politicised,
482 and precarious policy and employment landscape impacts on the mental and physical
483 health and wellbeing of its workforce. As previously discussed, there has been a rise in
484 what has been termed insecure and precarious work in many Western nations. Here,
485 scholars could utilise the work of Kalleberg and colleagues to make sense of the
486 employment conditions of community sport coaches and subsequent impacts on their
487 wellbeing. To this end, Kalleberg (2009) encourages social scientists to understand how
488 the changes in employment relations which have brought about the upsurge in
489 precarious work, variously impact on workers, their families, and societies. For
490 example, Kalleberg and Vallas (2018) noted adverse impacts on workers and their
491 social lives in non-work domains, which include impacts on individual health and
492 wellbeing, economic (in)security, and family formation. However, to date, there has
493 been limited consideration given towards how flexible employment relations in private,
494 public, and third sectors as well as low-pay, low benefit, temporary zero-hour contract
495 sports work impact the wellbeing of practitioners, including community sport coaches
496 (Ives et al., 2021; Roderick et al., 2017).

497 Interestingly, research in other occupational settings has started to identify links
498 between insecure and precarious work and the mental health and wellbeing of those
499 individuals in the workforces that enact such work (Kalleberg & Vallas, 2018).

500 Generally, precarious workers have been noted to express mutually shared experiences
501 of anger, anomie, anxiety, and alienation. Increased overall employment insecurity in
502 labour markets is associated with poorer mental and physical health outcomes (Mai et
503 al., 2023; Utzet et al., 2016), increased anxiety at home, delayed household formation,
504 and greater social isolation (Lewchuk, 2017). Indeed, Lewchuk (2017) demonstrated
505 workers categorised as in precarious employment were: 1) significantly more likely to
506 report that their general and mental health was less than very good compared to those in
507 secure employment and 2) more than twice as likely to report anxiety about their
508 employment relationship interfering with personal and family life, and negatively
509 impacting on their social relations. For the younger workers in the sample, there was
510 also evidence that they were significantly more likely to delay forming relationships and
511 having children. This is pertinent, as recent estimates in the UK place 600,000 coaches
512 in the 18-24 years old age bracket, the majority of whom coach in community contexts
513 (UK Coaching, 2020).

514 The work of community sport coaches is located between the interstices of
515 overlapping social policy issues and political agendas. For example, a number of
516 national governments have implemented a wave of austerity-driven policies in response
517 to the global financial crisis of 2008. In the UK, austerity measures have led to an
518 increased reliance on third sector organisations to provide high-quality services and to
519 fill the gaps left by central government (Morgan, 2013; Mori et al., 2023). Many
520 community coaches therefore work for public or third sector organisations on
521 programmes aimed at tackling crime, promoting educational gain, or improving the
522 mental and physical health of a variety of population groups (Mansfield et al., 2018;
523 Smith et al., 2022; Smith et al., 2020). Such characteristics of community coaching
524 fragments and divides the workforce to a greater extent than more established

525 professions. As such, the individual and collective labour market power of community
526 sport coaches may be viewed as relatively weak, despite being championed as workers
527 with the capacity to remedy various social issues through their work (Jeanes et al.,
528 2019). This potentially exposes community sport coaches to greater levels of
529 vulnerability, instability, and insecurity than other occupations (Ives et al., 2021).
530 Research has failed to appropriately consider the effects of such government-led
531 austerity policies on community sport coaches' engagement with and enactment of
532 policy, as well as the related impacts on wellbeing.

533 Despite this, much community sport coaching work may be considered virtuous
534 in seeking to achieve outcomes that contribute to social good. Whilst limited in scope,
535 there is evidence of positive mental health and wellbeing benefits of employment when
536 workers deem their employment to be productive and meaningful and where positive
537 social interactions generate feelings of being welcomed, respected, and supported
538 (Modini et al., 2016). Scholars may wish to consider here then, the extent to which
539 working on projects where community coaches enact policy leading to positive social
540 outcomes may induce satisfaction and accordingly positive wellbeing outcomes among
541 workers despite the prevailing working conditions in which they find themselves.

542 Connected to this is the growing trend for self-employed coaches working in
543 community contexts. Self-employment has been associated with predominantly
544 negative, particularly physical illbeing effects, but also positive aspects such as
545 happiness and enjoyment (Bencsik & Chuluun, 2021). Indeed, much work on
546 entrepreneurs indicates high levels of job control, satisfaction, and high job demand
547 which is associated with higher levels of eudaimonic (i.e., hedonic) wellbeing despite
548 the self-employed often earning less than their employed peers, working longer hours,
549 and experiencing more stress and higher job demands (Binder & Blankenberg, 2020).

550 There is clearly a need to better understand how the perceived desirability of
551 employment contracts, working conditions, and occupational relations positively as well
552 as negatively impact the wellbeing of those individuals responsible for enacting
553 community sport coaching work.

554 **Conclusion**

555 In this article, we have called for a more sophisticated investigation of the enactment of
556 sport, physical activity, and physical education policy. While existing literature
557 addressing those types of actors involved in the enactment of policy was identified as
558 being a necessary and important first step in the investigation of policy enactment, we
559 have argued the need to extend our empirical and analytical gaze beyond these features
560 to develop a more complete understanding of how policy is enacted and experienced.
561 Specifically, we encouraged scholars to investigate those political skills that actors use
562 when enacting policy, the performative features of policy work and associated
563 utilisation of fabrications, the management of one's own and others' emotions, as well
564 as the impacts of policy enactment for workers' wellbeing. While paradigmatic and
565 methodological issues are beyond the scope of this paper, we recommend that
566 researchers harness a diverse range of (multiple) qualitative methods of data collection
567 to explore the issues outlined. This should not only include the use of traditional
568 approaches (e.g. participant observation, interviews, surveys and documentation
569 analysis), but also less utilised data collection methods, such as journals and diaries,
570 autobiographies, visual, mobile methods, and media and digital data (McGannon et al.,
571 2021). This is not to suggest that these lines of inquiry represent the only aspects of
572 policy enactment that require scholarly attention. Space does not permit us to identify
573 and discuss every feature of policy work requiring greater social analysis. Finally, while
574 the study of policy enactment in community sport coaching was the particular focus of

575 this article, we believe that the directions for research proposed could (and perhaps
576 should) be usefully applied to the investigation of policy enactment across community
577 sport, performance sport, and physical educational settings. As such, this article makes
578 an original contribution to how we conceptualise, investigate, and theorise policy work.

579 **Declaration of Interest Statement**

580 We, the authors, report that there are no competing interests to declare and that no
581 financial or non-financial interest has arisen from the direct applications of our research.

582 **References**

- 583 Baddeley, S., & James, K. (1990). Political management: Developing the management
584 portfolio. *Journal of Management Development*, 9(3), 42-59.
585 <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621719010134788>
- 586 Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies*
587 *in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 13(2), 10-17.
588 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203>
- 589 Ball, S. J. (2000). Performativities and fabrications in the education economy: Towards
590 the performative society? [Paper presented as the Frank Tate memorial lecture
591 and keynote address to the AARE Conference (1999: Melbourne).] [Journal
592 Article]. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 1-23.
593 <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/ielapa.200104937>
- 594 Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of*
595 *Education Policy*, 18(2), 215-228.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000043065>
- 597 Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2012). *How schools do policy: Policy enactments*
598 *in secondary schools* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- 599 Bencsik, P., & Chuluun, T. (2021). Comparative well-being of the self-employed and
600 paid employees in the USA. *Small Business Economics*, 56(1), 355-384.
601 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00221-1>
- 602 Binder, M., & Blankenberg, A.-K. (2020). Self-employment and subjective well-being.
603 In K. F. Zimmermann (Ed.), *Handbook of labor, human resources and*
604 *population economics* (pp. 1-25). Springer International Publishing.
605 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57365-6_191-1
- 606 Blase, J. (1991). *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation*.
607 Corwin.
- 608 Burke, P. J., & Cerven, C. (2019). Identity accumulation, verification, and well-being.
609 In J. E. Stets & R. T. Serpe (Eds.), *Identities in everyday life* (pp. 17-33). Oxford
610 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190873066.003.0002>
- 611 Burke, R. J. (2006). Why leaders fail: Exploring the darkside. *International Journal of*
612 *Manpower*, 27(1), 91-100. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720610652862>

- 613 Chao, G. T., O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Wolf, S., Klein, H. J., & Gardner, P. D. (1994).
614 Organizational socialization: Its content and consequences. *Journal of Applied*
615 *Psychology*, 79, 730-743. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.5.730>
- 616 Charmaz, K., Harris, S., & Irvine, L. (2019). *The social self and everyday life:*
617 *Understanding the world through symbolic interactionism* (1st ed.). John Wiley
618 & Sons, Inc.
- 619 Chen, S. (2018). Sport policy evaluation: what do we know and how might we move
620 forward? *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 10(4), 741-759.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2018.1488759>
- 622 Coakley, J. (2021). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (13 ed.). McGraw Hill.
- 623 Coakley, J. (2022). Neoliberalism and community sport coaching in the United States:
624 Meeting challenges with an informed strategy. In B. Ives, L. Gale, P. Potrac, &
625 L. Nelson (Eds.), *Community sport coaching: Policies and practice* (1st ed., pp.
626 25-44). Routledge.
- 627 Corsby, C. L. T., Jones, R., & Lane, A. (2022). Contending with vulnerability and
628 uncertainty: what coaches say about coaching. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-20.
629 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21640629.2022.2057697>
- 630 Elder-Vass, D. (2010). *The Causal Power of Social Structures: Emergence, Structure*
631 *and Agency*. Cambridge University Press. [https://doi.org/DOI:](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511761720)
632 10.1017/CBO9780511761720
- 633 Evans, C., Rees, G., Taylor, C., & Wright, C. (2019). 'Widening Access' to higher
634 education: the reproduction of university hierarchies through policy enactment.
635 *Journal of Education Policy*, 34(1), 101-116.
636 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1390165>
- 637 Ferris, G. R., Davidson, S. L., & Perrewé, P. L. (2005). *Political skill at work: Impact*
638 *on work effectiveness*. Davies-Black Publishing.
- 639 Gale, L. A., Ives, B. A., Potrac, P. A., & Nelson, L. J. (2019). Trust and distrust in
640 community sports work: Tales from the "shop floor". *Sociology of Sport*
641 *Journal*, 36(3), 244-253. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2018-0156>
- 642 Gale, L. A., Ives, B. A., Potrac, P. A., & Nelson, L. J. (2023). Repairing relationship
643 conflict in community sport work: "Offender" perspectives. *Qualitative*
644 *Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 15(3), 417-430.
645 <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2022.2127861>
- 646 Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Doubleday.
- 647 Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*.
648 Harvard University Press.
- 649 Hammond, A. M., Penney, D., & Jeanes, R. (2020). Sport coaches as policy actors: An
650 investigation of the interpretation and enactment of disability and inclusion
651 policy in swimming in Victoria Australia. *Sport, Education and Society*, 25(5),
652 570-585. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2019.1628013>
- 653 Harris, S. (2015). *An invitation to the sociology of emotions* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- 654 Hartley, J., Alford, J., Hughes, O., & Yates, S. (2015). Public value and political
655 astuteness in the work of public managers: The art of the possible. *Public*
656 *Administration*, 93(1), 195-211.
657 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12125>
- 658 Hochschild, A. R. (2012). *The Managed Heart*
659 *Commercialization of Human Feeling* (1st ed.). University of California Press.
660 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pn9bk>

- 661 Houlihan, B., & Green, M. (2009). Modernisation and sport: The reform of Sport
662 England and UK Sport. *Public Administration*, 87(3), 678-698.
663 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.01733.x>
- 664 Hupe, P. (2014). What happens on the ground: Persistent issues in implementation
665 research. *Public Policy and Administration*, 29(2), 164-182.
666 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076713518339>
- 667 Ives, B., Gale, L., Nelson, L., & Potrac, P. (2016). Enacting youth sport policy:
668 Towards a micro-political and emotional understanding of community sports
669 coaching work. In K. Green & A. Smith (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of youth*
670 *sport* (1st ed., pp. 559-570). Routledge.
- 671 Ives, B., Nelson, L., Gale, L., Potrac, P., & Johnston, C. (2022). Emotions, emotion
672 norms, and emotion management in community sport coaching. In B. Ives, P.
673 Potrac, L. Gale, & L. Nelson (Eds.), *Community sport coaching: Policies and*
674 *practice* (1st ed., pp. 224-239). Routledge.
- 675 Ives, B. A., Gale, L. A., Potrac, P. A., & Nelson, L. J. (2021). Uncertainty, shame and
676 consumption: Negotiating occupational and non-work identities in community
677 sports coaching. *Sport, Education and Society*, 26(1), 87-103.
678 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2019.1699522>
- 679 Jeanes, R., Rossi, T., Magee, J., & Lucas, R. (2019). Coaches as boundary spanners?
680 Conceptualising the role of the coach in sport and social policy programmes.
681 *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 11(3), 433-446.
682 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2018.1555181>
- 683 Kalleberg, A., L. , & Vallas, S., P. (2018). Probing precarious work: Theory, research,
684 and politics. In A. Kalleberg, L. & S. Vallas, P. (Eds.), *Precarious work* (pp. 1-
685 32). Emerald.
- 686 Kalleberg, A. L. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers: Employment relations in
687 transition. *American Sociological Review*, 74(1), 1-22.
688 <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400101>
- 689 Kelchtermans, G. (2009). Who I am in how I teach is the message: self-understanding,
690 vulnerability and reflection. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(2), 257-272.
691 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600902875332>
- 692 Kirk, D. (2020). *Precurity, critical pedagogy and physical education*. Routledge.
- 693 Lambert, K., & Penney, D. (2020). Curriculum interpretation and policy enactment in
694 health and physical education: Researching teacher educators as policy actors.
695 *Sport, Education and Society*, 25(4), 378-394.
696 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2019.1613636>
- 697 Lewchuk, W. (2017). Precarious jobs: Where are they, and how do they affect well-
698 being? *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 28(3), 402-419.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1035304617722943>
- 700 Magill, S., Nelson, L., Jones, R., & Potrac, P. (2017). Emotions, identity, and power in
701 video-based feedback sessions: tales from women's professional football. *Sports*
702 *Coaching Review*, 6(2), 216-232.
703 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21640629.2017.1367068>
- 704 Mai, Q. D., Song, L., & Donnelly, R. (2023). Precarious employment and well-being:
705 Insights from the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Work and Occupations*, 50(1), 3-21.
706 <https://doi.org/10.1177/07308884221143063>
- 707 Mansfield, L., Kay, T., Anokye, N., & Fox-Rushby, J. (2018). A qualitative
708 investigation of the role of sport coaches in designing and delivering a complex
709 community sport intervention for increasing physical activity and improving

- 710 health. *BMC Public Health*, 18(1), 1196. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-6089-y)
711 [6089-y](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-6089-y)
- 712 McGannon, K. R., Smith, B., Kendellen, K., & Gonsalves, C. A. (2021). Qualitative
713 research in six sport and exercise psychology journals between 2010 and 2017:
714 An updated and expanded review of trends and interpretations. *International*
715 *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 19(3), 359-379.
716 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2019.1655779>
- 717 Modini, M., Joyce, S., Mykletun, A., Christensen, H., Bryant, R. A., Mitchell, P. B., &
718 Harvey, S. B. (2016). The mental health benefits of employment: Results of a
719 systematic meta-review. *Australasian Psychiatry*, 24(4), 331-336.
720 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1039856215618523>
- 721 Morgan, H. (2013). Sport volunteering, active citizenship and social capital
722 enhancement: what role in the 'Big Society'? *International Journal of Sport*
723 *Policy and Politics*, 5(3), 381-395.
724 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2013.764542>
- 725 Mori, K., Morgan, H., Parker, A., & Mackintosh, C. (2023). Examining the Impact of
726 Austerity on Community Sport Development Workers and Their Professional
727 Environment. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 8(3), 557-572.
728 <https://doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2021.1871803>
- 729 Nelson, L. (2017). The deconstruction and reconstruction of sports coaching: An
730 interview with Professor Robyn Jones: A commentary. *International Journal of*
731 *Sports Science & Coaching*, 12(4), 432-435.
732 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954117718077>
- 733 Nelson, L., Potrac, P., Gale, L., Ives, B., & Conway, E. (2022). Political skill in
734 community sport coaching work. In B. Ives, P. Potrac, L. Gale, & L. Nelson
735 (Eds.), *Community sport coaching: Policies and practice* (1st ed., pp. 197-209).
736 Routledge.
- 737 Nelson, L., Potrac, P., Gilbourne, D., Allanson, A., Gale, L., & Marshall, P. (2013).
738 Thinking, feeling, acting: The case of a semi-professional soccer coach.
739 *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 30(4), 467-486. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.30.4.467>
- 740 Nichol, A. J., Potrac, P., Hayes, P. R., Boocock, E., Vickery, W., Morgan, C. T., &
741 Hall, E. T. (2023). Coaching in the shadows: critically examining the unintended
742 (non)influence of pedagogical practice. *Physical Education and Sport*
743 *Pedagogy*, 28(4), 362-379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2021.1990244>
- 744 O'Gorman, J., Partington, M., Potrac, P., & Nelson, L. (2021). Translation,
745 intensification and fabrication: professional football academy coaches'
746 enactment of the Elite Player Performance Plan. *Sport, Education and Society*,
747 26(3), 309-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2020.1726313>
- 748 Penney, D., & Alfrey, L. (2022). Reading curriculum policy and (re)shaping practices:
749 the possibilities and limits of enactment. *Curriculum Studies in Health and*
750 *Physical Education*, 13(3), 214-222.
751 <https://doi.org/10.1080/25742981.2022.2126793>
- 752 Penney, D., Jeanes, R., O'Hara, E., & Magee, J. (2022). Community sport coaches as
753 policy actors. In B. Ives, P. Potrac, L. Gale, & L. Nelson (Eds.), *Community*
754 *sport coaching: Policies and practice* (1st ed., pp. 45-60). Routledge.
- 755 Perrewé, P. L., & Nelson, D. L. (2004). Gender and career success: The facilitative role
756 of political skill. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33, 366-378.
757 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.004>
- 758 Potrac, P., Hall, E., McCutcheon, M., Morgan, C., Kelly, S., Horgan, P., Edwards, C.,
759 Corsby, C., & Nichol, A. (2022). Developing politically astute football coaches:

- 760 An evolving framework for coach learning and coaching research. In T. Leeder,
761 M. (Ed.), *Coach education in football: Contemporary issues and global*
762 *perspectives* (pp. 15-28). Routledge.
- 763 Potrac, P., & Jones, R. L. (2009). Micropolitical Workings in Semi-Professional
764 Football. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 26(4), 557-577.
765 <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.26.4.557>
- 766 Potrac, P., & Marshall, P. (2011). Arlie Russell Hochschild: The managed heart, feeling
767 rules, and emotional labour: Coaching as an emotional endeavour. In R. Jones,
768 L. P. Potrac, C. Cushion, & L. T. Ronglan (Eds.), *The sociology of sports*
769 *coaching* (pp. 54-66). Routledge.
- 770 Potrac, P., Smith, A., & Nelson, L. (2017). Emotions in sport coaching: an introductory
771 essay. *Sports Coaching Review*, 6(2), 129-141.
772 <https://doi.org/10.1080/21640629.2017.1375187>
- 773 Roderick, M., Smith, A., & Potrac, P. (2017). The sociology of sports work, emotions
774 and mental health: Scoping the field and future directions. *Sociology of Sport*
775 *Journal*, 34(2), 99-107. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2017-0082>
- 776 Scott-Bell, A., Wharton, K., & Potrac, P. (2021). Moving beyond unproblematic policy
777 implementation. In M. Lang (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of athlete welfare* (1st
778 ed., pp. 336-348). Routledge.
- 779 Shulman, D. (2019). Unchallenged deceptions in social and professional relationships.
780 In T. Docan-Morgan (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Deceptive*
781 *Communication* (pp. 517-533). Palgrave Macmillan.
- 782 Smith, A., Greenough, K., & Lovett, E. (2022). The politics and policy of community
783 sport coaching. In B. Ives, P. Potrac, L. Gale, & L. Nelson (Eds.), *Community*
784 *sport coaching: Policies and practice* (1st ed., pp. 7-24). Routledge.
- 785 Smith, A., Haycock, D., Jones, J., Greenough, K., Wilcock, R., & Braid, I. (2020).
786 Exploring mental health and illness in the UK sports coaching workforce.
787 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(24),
788 9332. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/17/24/9332>
- 789 Thoits, P. A. (1990). Emotional deviance: Research agendas. In *Research agendas in*
790 *the sociology of emotions*. (pp. 180-203). State University of New York Press.
- 791 Thoits, P. A. (1996). Managing the Emotions of Others. *Symbolic Interaction*, 19(2),
792 85-109. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1525/si.1996.19.2.85>
- 793 Thoits, P. A. (2011). Mechanisms linking social ties and support to physical and mental
794 health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 52(2), 145-161.
795 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146510395592>
- 796 UK Coaching. (2020). *Coaching in the UK*. UK Coaching.
- 797 Utzet, M., Navarro, A., Llorens, C., Muntaner, C., & Moncada, S. (2016). Is the
798 worsening of psychosocial exposures associated with mental health? Comparing
799 two population-based cross-sectional studies in Spain, 2005–2010. *American*
800 *Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 59(5), 399-407.
801 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22577>
- 802 Vredenburg, D. J., & Maurer, J. G. (1984). A process framework of organizational
803 politics. *Human Relations*, 37(1), 47-65.
804 <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678403700103>
- 805 Wilkinson, S. D., Penney, D., Allin, L., & Potrac, P. (2021). The enactment of setting
806 policy in secondary school physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*,
807 26(6), 619-633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2020.1784869>
- 808