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Abstract

An Evaluation of the Impacts of the Champion Coaching Scheme on Youth Sport and Coaching

This thesis examines the impacts and legacy of the Champion Coaching Scheme of the National Coaching Foundation, focusing on three case studies of implementation from 1996-1999, on Merseyside and North Wales. As one of the most significant and long-running programmes of the 1990s, Champion Coaching represented a national blueprint for the development of youth sport and coaching.

The evaluation uses a ‘realist’ approach, drawing upon the scientific realism of Pawson and Tilley (1997). Outcomes are derived from the programme theory developed for Champion Coaching in a multi-method approach. Central to this analysis is the need to examine the context, mechanisms and outcomes from programmes. It draws together evidence from a range of primary and secondary sources; participants, parents, coaches, sport Development practioners, teachers; young people; Census and deprivation statistics. Using a range of techniques, including face to face and telephone interviews, survey and geographical analysis, context-mechanism-outcome configurations of each case study were produced, in order to draw out how the programme ‘worked’, and contribute to building the evidence base for sport development interventions.

The results demonstrate that the blueprint was flexibly interpreted and delivered resulting in particular patterns of outcomes in the different cases. Champion Coaching represented a successful approach to the development of ‘performance pathways’, as the level of club membership in participants was higher than suggested by national surveys. In contributing to coaching development, the Scheme had some clear impacts on the human capital involved in sport. However, results were not uniform and show how the sporting infrastructure and attitudes of schools or Governing Bodies to such programmes, can influence whether gains in such capital can be sustained.

At the meso-level of analysis of policy for youth sport and coaching, the research shows how Champion Coaching contributed to the policy development in this increasingly salient policy area and points to its legacy in school-aged sport. The conclusions point to some of the lessons learned for future policies and the implications for outcome-oriented evaluations, including the need to plan such evaluation at the stage of programme design.

KEYWORDS: youth sport, coaches, coaching, realistic evaluation, policy process
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Chapter One     Introduction and Background to the Study

1.1 Introduction

This brief introductory chapter provides the background to the thesis and the rationale for the research. Initially I identify the emergence of youth sport as a significant area of sport policy, against a backdrop of the growth of the sports development process as a concept and a tool for developing sport participation and performance. Some personal background is provided to place some of the later analysis and interpretation in context, as the role of the researcher in work of this nature is accepted as central to critical analysis.

The emergence of youth sport as key area of sport policy

Young people are clearly the current focus of policy for all the major agencies and organisations concerned with sport, as evidenced in the production of plans and strategies, programmes and initiatives. Youth has also been the subject of major reviews of government policy in sport, health and social policy, in reports such as Misspent Youth (Audit Commission, 1996), Raising the Game (DNH, 1995) and Young and Active (HEA, 1998). Youth has also featured in the work of special Policy Action Teams (PAT) of the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) set up by the Labour Government, looking at, among other areas, neighbourhood renewal, and sport and the arts (SEU, 1999). One of the recurring themes of this recent policy has been the concept of capacity building. The capacity of sport to act as a vehicle for personal and social development appears to have gathered some merit (Collins, et al, 1999; Coalter et al, 2000), though evidence is not always convincing. A focus on youth seems a logical approach, therefore, when seeking to generate habits of lifelong sports participation, which are assumed to bring social, as well as personal, benefits.

Since the early 1960s, and the report of the Central Council for Physical Recreation (CCPR) seeking a national Sports Development Council (Wolfenden, 1960), there has been a recognition of the concept of ‘sports development’. Wolfenden called for more work to tackle what was then described as a ‘manifest break’ or gap between school-based and adult sport participation, which became the touchstone of all policy dealing with youth sport in the UK since. Though
other European countries may have different contemporary issues, they shared this concern, hence the European wide commitment to ‘Sport for All’ (Collins, 1991; Heinemann, 1999). Approaches to the development of sport have varied however, with for example, a Ministry of Youth and Sport in France, which helped integrate clubs and schools (Collins, 2004). Definitions of sports development have proliferated, but the most accessible and thus useful, is that provided by Collins (1995:21):

“a process whereby effective opportunities, processes, systems and structures are set up to enable and encourage people to take part in sport for recreation or to improve their performance to whatever level they desire”.

The use of the term in the discourse of sport was not common until in the 1980s, and it was initially associated with work external to sport and recreation facilities, with more challenging groups of non-traditional sport participants, in community or outreach settings (Rigg, 1986). By this time, with the establishment of the Sports Council in 1972, the notion of developing sport opportunities for all sectors of society, under the umbrella term of ‘Sport for All’, was well established in policy. This was recognised by government through exchequer funding, even though the Sports Council received significantly lower levels of funding than the Arts Council, and was clearly outside of the mainstream of government activity.

Local government was empowered to be able to spend significant amounts on sport and leisure services, as they were recognised as providing important and valuable social services to local communities. From the 1970s to 1990s, much of this spending was for building facilities for community sport (Sports Council, 1993a).

Young people were, however, only one of the ‘target groups’ identified by Sports Council policies after its 1982 strategy, along with women, the over fifties and those from lower socio-economic groups, the disabled and black and ethnic minorities (Sports Council, 1982, 1988). The growth in sports development activity could be seen as a reaction to the perceived lack of success in ensuring that the facilities provided for communities were being used by them. Analysis had shown that the use of many centres was taken up first and most by those least
in need of the subsidised activity they provided (Audit Commission, 1988). So there was a change in emphasis from places to people in the SD process, which recognised that subsidised facilities alone could not ensure greater or more equitable participation.

This coincided with schemes like Action Sport for unemployed inner city youth, soon replicated for rural youth, women and other ‘target groups’. These had grown in the early to mid 1980s, based on providing jobs in sport, in response to inner-city unrest and in particular, the low employment prospects for youth. At this time, the author had been involved in an extensive sport and recreation programme in a ‘New Town’ in the NW of England, using funding from the Manpower Services Commission, to fund workers, previously unemployed, to deliver sporting opportunities and coaching in the local community (1982-83). In this initial phase of Sport Development, there was clear emphasis on the development of people through sport, alongside the concern to develop sport, in terms of participation or standards of excellence. This apparent ‘duality’ in objectives has been at the heart of debates on the nature and purpose of sports development since (Houlihan and White, 2002).

In the 1990s, work with specific sports was exerted into identifying and nurturing talent. The resulting rise in the employment and professional recognition of Sports Development Officers (SDOs) also demonstrated the significant resources being devoted by local government, sport governing bodies and national agencies to such work (Collins, 1995). By the mid 1990s there were an estimated 2,000 sports development officers, about half of which were responsible for working with youth, in a variety of roles, and settings.

As work in this area grew, there was increasing concern that policy was seen to be working, through the ability of young people to develop interests and stay involved in sport, including success at the top level. The access to ‘performance pathways’ and their (lack of) effectiveness was highlighted by The Development of Sporting Talent study (English Sports Council, 1998a), which indicated that overwhelmingly, the top performers in many sports come from relatively narrow, professional/managerial, social groups. This study concluded that a narrow and
embattled path existed for the less advantaged in society, regardless of their talent. The concept of pathways to performance and sport involvement has a central role in this research as a key indicator of the effectiveness of policy for youth sport development.

The development of sporting opportunity was heuristically represented by the hierarchical Sports Development Continuum (SDC), initially developed by the Sports Council to represent; foundation, participation, performance and excellence (SC, 1988). Though much amended since, the implication with this model was as participants moved from foundation, where they learned basic skills, to participation, for fun or recreation, and performance, ever fewer would continue, to eventually achieve excellence. How and why engagement changed along this continuum was the subject of some debate, which the literature in Chapters Three and Four highlights.

As successive governments have found, these gaps and differences, from school and adult sport, and between different social groups, and levels of performance, have persisted and arguably widened, despite the considerable efforts made at all levels of public policy and significant investment of resources in over 40 years.

Alongside the growth in concern regarding what was perceived as the 'problem' of youth sport (de Knop et al, 1996) and resources devoted to it, there has been limited evaluation of the long-term impacts or outcomes of projects, programmes and initiatives implemented in this area. Collins et al (1999) found a dearth of evaluations of policy interventions in sport, which did not bode well for the future funding of such activity, when government was seeking evidence upon which to develop its policies and allocate finance.

There is a relative wealth of material on the nature of sports participation by young people, from social, physiological or psychological perspectives. Sport and young people have received attention from sociologists, who seek to explain and analyse the socialisation of young people both in and through sport (Coakley, 1994; Greendorfer, 1992a,b; White and Coakley, 1992; Roberts, 1996a,b,1999). Psychological studies in young people in sport cover readiness for competition, motivation to participate and anxiety and arousal as well as aspects of skill
acquisition and learning (e.g. Biddle and Ntounamis, 1999; Carpenter and Scanlan, 1998; Zahariadis and Biddle, 2000; Boyd and Yin, 1996). They attempt to indicate how young people learn best and how providers may structure opportunities to achieve performance or enjoyment. Large-scale analyses and evidence reviews have identified that young people’s sport and activity choices are determined by a combination of personal, social/environmental and psychological factors (Kremer et al, 1997; Biddle et al, 1998; EPPI, 1998).

For example, Hendry et al (1993) showed that as children moved through adolescence, peers and then commercial providers rather than parents, became more important influences in sport and leisure choices. Roberts and Brodie (1992) linked the breadth and regularity of youth sport experience to sustained adult participation. Despite concerns voiced by the Conservative Government of the time in Raising the Game (DNH, 1995), the provision of community sport opportunity was identified by Roberts (1996a,b) as being highly significant in the ‘success’ of youth sport.

Such studies have demonstrated the complexity of sport participation choices and constraints faced by young people and the challenges to policy that clearly remain. Similarly, Biddle, and colleagues (HEA, 1998; Biddle et al, 1998) suggested that social and environmental determinants to physical activity and sport could be significant and potentially positive, but gender and socio-economic inequalities continued to reflect wider social structures of resources and power.

Studies that have evaluated youth sport and organised sport programmes have focused traditionally on issues, such as burn out, drop out and effectiveness of programmes in improving participant outcomes (Scanlan and Carpenter, 1998). However, much of the research in this area is international and not specific to the UK policy context (for example, Yang et al, 1997; de Knop et al, 1995). International studies, which considered trends in participation, national structures for delivery and ethical frameworks for youth sport (de Knop et al, 1996), demonstrated diversity and cultural differences, as well as similarities. Questions remain about the extent to which sports development programmes have used such research or been influenced by it.
Coaches have long been identified as playing a significant role in developing positive attitudes to and experiences in sport, (for example, Campbell, 1986, 1993; SE, 1991, Smoll and Smith, 1996, Lyle, 1986 and Woodman, 1993). However, good coaches were recognised as being scarce, and efforts continued throughout the 1990s to build a volunteer workforce to underpin sport in the UK, whilst at the same time increasing training and qualifications of coaches. Coaching Matters, a review of coaching in the UK (Sports Council, 1991) clearly identified such a concern over the quality and quantity of coaches in the UK, particularly those working with young people. By 1999 this situation had not been resolved, as calls for more evidence of effectiveness of quality coaching for sport development showed (UK Sport, 1999). In coaching, as in youth sport more generally, there was a gap in evaluation research that could help underpin policy development and evidence-based practice.

The author's background and motivation for the study
After working in Higher Education for about 8 years, as a lecturer in leisure and sports studies, I had seen a tremendous growth in interest in SD, as an academic area and an area of potential employment for sport graduates. At the same time I was acutely conscious that much SD practice was based on rather limited background theory or slim evidence. The notion of an SD continuum for example, was taken by some students to be a 'real' organisation, rather than a conceptual map representing an abstract and intangible process. It was difficult to find published work that could explain or support the concept of pathways, or the impacts of changed sporting trajectories due to SD interventions. Case studies of National Demonstration Projects (MacDonald and Tungatt, 1992, 1993) provided some basis for 'good practice' but limited theoretical development, as did the book by Eady (1993). Brivio and Pickford (1996) provided some more background, but again this focused on the 'how' rather than the 'why' of SD, or what its' outcomes were. As calls for evidence-based practice in public and human services grew in other policy areas, in the era of performance indicators and 'best value', sport very clearly lagged.

As well as a professional interest in the academic study of sport, I had had a long
and happy sporting career, though never achieving more than ‘performance level’ at best. Involved with club sport well into my adulthood, I was a volunteer and club supporter for my own and later my children’s sport. After completing a PE and Sport-based degree, my career prior to entering HE had included almost ten years in facility management. Much of this work was about providing services serving local communities, either in multi-purpose sport/leisure venues, or dual-use centres based in schools. Developing sporting opportunity and helping people achieve their potential, be it recreation or performance, was always central to my working life, though I never held a recognised SDO role. Therefore, though I had been part of an SD process for some time and felt I had some insight into how it worked, I needed to understand more about the relationships and interactions involved, in order to build better practice and theory to support future development work, and to disseminate this knowledge further.

Prior to starting this research, I was acutely aware that for almost twenty years of my professional career, I had rather taken for granted an improvement in sports opportunity as a result of sports development. However, compared with my own sporting trajectory, I reflected on the chances of a child from a working class background like myself achieving a long term sporting career in the current framework for sport. I found it difficult to perceive any convincing evidence of improvement, given the opportunities myself and contemporaries had enjoyed 30 years earlier. This was reinforced by the TOYA studies (Rowley, 1992; 1995) on the unequal opportunities enjoyed by elite performers and Development of Sporting Talent (ESC, 1998), which fuelled a desire to investigate further the real impacts of sports development on the communities it served.

1.2 Analysing policy and impacts in sport
In this analysis the macro social theory I adopted is neo-pluralist. This recognised that access to the policy process is not wholly open or equal and thus accommodated complex issues and impacts involved at a societal level. This view is further expanded upon in Chapter Two where I briefly outline the implications for methodology and analysis developed in Chapter Five. However, the main focus and thrust of this research is in the area of ‘middle range’ theory, and I make no claims to develop macro theory.
Using a Critical Realist approach to policy analysis means that I go further than attempting to explain the impact of the policy, to challenging the development of future policy – and there is more emphasis in later chapters on the ‘mechanics of causality’ (Danermark et al, 2002). In realist evaluations, it is not sufficient to say whether or not a policy or programme worked, but it must identify for whom it worked and how, or in what circumstances, it worked best. Thus I feel that middle range theory has the greatest potential for the development of evidence-based practice. However, sport policy is ‘porous’ (Houlihan, 1997) and inextricably linked with other areas of social policy, in education, leisure policy, local governance, national concerns for sporting performance and issues such as ‘widening participation’, ‘lifelong learning’, social inclusion and employment. I therefore needed to identify broad social theories which help explain and illuminate the analysis of policy and how it ‘worked’. Chapter Two briefly outlines the macro-level theories and approaches and links these in later chapters to meso level analysis.

As in many areas of social policy, the impacts of one initiative can seldom be seen in isolation, and many professional and political influences can be seen to operate at different levels. In this study therefore, I sought to identify relevant policy networks and significant policy agents/actors in local after school sport and sport development, and analyse their interactions and relationships. The components of policy networks, how they operate in this “crowded policy space” (Houlihan, 1999a; 2000) and issues of resources were of particular interest and are dealt with in Chapter Two and Four.

1.3 Critical Realism: a framework for policy analysis
What began as a relatively simple (or so it appeared) concept, the evaluation of a sports development programme, evolved into a more complex and multi-layered investigation. Through an ongoing interaction with, and exploration of, a range of theoretical perspectives, a more holistic and critical project emerged. Critical realism was the framework underpinning the analysis, which helped organise and shape the research (Archer et al, 1998). Critical realism, according to Danermark
et al (2002), is based largely on the work of Bhaskar, 1993 and Bunge, 1997, though it follows a tradition in social science which included Bourdieu, Habermas and others as key writers. Danermark et al (2002:2) identified “critical methodological pluralism” as the key to realist analysis. The epistemological and ontological assumptions of the critical realist perspective are explained in Chapter Five, but the implications of this perspective are important, as they determined that approaches taken in the investigation and how data was used and interpreted.

Critical realism accepts that there exists an external world, independent of human consciousness, and a dimension, which includes socially determined knowledge and reality (Danermark et al, 2002). The focus in critical realist analysis shifts from the event, or the subject of the study, to the mechanisms that lead to it, in order to develop knowledge and understanding of what it is about them that produces the event.

I have also drawn heavily on the work of Pawson and Tilley (1997) and Pawson (2001, 2002), in attempting to shape a realist evaluation of sport policy. Critical realism, for theoretical and philosophical reasons, overcame an apparent divide between qualitative and quantitative methods or positivist or interpretivist paradigms (Pawson and Tilley, 1997; Bryman 1988; Bryman, 2001). Critical or scientific realism has been applied to work in many different aspects of social policy, such as nursing (McEvoy and Richards, 2003), urban regeneration (Ho, 1999) and sport (Nicholls, 2004; Obare and Nichols, 2001; Taylor et al, 2001).

At times, this complex and critical approach resulted in some ‘retracing of steps’ and ongoing refinement of objectives. This meant that the research process has not been simple, linear or uni-directional. There has been the problem of defining a clear focus in a multi-faceted problem, involving a complex web of actors, outcomes, policy, levels of meaning and analysis. A further complication has been the issue of time and resources as the work was completed on a part-time basis over six years.

Early fieldwork and the initial interaction with potential case studies created some problems in agreeing methods and access to data, but resulted in clarification.
This was essential to establish relationships with case study organisations, even though one of those initially identified was unable to provide data for participants as originally promised. Initial fieldwork also contributed to a better understanding of the theoretical framework and how this needed to be able to reflect the complexity of Champion Coaching. This was a multi-sport, multi-site programme of sport courses, offered to selected children aged 11 to 16 years.

1.4 The rationale for a focus on Champion Coaching

The Champion Coaching (CC) Scheme of the National Coaching Foundation (NCF) was established initially in 1991 as a pilot programme in 21 areas, and eventually grew to a scheme delivered by over 140 local authorities in England and Wales and Northern Ireland. It was terminated in 1999/00, when Sport England announced its Active Sport programme. Chapter Four (section 3) explains in more depth the scope and development of CC, but some introductory comments are essential to provide some context to the following chapters.

Some might argue I should have focused my attention on Active Sport. But Active Sport, though contemporary, is scarcely old enough to produce outputs, let alone outcomes (Enoch, forthcoming). Such is the volatility of sport policy, that Champion Coaching was one of very few schemes that operated in essentially the same, nationally structured format, for any significant length of time (eight years). Furthermore, it had a defined population of participants, coaches and identified local government and sport partners. Some data was available on a large CC scheme in Nottinghamshire (Collins and Buller 2000; 2003) and some annual reports were completed by the NCF, though in varying detail. This provided some basis for empirical study and opened up possibilities for methods such as focus groups or interviews, and linked case studies. As with many schemes in sports development, CC was designed with a number of specified objectives, against which it could be examined for evidence of effectiveness.

As a scheme designed for developing sport for both young people and coaches, it also enabled consideration of policy and practice in both areas. This raised the question of whether different policy objectives were complementary or
competing: did the interests in one policy area (participants) compromise the objectives in another (coaches)?

As CC ran for over eight years, it also satisfied the criteria of being sufficiently sustained to be able to demonstrate ‘outcomes’ of sports development, rather than a narrow or short term focus on ‘outputs’ (Collins et al, 1999). The number of children or coaches involved, or the number of programmes, could be considered outputs. Though measures of satisfaction of children and parents could be described as indicators of effectiveness, they are limited in scope, and again, arguably a form of output. The ‘outcomes’ of such projects were long-term changes in behaviour; for example, sustained participation or club membership; or structures or sustainable links in sports development (pathways), through new clubs or long term development opportunities for young people, or the employment of better trained youth sport coaches.

Furthermore, as noted above, there was also a dearth of information or analysis of the impact of “quality coaching” or on the work of coaches on the SD process. Coach Development is a relatively neglected area of research and publication, as research has tended to focus on coaching methodology/pedagogy or the science of coaching, and impacts of the coach on athletes’ performance. There is a more limited body of literature dealing with the careers of coaches and systems and schemes for their development (Lyle, 2002; CTF, 2002).

Therefore, the research seeks to contribute to knowledge in the evaluation of impacts and effectiveness of sports policy, with particular emphasis on performance-oriented, out-of-school sport and in the development of coaching and coaches.

1.5 The structure of the thesis
Chapter Two sets out the meso frameworks for policy analysis and the theories underpinning the evaluation of programmes and policies. Macro-level perspectives are identified and examined in relation to these meso-level theories of the policy process, though the main focus is on the latter. The implications of
these theories and approaches are developed in later chapters, and linked to the choice of methods in Chapter Five.

As Champion Coaching was designed to develop performance pathways, Chapter Three examines theories at the micro level of analysis, concerned with participation in sport, with an emphasis on socialisation, and major influences on choice and opportunity, namely the family, school experiences and sport programmes. The inter-relatedness of these influences is examined, with a focus on the equity basis of sport programmes. The work of Bourdieu (1978, 1988) is seen as central in its contribution to a critical realist perspective on sport, particularly in the analysis of 'difference' and inequalities (Nash, 2003).

Chapter Four considers policy for youth sport and coaching, with a particular emphasis on applying the frameworks identified in Chapter Two and the structural issues reviewed by Chapter Three. It also examines the background to policy in coaching and the development and outputs of Champion Coaching. This chapter is therefore essential in setting out the programme theory of Champion Coaching, the research questions and the measures used for evaluating case studies.

Chapter Five then sets out my chosen methodology, including the selection of techniques for fieldwork and analysis. A critical realist research paradigm is outlined, and its implications for the methods explained. Specifically it displays a rationale for case studies and examines their key features and strengths in contributing to a realist evaluation. Identified outcome measures are linked to the literature reviewed earlier. Difficulties, limits and potential areas of bias are also examined, and ways of reducing them. The chapter identifies the key features of the selected cases and the contexts and mechanisms they represent for a realist evaluation.

Chapter Six presents the results of the case studies holistically, with respect to the mechanisms and outcomes achieved by participants in each of the case study areas. The quantitative analysis of surveys of pupils and parents and is followed by analysis of the geographical patterns of pathways and outcomes. Qualitative data from teachers and children is incorporated into a thematic analysis of how
young people perceived the current opportunities available to them. A cross case analysis produces a more complete model of how Champion Coaching impacted on participants and pathways.

Chapter Seven provides a parallel cross-case analysis of the impacts of CC on coaches and coaching. It also points to aspects contributing to the meso level analysis, in how organisations interacted and their relationships, which are developed further in the next chapter. Interviews with coaches, SDOs and CDOs complement the data from a survey of coaches. These themes focus on coaches’ views of the impacts on their coaching, on their development of personal and social capital and youth sport opportunity. In the final section, particular lessons for developing coaches are highlighted.

The final chapter provides the Context-mechanism-outcome (CMO) configurations for each case, which are the basis of the scientific realist evaluation of Pawson and Tilley (1997). These are summarised in a CMO for the scheme, considering the mechanisms in the case studies for coach development and youth sport. Final conclusions and limits to the study are drawn at the different levels; micro for participants and coaches, and meso for organisations and systems. Conclusions and recommendations for policy development and research are then proposed.
Chapter Two  

Sport and the Policy Process

2.0  Introduction

As noted in Chapter One, this research is primarily concerned with the impacts and outcomes of a particular programme and the implications for policy, particularly in youth sport and coaching. The sections that follow provide an overview of relevant theories, models and frameworks that can aid analysis of the policy process of youth sport. Macro level theories are briefly examined in Section 2.1 in order to consider various perspectives on the policy process at the societal level, including Marxism, pluralism and developments of these approaches, and how they impact on the research. The focus of Section 2.2 is on meso-level theories of policy analysis, including Policy Networks and Communities (Rhodes, 2000), the multiple streams framework (Kingdon, 1995), and the advocacy coalition framework (Sabatier and Jenkins Smith, 1999). Their relative strengths and weaknesses are considered in application to sport policy. The implementation and evaluation stages of the policy process, and theories and concepts underpinning evaluation are examined in Section 2.3. The chapter concludes with an analysis in Section 2.4 of the characteristics of the sport policy arena and particular problems and issues associated with evaluating sport programmes.

2.1  The Policy Process

In order to develop theories and frameworks for analysis of a sport policy or programme, we must first examine the concept of the policy process. As noted by Houlihan (1991) and Parsons (1995), there are many approaches to the study of policy. A definition of public policy by Jenkins indicates the activities involved:

"a set of interrelated decisions taken by a political actor or group of actors concerning the selection of goals and the means of achieving them within a specified situation where these decisions should, in principle, be within the power of these actors to achieve"

(Jenkins, 1997:30).

The strength of this definition is that it links policy to particular actors and their ability or power to achieve the goals they set. As pointed out by Hogwood and Gunn (1984), the term policy has a variety of meanings, including:
1) a label for a field of activity
2) an expression of general purpose or state of affairs
3) specific proposals (eg. by Government)
4) decisions (by Government)
5) a programme (a package of legislation and resources)
6) output (what is delivered)
7) outcome (what is achieved)
8) a theory (cause and effect)
9) a process (unfolding over time)

(Hogwood and Gunn, 1984: 4).

In this study it is used at different points to describe a field of activity (e.g. sport policy), specific public programmes, and a process, as described by Hogwood and Gunn. In their summary of the process, policy comprised a series of patterns of related decisions to which many circumstances and personal, group and organisational influences contributed (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984:23-24). They indicated that the process involves many subprocesses; that it may extend over time; that aims and purposes are identifiable but may be subject to change; that the outcomes need to be studied against the intentions, and that the policy outcomes may be influenced by accidental or deliberate inaction. It involves various actors operating in a variety of organisations, mainly, but not exclusively, in the public sector. Furthermore, the

“study of policy requires an understanding of behaviour especially behaviour involving interaction within and among organisational memberships”

(Hogwood and Gunn, 1984:4).

Jenkins’ (1997) key assertion was that there are a variety of approaches and perspectives required to deal with this complex and dynamic process. He took a broadly systemic view of the policy process - in that it is best understood by considering the political system in its environment and by examining how such a system maintains itself and changes over time (Jenkins, 1997:34).

Sabatier (1999) put the various elements that contribute to this complexity into five main categories:

- Actors - interest groups, government agencies, different levels of government (eg local or central), each with potentially different values, interests, perceptions and policy preferences
- Time span - which can be from 10 - 20 years for some policy cycles
- Unit of analysis - multiple programmes exist at different levels and stages of development, at different locations. Units of analysis should therefore
be at the level of policy subsystem or domain, rather than specific programmes
- Policy debates - often involving highly specialised, technical disputes of causes, severity and alternative solutions to problems
- Deeply held values/interests - high stakes for those concerned, which can sometimes lead to selectivity, distortion or misrepresentation of data or evidence

(Sabatier, 1999).

Consequently several perspectives and approaches have been developed to accommodate this complexity, perhaps better described as ‘conceptual frameworks’, based on the more stringent predictive and application requirements implied by the term theory, as identified by Ostrum (1999).

As previously stated, the main focus of this study is at the meso and micro levels of analysis. However, this section reviews relevant and macro-level or societal theories consistent with such analysis, as they are concerned with the purpose and functions of policy and underlying assumptions about the working of the state. Macro level theory and its links with meso and micro level theories contribute to the choice of method and techniques of analysis as set out in Chapter Five. As noted by Hill, study of policy cannot ignore the role of the state:

“in order to understand the policy process it is necessary to relate it to the power structure of society as a whole. Policy is the product of the exercise of political influence, determining what the state does and setting limits to what it does. Any detailed attention to the policy process... needs to be set in this wider context”

(Hill, 1997a:41).

The analysis of theories of the state is the realm of political science. Smith (1995) and Hill (1997a) analysed theories of the state as they apply to the policy process, focusing on the structure of power in society. They propose the main approaches are Marxist, pluralist and elitist, now outlined.

Marxist approaches have a clear focus in ‘class based’ analysis of the struggle for control of society. Dunleavy and O’Leary (1987) and Taylor (1995) identified that neo-Marxist developments of the classic Marxist view take into account the features of a modern liberal-democratic state and changing social and economic conditions. In contrast with the class-based conflicts and hegemonic views of society represented by Marxist or neo-Marxist views of the state, pluralism
recognises unequal access to or engagement with the political process. Simply put, pluralist theories have a number of essential characteristics:

“a belief that the state is neutral; that societal groups are potentially equal in their influence and that access to the political system is open”

(Smith, 1995:209).

This perspective also accepts that agencies and organisations other than the state are powerful or influential in the policy process (Dunleavy and O’Leary, 1987; Parsons, 1995). According to Smith, in recognising diversity in social, ideological positions and practices, the pluralist view is consistent with the nature of a complex, liberal modern state. Pluralism assumes that society is not dominated by a single interest group or class, that power is non-cumulative and dispersed, and that the state acts as a regulator or arbiter in policy conflicts (Smith, 1995:209).

Pluralism, as analysed by Smith and McLennan (1989, in Hill 1997a) has undergone considerable critiques and refinement. Lukes (1997) suggested that power was clearly unequally distributed in society and in policy making.

Neo-pluralism emerged as a development of this classical approach, in recognising the importance of business and market forces in the political process (Dunleavy and O’Leary, 1987; Houlihan, 1997). The unequal influence of pressure groups results in unequal access to the policy process. A feature of what Jarvie and Maguire termed ‘conventional liberal pluralism’, emerged in the UK during the 1970’s, in research that explained sport and leisure involvement in terms of competing interest groups:

“A rejection of class as the major basis for explaining social differentiation rested upon the acceptance of a capitalist economic framework as the natural setting for democracy. Societal demand and the market place were seen as major factors influencing tastes, fashions and developments in sport and leisure. That is to say that popular pastimes would emerge and fade according to the natural ebb and flow of societal demand. The emphasis was therefore placed upon the sovereignty of the consumer in exercising his or her leisure choices”


Conventional pluralism tended to see the state as neutral, with its own agencies acting as yet another interest group. Neo-pluralist or critical pluralist views developed through greater awareness of the social divisions, competing interests and conflicts found in many democratic societies.
Elitism, which proposes certain groups in society have greater control over policy and politics through the power and resources they control, has further developed this notion of diversity of control and access. Such power comes from economics, knowledge or political influence. For example, Haas (1992) identified 'epistemic communities' that exercise power on the policy process through their knowledge, defining them as “a network of professionals with recognised expertise and competence in a particular... issue area”(Haas, 1992:3).

Though the workings and influence of epistemic communities in sport may be open to some debate, they represent important groups in some policy sectors, for example the medical community in anti-doping policy (Houlihan, 1999b). This concept is therefore consistent with a macro perspective on policy that recognises a power dynamic based on knowledge and unequal access to the process by different groups. Given the liberal democratic nature of the contemporary political context of UK sport policy, a neo-pluralist /elitist perspective is the most appropriate macro perspective in this study (Houlihan, 1997, 2000). Using this perspective, we can examine the workings of the sport policy network within the policy process through resource dependence and power relationships. This theoretical stance recognises that in society there is a multiplicity of elites, institutions and organisations at work in any given area of policy (Smith, 1995). The neo-pluralist view accepts an uneven balance of power and access to the policy process that is a feature of modern sport policy, and recognises to a greater extent, the influence of commercial or business concerns in a capitalist society. Though some consider neo-pluralism a sophisticated and complex view of the modern state, it is felt by others to have limitations in policy areas where the interests of business and commerce are less influential:

“neo-pluralist perspectives of policy areas may be insulated from direct citizen control, but see power vested in fragmented, professionalised knowledge elites”

(Dunleavy and O’Leary, 1987:324).

As pointed out by Evans (1995), for this reason some aspects of elitist theory are useful, where they recognise limitations to the power of the state and the role of elites in pushing forward some policies and keeping others off the political agenda. As noted by Lukes:
"individuals or elites may act separately in making acceptable
decisions, but they may act in concert - or even fail to act at all - in
such a way as to keep unacceptable issues out of politics, thereby
preventing the system from becoming more diverse than it is"

(Lukes, 1997: 46).

Such an acceptance of influence on political decisions through knowledge,
economic or resource power seems to be quite appropriate to sport, as it has been
classified as fragmented, with competing interest groups and decision-making
elites (Henry, 1993; Houlihan, 1991, 1997; Roche, 1993). As pointed out by
Marsh (1995), there is some evidence of convergence of these different
perspectives in political science, between these different theories of the state, as
empirical studies attempt to test their assumptions and provide evidence to support
or refute their theoretical bases.

A more complete review of current political science is beyond the scope of this
study, but the macro theoretical approach adopted by this research, consistent with
a neo-pluralist/elitist view, has some merit for the analysis of sport policy
supported by reference to Houlihan (1991, 1997). A neo-pluralist/elitist view of
society best reflects the group and state relationships of a modern, liberal western
democracy and sports policy in particular. As noted by Houlihan (1997), sport
policy is characterised by multiple pressure groups, with a political agenda biased
(particularly recently), towards corporate power, wide-ranging sectoral interests
and power contested by numerous groups. He further noted: "the issue of power
is particularly important to the elitist/neo-plural perspective" (Houlihan, 1997:
257). This is therefore a key factor which links the macro and meso level theories
of the policy process and one which must be addressed by the methods and
approaches of the research.

2.2 Meso level policy analysis

Following from the analysis of macro theory, this section analyses meso level
theories that facilitate studying sport policy for young people and after-school
sport. To analyse the outcomes and impacts of policy understanding the
interactions and relationships of the policy actors and agencies involved with its
formulation and delivery is essential. So, it is necessary to use a framework that
accommodates this within a neo-pluralist/elitist perspective. The relationship
between various groups and those groups and the state in policy making has been examined by a number of theorists, seeking to explain how policy is made, and by whom. This sets the context for Chapter Three and Four, which draw upon micro level theories, to develop the theory underpinning Champion Coaching, and its impacts on individuals or organisations. Those considered most relevant to this study are now examined, namely, policy networks and communities, multiple streams and advocacy coalitions.

In Parsons’ view, policy analysis is placed in the meso level of analysis - bigger than individual (micro) decisions, but smaller than (meta) social movements (after Heclo, 1972, cited by Parsons, 1995). Though the research is essentially about the final stages of the policy process, implementation and evaluation, an overview of policy formation is also required, to illuminate the purpose and goals of the policy and its programmes. To understand what a policy achieved it is important to consider what it set out to achieve and how it came about.

**The Stages Approach**

An overarching view of the policy process was provided by Hogwood and Gunn (1984), represented as a ‘Stages’ model. This divided the policy process into a number of stages or steps, within a ‘policy life cycle’. The stages proposed by Hogwood and Gunn are similar but not identical to other stages models (Jones, 1994 cited in Bramham, 2001, and Downs, 1972 in Houlihan, 1997, 1999b). Though they vary in terminology, these models largely follow the same general structure and are viewed as cyclical in nature (hence a policy cycle) viz:

1. Deciding to decide
2. Deciding how to decide
3. Issue definition
4. Forecasting
5. Setting objectives and priorities
6. Options analysis
7. Policy implementation, monitoring and control
8. Evaluation and review
9. Policy maintenance, succession, or termination

(Hogwood and Gunn, 1984:4).

Though they provided a detailed breakdown and explanation of these stages, Hogwood and Gunn recognised this approach as not being definitive, and simplifying what is often in reality, a complex, non linear process. They
recognised that, despite such categorising, in reality the process may be truncated, the dividing lines between stages artificial, and stages may not follow the logical order presented (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984:4). Thus:

"viewing the policy process in terms of stages may seem to suggest that any policy episode is more or less self contained and comprises a neat cycle of initial, intermediate and culminating events. In practice, of course policy is often a seamless web involving a bewildering mesh of interactions and ramifications"

(Hogwood and Gunn, 1984:24).

Despite these limitations, they proposed the framework as a means of organising what is known about how policies are made. They also highlighted the need for different forms of analysis at different stages in the process. They referred to their model as a ‘contingent’ approach, that recognised both resource limitations and political factors, which can preclude a fully objective, or in depth analysis at each stage. The stages model has been described as heuristic, implying it has less value than a more empirical model or theory, and specific criticisms are that it:

- lacks a causal explanation of how policy moves from one stage to another
- cannot be tested empirically
- characterises policy making as "top down"
- ignores the "real world" of policy making with multiple levels of government and interacting policy cycles and that it
- does not provide for an integrated view of the policy process.

(Parsons, 1995; Sabatier and Jenkins Smith, 1999).

Therefore, as noted by Parsons (1995), despite its usefulness, the stages model must be treated with caution. It can, however, offer a rational structure to consider the multiplicity of realities inside the process. Each stage offers a context in which a framework can be deployed (Parsons, 1995: 80). Even critics of the model have used it as a basis for further analysis.

In terms of studying a particular programme or policy, as in sport, it can provide a means of examining how an issue becomes recognised and arrives onto the political agenda. It can also be useful when looking at the evaluation stage, in helping to frame the analysis of effectiveness, criteria for evaluation and techniques of data collection (examined below in Section 2.3). An attempt to apply the stages approach to after-school sport is seen in Section 4.1. Houlihan applied this type of model to different aspects of sport policy, including school sport and doping policy (Houlihan, 1991). I seek to overcome the identified
weaknesses of the stages model in dealing with the complexity and dynamism of the policy process by combining it with the concepts of policy communities and policy networks (Houlihan, 1997:257) and other meso level frames examined below.

**Multiple streams framework**

Originally conceived by Kingdon (1995), the multiple streams framework (MSF) focuses on the agenda setting stage and the operation of the policy system. In effect, Kingdon recognised that policy makers were ‘too busy’ to deal with everything, and he was interested in how issues or problems were brought to the attention of policy makers and then underwent formulation. His ‘multiple streams’ are: policies, politics and problems.

In the problem stream, he identified three mechanisms that serve to bring issues or problems forward: indicators, events and feedback. Indicators were government or other statistics. Events were disasters, or symbols of sufficient significance to promote an issue, such as the Olympics, or drug abuse scandals, security or environmental impacts. For example, events like the urban riots of the 1980s in the UK triggered government responses to problems of the inner cities. Feedback was information received about failure to meet goals or information that showed some unintended consequence of a policy, such as the costs of environmental regulation.

Kingdon characterised the three policy streams, of problems, policies and politics, as moving around in a ‘primal soup’ of ideas and issues, drawing on the work of the evolutionary biologist, Richard Dawkins (1976). This was seen as a development of the ‘garbage can’ view of policy by Cohen, March and Olsen (1972) cited by both Kingdon (1995) and Zahariadis (1999). Kingdon was particularly interested in how ideas and issues rose from this primal soup of diverse ideas, alternatives and opportunities. Key to this was the role of what he termed policy entrepreneurs, who were:
those individuals willing to invest time energy, money - to promote a position for anticipated future gain in the form of material, purposive or solidarity benefits.”

(Kingdon, 1995: 179).

They are therefore highly influential in getting a policy to the top of an agenda and in getting it implemented.

Another key concept of interest from the MSF is the notion of a ‘policy window’, a critical period when all three streams come together and when policy entrepreneurs must ‘seize the initiative’ in order to progress an idea. This critical time involves the issue being seen as important on various fronts, by all those relevant to its implementation, and consequently is more likely to be successfully adopted. This situation, described as ‘coupling’ (Kingdon, 1995; Zahariadis, 1999) occurred when:

“a problem is recognised, a solution is developed and available in the policy community, a political change makes the right time for policy change and constraints are not too severe”

(Zahariadis, 1999: 77).

When coupled, problems and solutions, or solutions and politics gain an issue prominence on the agenda, but when all three come together the chances of implementation are dramatically increased.

The MSF, according to Zahariadis (1999:74), focuses on the processes inside the ‘black box’ of policy making, but also incorporates notions of randomness, ambiguity and constant evolution, which makes it particularly useful in looking at sport. These concepts and opportunities are examined in the analysis of youth sport policy in Chapter Four.

The application of Kingdon’s work has been further strengthened by Zahariadis in his comparative studies. His main adaptation was in combining various aspects of the political stream (labelled by Kingdon as national mood, interest groups and turnover), into one conceptual variable, ‘the ideology of governing parties’. Zahariadis’ interpretation may more closely reflect the relatively stable nature of the political system of parliamentary democracy in a state like the UK, and also the relative dominance of political ideologies. Thus, a policy alternative or programme is more likely to be accepted and developed if it is consistent with the
dominant political party's ideology and overall objectives. For example, the philosophy of 'Sport for All' matched Labour's concerns for social inequality and social exclusion, this helped raise the profile of sport on the post-1997 political agenda and was reiterated in *A Sporting Future for All* (DCMS, 2000).

The main contribution of MSF is that it views policy as a fluid and evolving process, and though it sees policy as unpredictable and sometimes ambiguous, it deals with temporal change. Zahariadis described it as a "lens" through which to view policy, with some predictive value, and it has been recognised as having potential for sporting contexts (Houlihan, 2000). The concepts of policy entrepreneur and policy window are a particular strength, as interventions by individuals and the role of chance and serendipity in policy are recognised, making it particularly apt to studying sports policy.

**The Advocacy coalition framework**

As already noted, this research is concerned with the implementation and evaluation stages of the policy cycle. Consequently, the advocacy coalition framework (ACF), as proposed by Sabatier (1993) and further developed with Jenkins Smith (1994, 1998, 1999) is considered, because of its emphasis on implementation and change. The ACF was found by Oakley and Green (2001) to be particularly helpful for looking at change in elite sport policies, and noted by Houlihan (2000) as having some strength in analysing 'policy learning'; policy learning in this context is the process by which policy changes and develops.

As already mentioned, the ACF was developed as a response to the perceived inadequacy of Hogwood and Gunn's (1984) 'stages heuristic', and a desire to better understand the role of technical information in the policy process (Sabatier and Jenkins Smith, 1999). Though this framework has been applied to numerous policy sectors (Sabatier 1998), it has not included sport, except for Oakley and Green (2001). This approach has much in common with policy networks, in that it groups policy actors within policy subsectors, or coalitions. However, it recognises a much stronger role for technical knowledge developed by what was described as 'epistemic communities' or 'policy elites' based on expertise and competence (John, 1998; Haas 1992). Five essential premises are at the heart of
the ACF that:

- there is a need to address the role of technical information in the policy process
- understanding the process of policy change and assessing policy impacts requires a time perspective of a decade or more
- the most useful unit of analysis for understanding the process is the policy subsystem or domain
- policy subsystems involve actors from several levels or tiers of government, and that
- public policies or programmes incorporate implicit theories about how to achieve their objectives


The framework is shown diagrammatically as a structure of linked boxes, shown in Figure 2.1. Exogenous variables are grouped into one quite stable set, and another more dynamic, which affect constraints and opportunities for the subsystem’s actors. Relatively stable parameters include basic attributes of the problem area, the distribution of natural resources and fundamental socio-cultural values and structures. External or system events include changes in socio-economic conditions and public opinion. Within the policy subsystem, coalitions of groups of actors are formed from governmental and other organisations that share values and beliefs, which are involved in co-ordinated activity over time, that is:

“actors from a variety of public and private organisations who are actively concerned with an issue and who regularly seek to influence public policy in that domain”

(Sabatier and Jenkins Smith, 1999:119).

How far sport demonstrates this mix of policy actors engaged in co-ordinated activity over time is quite crucial and could be a weakness of this approach to youth sport, as discussed in Chapter Four.

Over time, in an effort to achieve their policy objectives, these coalitions may use ‘guidance instruments’, which may be changes in rules, budgets or personnel, as strategies to alter the behaviour of governmental institutions. What are termed ‘policy brokers’ mediate between various coalitions, in order to resolve conflicting strategies and arrive at a mutually acceptable compromise. This mediating role could be compared to the ‘policy entrepreneur’ of the MS framework. The end result is one or more government programmes, with policy outputs and impacts (intended and unintended, or as side effects). Implementation
may lead the coalitions to revise their beliefs and/or strategies (Sabatier, 1998:104). A particular interest of the ACF is the notion of ‘policy oriented learning’, partly derived from earlier work by Heclo (1974:306), who saw it as:

“relatively enduring alterations of thought or behavioural intentions which result from experience and or new information and which are concerned with the attainment or revision of policy objectives.”


This new information or experience is an important aspect of the feedback loop in the diagram, Figure 2.1, concerning policy effectiveness and impacts. This can be compared to the notion of feedback in the MSF noted as contributing to policy change or evolution, a concept of particular interest in after-school sport policy. Policy-oriented learning however, is only one force involved in policy change. External events are another important trigger in the ACF (for example, a change of government).

Figure 2.1: The Advocacy Coalition Framework (Sabatier, 1999:149)
Sabatier (1998) suggested subsystem actors are further influenced by the degree of consensus needed to permit major policy change. This factor is used particularly in studies comparing different legislative environments, and could be seen as less relevant to a study focused in the UK.

The ACF also deals with the role of professional forums, concerned not only with how coalitions develop and share internally beliefs and knowledge, but also across them. Sabatier noted the critical characteristics of successful professional forums as composition, funding, duration and agreement on an unacceptable status quo. Such a group, he proposed, should include those from science and non-science backgrounds, representing a range of professional norms and beliefs. Funding should be either independent or from multiple agencies, reducing reliance on sources which could compromise independence. The forum should also meet regularly over a year or more to develop. Sabatier accepted that in practice these conditions are rarely met in full, and so successful policy forums are rare. He argued in England, with more decentralised systems, policy change may be more likely to occur through convincing a policy broker of the need for change, rather than by convincing other coalitions (Sabatier 1999:147). Two relevant forums are identified in Chapter Four, the School Sport Forum in 1989 and Coaching Task Force in 2002 and their contribution to policy learning is examined later. A potential weakness of applying the ACF to sport policy is the lack of evidence of such professional forums operating successfully. As examined in Chapter Four, the professions involved with youth sport have rarely worked in a cohesive and systematic way, and often have diverse and conflicting views on how government policy should be developed.

The value of the ACF to sport policy analysis is that where there are long term programmes (for example Sport for All) it can be applied to past and current policy change (Collins, 2002). It is particularly relevant when the change from Champion Coaching to Active Sport in 1999 is considered, and the earlier changes to Champion Coaching itself in 1995/6. The ACF is also useful in that it allows for the analysis of subsystems, actors and coalitions, both within and outside government, acting through a maze of organisations such as those found in sport. Its emphasis on the role of professional forums could be useful for the prominence
it gives to the knowledge and beliefs held in coalitions. However, it is more useful as a lens for analysing sport policy, rather than the impact of particular programmes, as noted by Sabatier (1999).

**Policy Networks**

The purpose of the metaphor of a network has been described as being about the patterns of dependence between policy actors and organisations, thus:

> “the metaphor of a network or community seeks to focus on the pattern of formal and informal contacts and relationships which shape policy agendas and decision making as opposed to the interplay within and between the formal policy making organisations and institutions”

(Parsons, 1995:185).

Houlihan (1999b:313) noted that:

> “the network metaphor emphasises a process of policy making that acknowledges the diffusion of power among a variety of actors who may share similar concerns, but whose interests are potentially conflicting and shifting.”

Therefore, to a certain extent the network metaphor may more closely reflect the conflict and diversity found among the policy actors in sport, and is consistent with a neo-pluralist macro perspective of the sport policy field.

A key factor is the nature and pattern of the resources that flow between them; Rhodes (2000: 10) stated that a policy network is “a cluster of complex organisations connected to one another by resource dependencies”. Such resources may be either tangible or intangible, including finance, control over legislation, specialist knowledge, legitimacy, manpower or equipment. Dependencies exist when one organisation needs resources controlled by another, which results in a pattern of negotiation and bargaining. Within any network or community we may see variations in dependence and the extent of resource control by individual actors. It is therefore useful to look behind the formal relationships in policy sectors. Earlier work on ‘issue networks’ and ‘iron triangles’ in the context of US policy by Heclo (1976, cited in Parsons, 1995:186; Rhodes, 1997) characterised the relationship of administrative agency, congressional subcommittee and pressure group as being a tightly knit, closed system of policy-making. But such closed systems are rare, particularly when
different government departments have overlapping interests in policy sectors, and sport is a good example of this, as is health.

Rhodes (1990, 1997, 2000) and Marsh and Rhodes (1992) developed this concept by applying ideas of resource dependency and exchange theory to central/local relations in British government. Networks were characterised as being connected by ‘interests’, but more significantly, resource dependencies. The contemporary focus on new political approaches of involving other interests in ‘governance’ took into account how government was shaped during the 1980s in the UK (Rhodes 1997; 2000). Studies of policy networks thus seek to explore how policy is made and implemented in a network of actors and organisations. According to Rhodes, networks are part of an intermediation which is key to governmental political processes. They are important therefore for six reasons, that they:

- limit participation in the policy process
- define the role of actors
- decide which issues will be included and excluded from the policy agenda
- shape the behaviour of actors ‘through the rules of the game’
- privilege certain interests, not only according them access but also favouring their preferred policy outcomes
- substitute private government for public accountability

(Rhodes, 2000:10; Marsh and Rhodes, 1992).

How networks deal with the issue of power and accountability is of particular interest in the analysis of sport, a point reinforced by Houlihan (1999b).

“Policy networks are a tool for exploring how power is exercised in modern Britain and who benefits from its exercise”

(Rhodes, 2000:10).

Relations in the policy network are characterised by Rhodes as a type of game in which all actors manoeuvre for advantage, deploying resources to increase their influence over outcomes. He further emphasised the complexity and dynamic nature of this game, where the “various interests, levels and units of government are interdependent and the relationships are constantly shifting” (Rhodes, 2000:11).

This description of policy relations in networks is particularly apt to a study of sport policy, where in the 1990s in particular, there are clear examples of changing relationships between key actors and of dynamic resource relationships. The government responsibility for sport has changed departments several times,
the Sports Council, has evolved via the English Sports Council into Sport England and UK Sport, with key remit and resource changes. Funding for sport has undergone major changes, not the least of which being the introduction of Lottery funding in 1994.

Rhodes and Marsh (1992) identified that networks have different structures and dependencies, which may vary along such dimensions as membership (e.g., professions, private sector), interdependence (e.g., between levels of government), and resources. They described five types of networks on a continuum from highly integrated ‘policy communities’ to loosely integrated, but narrowly focused ‘issue networks’, a typology I apply to youth sport in Chapter Four.

“policy communities are networks characterised by stability of relationships, continuity of highly restrictive membership, vertical interdependence, based on shared service delivery responsibilities and insulation from other networks and invariably to the general public (including parliament)”

(Rhodes, 1990: 304).

Some have argued that networks are only heuristic tools for demonstrating power relations, but there is more to this approach. The concept of power dependence, as highlighted by Rhodes, is felt to be particularly relevant, when considering how much of sport policy is delivered at subgovernmental level, through a range of agencies and organisations, in a complex web of so-called ‘partnership’ arrangements (as noted by Houlihan, 2000; Roche, 1993; Robson, 2001).

Though Rhodes has discussed criticisms of the typology and highlighted several problems with applying the network metaphor to different policy sectors, it nevertheless provides a useful meso-level theoretical perspective with which to address the resource and power relationships in the sport policy process. It has also some value in addressing the implementation and outcomes of policy (Rhodes, 1997). Networks are useful to link both macro/societal issues of power and the micro-level in contemporary society, dealing with the role of interests in particular policy decisions or programmes (Rhodes, 1997: 46).

Hill (1997a) identified how exchange theory explained the complex networks and reciprocal arrangements between groups acting within the policy process, linking
state and non-state institutions. However, he argued there was no reason to chose between policy networks and policy communities, as:

"these are closely related ideas between which there is no need to make a choice, while formulating a policy theory drawing upon them. Policy communities are a stronger version of networks”

(Hill, 1997a:72).

However, he pointed out that with some issues and policy areas we may be more likely to find communities, and vice versa. This is an aspect of theory to which this research has some contribution to make, i.e. how far has sport policy produced relationships which lead to policy communities or networks and how do these networks operate?

Smith (1993) identified four reasons why, in the UK situation, we see networks and communities emerging from simpler, pluralistic clusters of organisations, because they:

- facilitate a consultative style of government
- reduce policy conflict and make it possible to depoliticise issues
- make policy making predictable, and they
- relate well to the departmental organisation of government

(cited in Hill, 1997a).

While acknowledged as useful in explaining how policy making is organised, Hill criticised the policy networks perspective for lacking explanatory power as to why the policy process works in this way (Hill, 1997a) (author’s emphasis added).

Therefore, the existence and operation of ‘networks’ and ‘communities’ in sport is somewhat contentious. On the one hand there is widespread use of both terms when describing policy and practice in sport (for example, the network for Youth Sport, the coaching community, Sport in the Community). The sense in which they represent measurable and demonstrable ‘policy communities’ or ‘policy networks’ as described by Rhodes and other authors, appears to be very questionable (Houlihan, 1997, 2000; Roche, 1993; Rhodes, 1997). That complex interorganisational interactions, power and resource dependencies exist in the sports policy area is not in doubt. How far these interactions represent co-ordinated and coherent policy groupings (of whatever level or scale) would seem to be the issue, and is further examined in Section 2.3.

Finally, when analysing ideas of policy, networks and communities, the changing
political environment for sport in the UK since the early 1980s must also be considered. Governance, described by Rhodes (2000:8) as a new process of governing, involving the “hollowing out” of the state and moving sectoral boundaries (public/private/voluntary) was one of the key political themes of this period, from which sport has not been immune (Collins, 1990). Stoker (1999:3) identified governance as a concern for governing with:

“achieving collective action in the realm of public affairs, in conditions where it is not possible to rest on recourse to the authority of state”.

Governance thus brings private, voluntary and commercial actors to centre stage along with governments. This is what makes it particularly appropriate to the study of sport policy, since though organised sport began in voluntary action and then municipal provision, in recent times it increasingly involves private capital. Stoker further emphasised the importance of partnerships and the process of networking in this respect.

The implementation of sport policy through local government services for example was arguably part of the ‘New Public Management’ approach of Conservative governments during the 1980s and early 1990s. Sport and recreation services were included in local government finance legislation, in a search for more value for money from local government. The increasing emphasis on ‘partnerships’ of all types in delivering services (including Public-Private Finance Initiatives), and the development of more non-governmental departments (UK Sport, Sportscoach UK) are further examples of the importance of new forms of governance in sport.

The problem of applying network and community analysis to sport is that because of its nature, it sits outside mainstream public policy and has a lower political profile. Also problematic were ‘spillover’ and ‘overlap’ with other policy spheres, as noted by Parsons (1995), and identified in sport policy by Houlihan (1997; 1999a). Education and sport policy clearly overlaps with sport in schools and changes implemented in one area can impact in the other, causing spillover (Houlihan, 1997; 1999a). Policies which deal with young people in sport also link with or are impacted upon by policies in crime and offender rehabilitation.
The ‘porous’ nature of sport’s policy boundaries can be seen as both an opportunity and a weakness in achieving policy objectives. As an opportunity, sport can offer potential solutions, like social inclusion and cohesion across problems in several policy areas as just exemplified. However, this can be a problem which can give rise to conflicts in objectives and lack of clarity in management of complex multi-agency programmes (Robson, 2001). Policy effectiveness may be hindered by interdepartmental conflicts or lack of coherence involved in multi-agency working, or simply, initiative overload (Tait, 2000; Collins et al, 1999). Hence a call for more ‘joined-up’ policy making, and cross-cutting agendas for public policy (SEU, 1999; DETR, 1998).

Hill (1997a) identified that breaking down traditional departmental barriers is an aspect of cross-departmental work encouraged by changes in the public sector in the 1980s and 1990s:

"new approaches to the organisation of the public sector designed to get away from the traditional bureaucratic model are having significant effect upon both intra and inter organisational relationships"

(Hill, 1997a:173).

This reinforces the impact of the ‘New Public Management’ (NPM), which Hill described as a useful shorthand for widespread and diverse innovations concerned with the agenda for bureaucratic reform (Hill, 1997a). Hill also, however, referred to critiques of the NPM and continuing arguments about the value judgements and potential conflicts between efficiency and equity. For some, he argued, the management approaches engendered seemed to emphasise ‘market forces’ over social justice. What is of interest in this debate is how far the criteria by which government judges the success of programmes is influenced by the philosophies of the agencies and organisations delivering them. This will be examined further in section 2.3.

Hill referred to a strengthening of centralised control shown by a growth in the number of agencies responsible for regulating (e.g. Environment Agency) or monitoring progress in various policy spheres (e.g. Qualification and Curriculum
Agency, Office For Standards in Education (OFSTED) and the Financial Services Authority) which has characterised UK government since the 1990s. What has been described as a ‘hands on’ approach, but at ‘arms length’, arguably gave professional groups in local implementation much less scope for discretion in interpreting policy than might be implied by their quasi-autonomous role, as shown by Taylor (1997), when he examined the work of the Department of National Heritage.

To conclude this section regarding frameworks for analysing sport policy at the meso level, I have highlighted some key aspects of the literature. Though what has been reviewed is neither exhaustive nor definitive, some key concepts derived from these models are useful for analysing policy for youth sport and coaching. The development and operation of networks or coalitions, the role of policy entrepreneurs or brokers, policy windows, resource knowledge and power relationships are all noted as being particularly relevant to sport policy, both in implementation and in the evaluation of outputs and outcomes. The stages approach, though considered by some to be simplistic, has some value in providing a starting point for organising knowledge of a particular area into a logical shape.

The frameworks used to analyse how the policy process has worked for youth and coaching, need to allow for the complexity and dynamism of the sector, as well as other salient features, including fragmentation, vulnerability or openness and temporal change. Thus no single meso-level theory or model was found to be wholly appropriate. The sector represents clusters of interest at different levels, both inside and outside government, therefore a number of theories and models are required to appreciate this complexity. This section has examined some relevant meso-level policy analysis models but points to the need to develop approaches that relate to implementation at programme level.

These theories which have some strengths in relating to the characteristics of the sport sector are applied to youth sport and coaching in Chapter Four. As the focus of the research is on the evaluation phase of the policy process, the next section examines key concepts and theories for implementing and evaluating the impacts
of programmes, before going on to the characteristics and evaluation of sport policy and the implications for evaluating programmes in more depth.

2.3 Implementation and policy evaluation

This section is concerned with the theoretical background to the implementation and evaluation stages of the policy process. As such, it forms an important link to the micro level of analysis, that of the individual programme or project, and introduces some important concepts to help the analysis of literature in youth sport and coaching policy, covered in Chapters Three and Four. In the methodology Chapter (Five), these are related to my choice of techniques, methods and concepts for fieldwork and analysis. Various approaches to evaluation are identified, notably the ‘scientific realist’ approach of Pawson and Tilley (1997). A theory-based evaluation approach (Weiss, 1997; 1998) is developed with reference to Champion Coaching in Chapter Four. Particular problems in analysing policy in welfare-based programmes are issues surrounding stakeholders, evaluation criteria and the measurement of outputs and outcomes (Palfrey and Thomas, 1992), examined below.

*Policy Implementation*

The need to consider the implementation aspects of any programme or policy was recognised early in the literature on the policy process, by Parsons (1995) citing Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) and Gunn (1978). Whilst how policy came about continued to receive attention, growing emphasis was given to analysing how policy was implemented and how implementation could impact on achievement of policy goals because:

"it became evident that policy making in so many areas had not achieved its stated goals, or that those goals had not been well designed, so students of public policy began to shift their attention from inputs and processes towards the withinputs and outcomes" (Parsons, 1995:457).

The ACF discussed earlier, is one framework that reflected this concern, in a holistic view of the policy process. In a ‘top down’ model of policy implementation, the process of delivering programmes tended to be ‘handed down’ by policy makers, as a rational set of sequences to be followed systematically to achieve a successful outcome. Solutions to problems were modelled, logical and systematic processes closely defined, with little scope for
interpretation or variation (Parsons, 1995). But such approaches were criticised for being too mechanistic and simplistic to achieve solutions in complex and dynamic environments (Parsons, 1995). The shift in policy makers’ concern with outputs and outcomes was concurrent with the growth of managerialism and NPM noted earlier in this chapter. This led to what Parsons (1995:458) referred to as “a revolution in the discourse of governance”. The use of performance measurement indicators, evaluation criteria, targets and project management techniques associated with business became the norm (Carter et al, 1992).

As few situations are ever clear-cut and ‘ideal’, there are many potential criticisms of ‘top down’ models. A critique of ‘top down’ approaches to implementation developed, influenced by Lipskey’s (1976) work identifying the role of local ‘street level bureaucrats’ (Parsons, 1995). Concerns that ‘top down’ approaches neglected the role of individuals or organisations delivering programmes, or the diversity of local conditions of implementation led to the emergence of ‘bottom-up’ approaches to policy. It became clear that not all policies and programmes derived from them were always delivered or implemented according to the ‘theory’ or assumptions on which they were based. ‘Bottom-up’ models recognised the mediating influences of policy deliverers and settings. Professionals, such as teachers or doctors, could exert strong influences on how programmes were experienced or delivered. This influence was directly related to the extent of their discretion in interpreting policy (Parsons, 1995). This was evidenced in research into education policy, which traced how policy was interpreted in schools made significant impacts on the eventual outcomes achieved (Penney and Evans, 1999). The research of Penney and Evans further highlighted the conflicts and power struggles in policy making, where professionals sought to gain more say in directing policy, but often lacked a unified voice. Tait (2000) described how the social inclusion field works via ‘bottom up’ implementation, often on the community development model. The most significant factor determining success in policy was that:

“the vast majority of effective change is the product of networks of local people, at the client service level, who are knowledgeable about the particular circumstances of a given community”

(Tait, 2000:9).

A “policy-action continuum” proposed by Barrett and Fudge (1981) was cited by
Parsons (1995) to explain the distinction between policy makers and those who, through their actions, deliver programmes. Power was seen as central to this dynamic, particularly when centred on control over resources, with bargaining and negotiation as key features. This continuum has some strong characteristics in common with the types of networks proposed by Rhodes (1997).

Foucault has also contributed to understanding policy implementation. He argued (1980:117-119) that traditional models of governance were inadequate for understanding contemporary forms of social organisations. He viewed contemporary societies as characterised by a fragmented and discontinuous series of transformations supported and augmented by a multiplicity of different “knowledges, practices and truths” operating at ground level. Rather than government imposed from above, he argued that power:

“comes from below; that is, there is no binary and all encompassing opposition between rulers and rules at the root of power relations, and serving as a general matrix- no such duality extending from the top down and reacting on more limited groups to the very depths of the social body”

(Foucault, 1976: 94).

Tait (2000:12) pointed to two reasons for ‘bottom up’ approaches being appropriate in sport: first, local sporting networks that can assist implementation and second, highly effective and charismatic individuals are more influential.

This reinforces the need to look in more detail at the policy context of any implementation. In any ‘human services’ policy (for example, health, welfare, or even sport), services are delivered for and by people across different sites, making implementation complex, dynamic and diverse. Thus, frameworks or models of analysis of outcomes need to cope with complex local situations and the individual perspectives of both deliverers and clients. Chase (1979, cited in Parsons, 1995: 472) indicated areas that can give rise to problems of implementation. These were problems relating to:

- operational demands, such as the numbers of people to be served
- the nature and availability of resources, e.g. how many staff needed, or how much funding is required; and
- the need of programme managers to share authority with and retain support of other bureaucratic or political actors, e.g. where there are conflicting priorities among partner agencies.
This reinforces the need noted in the discussion on networks, to look at interorganisational relationships and local circumstances in policy implementation and evaluation. Very few programmes fall within the remit of a single agency operating at a single delivery level and sport is no exception. Being aware of power and resource dependencies impacting on programme delivery shows the value of the networks approach to understanding how policy is implemented. The ACF model is an attempt to synthesise top down and bottom up approaches to policy making, as it incorporates the influence of policy delivery actors/agents.

Though arguments may remain about which model is more appropriate for policy analysis, this research utilised a selection of models or frameworks for different aspects of the process. As Parsons (1995:489) pointed out, “frames will disclose or illuminate various dimensions of implementation. No one metaphor provides all the answers”.

The need for policy evaluation
There has been a growing concern to evaluate the impacts of programmes, initiatives and projects for many aspects of social policy (Rossi et al, 1999; Palfrey et al, 1992; Martin and Kettner, 1998); recently reflected in sport policy (Coalter et al, 2000; Coalter, 2001abc; Collins et al, 1999). Major investments in health, education and welfare have long required statements of intended outcomes, though it is arguably only in the last twenty years that this has been so specifically prescribed, with increasing emphasis on Value for Money, Best Value and accountability (Audit Commission, 1984; 1988, 1997; DES, 1991; Carter et al, 1992; Doig, 1992).

Programmes in the public sector are expected to identify quite specifically what is to be achieved, for whom, by whom and at what cost. In what was described as a “dominant culture of managerialism”, Palfey and Thomas (1996) identified concerns to achieve efficiency and effectiveness in public policy, particularly under Conservative governments. The need to evaluate policy is essential because of the uncertain and contingent nature of policy implementation (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984), with outcomes neither clear cut nor predictable, or based on simple cause-and-effect relationships as often claimed. As well as being difficult to
predict, the outcomes of policy are even harder to measure. Consequently, there is a tendency to settle for measuring outputs, for example, numbers using a service.

Since 1997, according to Meadows and Metcalf (2003) the Labour governments' approach to policy has placed great emphasis on finding out 'what works' and then using that evidence to feed into practice (CMP, 2002). Policy evaluation therefore, has become an expected and integral part of the policy process. It is recognised as fraught with difficulty in terms of what is to be evaluated, how the evaluation is to be carried out, by whom or for which clients (Weiss, 1998; Davies et al, 2000). Like the UK, the US has had similar requirements as policy analysts look for more 'bang for the buck' (Weiss, 1998).

In contributing to the cycle of policy, the results of the evaluation can be used to inform the development of future policies, to amend or terminate programmes (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984), or just to sustain decision-making, media and the public (Rossi et al, 1999). As Patton (1896) pointed out, the key to effective evaluation was how far it was utilised in policy development, which was often far from clear.

**Approaches and issues in evaluation**

Evaluation has been defined as:

> "an assessment of the effects or outcomes of an activity compared with the goals which the activity was intended to achieve"


This simple definition however, tends to disguise the complexity of the analysis of public policy. Public policy goals are often broadly based and stated in general terms and have several levels of meaning for those involved in delivery and for 'clients' of such programmes. Consequently, with many programmes and policies interacting over time, it is difficult to separate the effects of particular programmes into easily measured effects. Complex social policy interventions recognised by Byford and Sefton (2003) often have mechanisms that work in complex ways. They can be characterised by intense user involvement, multiple components, heterogeneous recipients, multiple and complex goals and multi-agency involvement. This is certainly true of sport.
This complexity is recognised by Weiss thus:

“Evaluation is the systematic assessment of the operation and or the outcomes of a program or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of a program or policy”


According to Weiss, there are five key elements to evaluation:

- Systematic assessment - incorporating social science research, a formal, rigorous approach
- Operation - concerned with process, implementation
- Outcomes - concerned with effects on recipients/clients/participants
- Standards - for comparison with officially stated expectations, varying goals, and involving judgement
- Contributing to improvement - the evaluation makes some impact on circumstances.

The particular problems of evaluating public programmes noted by Weiss were to do with measuring impact and effectiveness. As she noted, customer satisfaction may have little impact on the perceived success of a scheme.

Programme evaluations of effectiveness do not always deal with issues of free choice, often being prepared or designed for captive markets and monopolistic situations (as in health, education or welfare schemes). Therefore, they often have little to do with demand. In the American literature, Weiss noted distinctions between policy, programmes and projects, based largely on the level of the intended impact. For her, policies were officially stated objectives tied to a set of activities, intended to realise objectives in a particular area or jurisdiction. National initiatives were described as programmes and local level initiatives as projects. Rossi et al (1999) also referred to policy instruments as programmes of various sizes, both local and national. In this sense therefore, Champion Coaching could be described as both a programme (as a national initiative) and as projects (for local implementation).

The implication for evaluating effectiveness of the national programme is that local projects of implementation should be considered separately as well as aggregated. Rossi et al (1999:4) defined programme evaluation as:
the use of social research procedures to systematically investigate the effectiveness of social intervention programs”.

A key concept therefore is that of “effectiveness” relative to policy aims and objectives. Measuring effectiveness, using defined criteria for any particular programme is the central concern of any evaluation. Did the programme achieve what it set out to achieve? How can we find out? These are the two essential questions for evaluation.

Various approaches to evaluation have been proposed (Rossi et al, 1999; Palfrey et al, 1992; Pawson and Tilley, 1997; Weiss, 1998; Patton, 1986), incorporating a range of social research procedures and approaches. A particular concern here is the complexity of organisational types concerned in sport programmes, including community-based organisations (Wyszomirski, 1998). The ‘theory of change’ based approach described by Edelman (2000) and Weiss (1998) can be compared with Rossi et al’s ‘program impact theory’ (1999) and Palumbo and Hallett’s constructionist approach (1993). According to Edelman:

“a theory of change approach, with activities, outcomes and contexts linked and developed in conjunction with the community, will lead to initiatives that are ‘plausible, do-able and measurable’”


Rossi et al (1999) provided an extensive and systematic review of techniques covering all aspects of the evaluation process. They recognised that techniques depended on the approach and perspective of the evaluation, a contingent approach to prevailing organisational environments that reflected a range of research paradigms from positivist to interpretative. The important issue for them was that any evaluation should be of the best possible quality and that appropriate techniques were applied rigorously and systematically, a view shared by Weiss (1998) and Pawson and Tilley (1997). This is consistent with what Danermark et al (2002) referred to as “critical methodological pluralism”.

Pawson and Tilley (1997) provided a scientific realist approach to evaluation, a development of the theory-driven, program logic approach. Their Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configuration is an attempt to map out not just what works in a programme, but the mechanisms by which a range of outcomes are achieved, in order to understand more fully how programmes have worked and for
whom. They defined a CMO as "a proposition stating what it is about a programme which works, for whom and in what circumstances" (Pawson and Tilley, 1997:217). The context they refer to is essentially the specific circumstances of a targeted community or area. The mechanisms represent what it is about a programme that makes it work. These can then be mapped against the outcomes achieved, which are not necessarily all intentional.

Realist evaluation, they proposed, contributes to accumulating learning and knowledge because it provides a rigorous assessment, particularly where there are a range of contexts and complex social situations (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). The starting point for this perspective is a realist research paradigm, which recognises significant weaknesses in traditional scientific approaches of experiment/control and stresses the ‘mechanics of explanation’ (Pawson and Tilley, 1997; Danermark et al, 2002).

Palfrey et al considered a range of perspectives on evaluation through the lens of various academic disciplines, including economics, political science, social policy analysis and philosophy. They found examples of evaluation that reflected these particular perspectives and concerns, and influences toward holistic approaches to policy evaluation (Palfrey et al, 1992:44).

A growing concern for evidence-based evaluation (Weiss 1997; Davies et al, 2000; Sanderson, 1998, 2002) has clearly emerged in public policy, particularly those dealing with social welfare or human services (Alcock et al, 1998). It has been argued that such evidence-based approaches have become more critical, as pressures on resources have increased, as has greater accountability, as a result of increased managerialism in the public sector (Carter et al, 1992; Davies et al, 2000; Martin and Kettner, 1998). Factors contributing to the drive to increase evidence-based approaches, and the subsequent growing increase in interest in evaluation in public services in the UK were highlighted as:

- expansion and availability of relevant social science knowledge
- a decline in deference to the government, and
- a demand for greater public accountability

(Annan, in Davies et al, 2000:vii). This was echoed by Martin and Kettner (1998) for the US. The increased pressure
resulting from competition for resources between different policy areas, financial constraints and tensions between local/central government, was particularly evident in the U.K during the early 1980s and 1990s (Wilson and Game, 1984).

A recent development in British policy making that has fuelled this approach has been Policy Action Teams (PAT), working as ‘think tanks’ looking across departments and specifically at social exclusion issues. Utilising non-governmental experts, these PATs have a strong emphasis on evidence generation and dissemination. However, as Annan (2000) and Pawson (2001) highlighted, the relationship between research evidence, policy and practice is not straightforward. First, evidence is influenced by the interests, values and discourses of those people or institutions producing or commissioning it (Van der Meer, 1999). Second, though a great deal of research uses quantitative methods using randomised controls and large scale surveys, policy makers required a greater range of evidence. This may include, more “finely grained understanding of specific contexts and the meanings which individuals give to those contexts” (Annan, 2000: vi).

Evidence for policy makers therefore should embrace both qualitative and quantitative approaches and use a range of techniques, rather than be bound to any particular research paradigm (Sanderson, 2002). As a result of this increased emphasis on evaluation, many techniques have been developed, including social audits, systematic reviews and performance measurement (Weiss, 1998) and those based on community audits of need (Hawtin et al, 1994), as well as qualitative assessments of programmes (Doig, 1992).

Such a pluralist approach to evaluation requires the evaluator to collect and analyse information from various sources, using different methods, perspectives and criteria. In this way, methodological triangulation can overcome potential difficulties of relying on a particular perspective, and can examine both process and outcome. Importantly for critical realism, the data must be appropriate to the problem under consideration, even if not directly observable. Unanticipated or unintended consequences of policy can be traced, and the interests and concerns of the stakeholders in the process can be retained (Palfrey et al, 1992:48). But a
A stakeholder-focused approach requires establishing the nature and sources of appropriate information in the early stages of programme design, which is not always possible, as Weiss (1997) pointed out.

The demands of such approaches may deter some agencies from adopting them. For example, Coalter (2001c) referred to an ‘information deficit’ in sport and cultural services, which required developing a professional culture that saw output and outcome definition, monitoring and evaluation as central components to service design and delivery. Despite this observation, concurrent programmes often provided rather flimsy theoretical justifications or lack of reference to specific, measurable outcomes, and lack of detail on summative final evaluation arrangements. For example, reports on the first year of School Sport Coordinators and Sport Action Zones (Sport England 2001; 2002a, b) provided little theoretical basis for these initiatives and evaluation programmes are often devised some time after the implementation of the programmes concerned.

A distinction must also be made between monitoring and evaluation (Palfrey et al, 1992). Monitoring is the process of gathering information about progress toward the objectives of or performance on a programme whilst it operates, and so relies on measures being identified prior to the start of the programme, and on appropriate procedures being put in place to gather and record the specified information. As pointed out by Collins et al, (1999) however, this rarely happens in sport programmes. Administrative records and systems are an important aspect of this process (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984:220), though they are often problematical (Weiss, 1997).

The term given to specific measures of performance within criteria identified for evaluation is Performance Indicators (PI’s) (Carter et al, 1992). Formative evaluation is the term given to analysis of the monitoring process that can subsequently feed back into the programme for improvements, amendments or action, or as a control mechanism. In contrast, summative evaluation is that which takes place once the programme is complete (Palfrey et al, 1992; Clarke and Dawson, 1999).
Another terminological distinction is between process and outcome evaluations (Clarke and Dawson, 1999; Weiss, 1998; Rossi et al, 1999, Alcock et al, 1998). Process evaluations consider the difference between how programmes operated, compared to how they were intended to operate. This was seen as essential by Weiss (1998) to uncover what was going on ‘inside’ a programme, and to determine how results came about. Rossi et al (1999) reinforced this distinction and the need to consider both process and outcome. Martin and Kettner (1998) referred to process evaluation as illustrating a ‘crisis of confidence’ in public services, and saw moves towards greater monitoring and managerialism as a somewhat negative response to perceived problems in human services delivery. Regardless of the perspective taken, process evaluation is important to understand how programmes have worked.

Ideally, therefore, the procedure for monitoring and evaluation of both process and outcomes, should be holistic and thorough (Palfrey and Thomas, 1992) as well as timely, so as to feed into the policy process. However, if evaluation is not planned and resourced adequately prior to implementation, there will inevitably be a compromise between the ideal and the feasible. If sufficient PIs and systems are not established to gather the information needed, retrospective or proxy measures and loss of data could result. However, there has been growing recognition of the implications of agreeing suitable measures and resourcing monitoring (Alcock et al, 1998). Consequently, a significant debate exists on the distinction between outcomes and outputs, and the nature of measures used to determine their achievement.

*Programme impact theory, outputs and outcomes*

Impact theory, according to Rossi et al, (1999:101) is “how the intended intervention for the specified target population brings about the desired social benefits”. Although mainly based on American evaluations of social programmes in education, health or welfare, this approach is useful in providing a theoretical framework for evaluating publicly funded sports programmes, on the assumption that they are designed to make positive contributions to communities, rather than achieve materialistic objectives.

A theory-based or programme logic approach starts from examining the
underlying theory, either articulated or implied, that underpins the social programme. For community-based social projects, Edelman (2000) supported the use of theory-based approaches, and multiple method evaluation to determine effectiveness as these would impact more positively on practice. The process is shown diagrammatically thus:

```
Theory  Action Hypothesis  Implementation output  Intermediate outcome  Final(distal) outcome
       (Based on Rossi et al, 1999:101).
```

However, this is a simplistic representation of the complex relationship between theory and programme design. How far such theory represents a consensus of those concerned with programme design and delivery is far from clear cut.

Palumbo and Hallett (1993) challenged the assumption that programme theory is based on consensus in their evaluation of prison regimes. They referred to the ‘socially constructed meanings’ and ‘multiple realities’ of various stakeholders, which are often in conflict. This conflict can give rise to disagreements about priorities, goals and options, as well as measures of success. Central to the problem of conflicting perspectives of objectives is that evaluation often relies on implementers to contribute to their own evaluation. The programme logic model relies on the findings of evaluations to bring about improvements in performance. From their research, Palumbo and Hallett concluded that not only is it unrealistic to expect to find the consensus-based model of evaluation in practice, but that an emphasis on positivistic approaches to evaluation neglects rich qualitative sources of information about how programmes worked.

Thus they recommended using multi-goal, multi-method evaluations, involving a constructionist approach, based on interpretive rather than ontological logic (after Guba and Lincoln, 1989):

"a constructionist approach to evaluation captures these multiple meanings, whereas positivist, summative evaluation does not"
because the latter assumes it is possible to get agreement on goals and objectives of programs. In other words, traditional evaluation is based on a consensus model which is often unrealistic” (Palumbo and Hallett, 1993:48).

This reinforces the realist approach to evaluation advocated by Pawson and Tilley (1997). In the Program Impact model proposed by Rossi et al, (1999) as in the theory of change approaches (Weiss, 1998), it is important to map out all the expected impacts, changes and results. A careful distinction must therefore be made between outputs (the immediate results, products or services of the programme) and outcomes, (the end results of these activities or programmes over a longer time frame), whether intended or not. These outcomes may be, for example, greater levels of fitness in the population, as a result of an awareness campaign for physical activity. Collins et al (1999) suggested a time frame of seven years or more, to capture the impact of late adopters.

Coalter (2001c) referred to a need to define outputs, which measured social effectiveness and not just organisational efficiency, and to collect data, which enabled an evaluation of how far services are addressing their social remit. However, as pointed out by Van der Walle (1998), the latter are often difficult to determine. Weiss (1998) argued that outcome measures may not always relate to participants, but to geographical areas. It is important to be able to determine that ‘net’ effects (compared with non-participants), are attributable to the programme and not in whole or part, to some extraneous factors.

A simple conceptual model for the ‘programme theory’ of Champion Coaching is shown in Table 2.1. This model shows the proximal or intermediate outcomes, and distal outcomes (long term changes for those (participants and coaches) concerned, and pathways for progression that were the objectives of the Scheme. This programme impact theory is based on NCF documents, though the outcomes and outputs are not expressed necessarily in precisely these terms (NCF, 1992). This model is further developed in section 4.4, with a more complete theory of change and process examined.
Table 2.1: A Programme Theory for Champion Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Proximal Outcomes</th>
<th>Distal Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>young people</td>
<td>sports courses in at least 4 sports</td>
<td>• skills</td>
<td>• sustained progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aged 11-16</td>
<td>coach profiles</td>
<td>• enjoyment, participation, new youth sport opportunities</td>
<td>• improved performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coaches in youth</td>
<td>coach scholarships</td>
<td>• training and development opportunities for coaches</td>
<td>• secure club memberships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sport</td>
<td></td>
<td>• experience for coaches</td>
<td>• integrated networks/pathways in youth sport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Scheme - delivered in local authority-led projects, by coaches qualified in youth sport. These comprised a programme of sport courses delivered according to governing body guidelines in selected sports, for (motivated) children, usually selected by teachers.

(After Rossi et al, 1999)

Any evaluation of Champion Coaching should therefore consider how the Scheme worked, and the outcomes it achieved - both intermediate and final. If the evidence suggests Champion Coaching has not achieved what was intended, in Rossi et al's framework, this could be the result of either 'implementation failure' or 'theory failure'. As the delivery of Champion Coaching varied between local authorities, alternative cases of implementation can demonstrate better the theory behind the scheme.

As identified earlier, a contribution to improved social conditions must be considered, for any social programme, which must take into account their value framework (Rossi et al, 1999). However, it must be conceded that the 'value framework' for Champion Coaching was not the same as for a programme designed to reduce long term unemployment. Champion Coaching made no particular claims to overcome social disadvantage, though it was intended to be accessible to any child who could benefit from the coaching available. Nonetheless, Champion Coaching shared values similar to other social welfare
programmes in assuming that sport provided communal as well as individual benefits.

The programme in each authority was ultimately to be more about doing ‘good’ for young people and local communities than about promoting a particular sport or club, for commercial or other gain. Sport equity was an important underlying philosophy of such sport programmes, based on the principle of Sport for All. Van Der Walle (1998) pointed to the difficulties of assessing specific impacts of social welfare programmes, and what improvements in circumstances for the target groups can be measured. Österle (2002) highlighted the elusive nature of equity in social policy, contributing to the complexity of such evaluations.

Rossi et al (1999: 255) reinforced the need to examine implementation in its policy context, and concluded that an intervention could very rarely be delivered in a ‘pure’ form, separate from this context. Where an intervention involved interaction with individuals (for example in Champion Coaching, parents, coaches, PE teachers, club officials, sports development officers) in different settings for delivery, the reactions of others can affect the outcomes achieved. All aspects of the delivery system are therefore important to an evaluation, so analysing delivery has to be an adjunct to impact assessments (Rossi et al, 1999: 255). The complex and diverse range of situations makes selecting more than one case of implementation essential for fuller understanding of outcomes and process (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). In this way, knowledge is accumulated and policy learning informed by new theory development.

Context is also important, because it is so difficult to separate out the particular impacts of a single public policy from so many others, when they interact. As examined in section 2.4, sport is recognised as being particularly vulnerable in this respect. The ‘ecology’ of the research influences its nature and process as well as the eventual interpretations of the findings to a greater or lesser extent (Clarke and Dawson, 1999).

In his analysis of defence spending Van der Meer (1999) suggested that the impacts of evaluations were socially constructed. He found that an evaluation has
hardly any direct effect that can be unequivocally ascribed to it. Rather evaluation seemed to either support or counteract debates and options already present in the interaction of policy actors. Various factors were identified as important to whether practitioners and policy makers take up the findings of evaluation. Rist (1994), cited by Van Der Meer, identified conditions conducive to using evaluation findings were timing, the credibility of sources, methods of communication and the stage of the policy process. To these, Van der Meer (1999) added whether the institutions had internalised the practices of evaluation. As noted above, Edelman (2000) and Thayer and Fine (2001) advocated giving a strong role to stakeholders in deciding on impact measures, in order to improve the likelihood of their acceptance and use. Very much a “bottom up” approach, Thayer and Fine (2001) found the utility of evaluations to be enhanced by having a focused design, documenting success, offering recommendations and providing a tool to plan service delivery. The contribution of stakeholders in policy implementation and evaluation is examined now in more depth, as they clearly have an impact on the process.

**Criteria for evaluation - the role of stakeholders**

Stakeholders are groups with clear interests in the outcome of the evaluation or of the policy or programme. Such stakeholders in public policy may be policy makers, programme funders/sponsors, professional or political, evaluation sponsors, target participants, programme managers, programme staff, evaluators, or programme competitors (Palfrey and Thomas, 1996; Knox and MacAlister, 1995; Thayer and Fine, 2001).

A paradox highlighted by Knox and MacAlister is that though ‘target participants’ or programme users or consumers may arguably have the biggest stake, they may be the least likely to be heard. Work by Thayer and Fine (2001) in the US with non-profit organisations found that in contrast to the intense involvement of programme staff with evaluation, participants or clients were generally not involved except possibly with data collection. However, it is important to identify them and to consider their perspectives on both processes and outcomes. The extent of contact may vary from an interviewee or key informant, to providing access to documentary sources, or merely as anonymous respondents in a survey.
The multiple constituency of interests in public policy means that evaluations must have a multiple constituency of perspectives. Knox and MacAlister (1995) reported a need for more ‘user- focused’ evaluations to inform policy, a concern echoed by Thomas and Palfrey (1996).

The range of criteria pertinent to stakeholders in public policy evaluations was noted by Thomas and Palfrey (1996) as:

- **effectiveness**: (achieving objectives)
- **efficiency**: (ratio of inputs to outputs)
- **equity**: (offering services to all who would benefit on equal terms)
- **acceptability**: (to the client group)
- **accessibility**: (ease of purchase/involvement for those who need to use the service)
- **appropriateness**: (relevance to customers’/clients’ need)
- **accountability**: (ability to demonstrate the efficient use of funds)
- **ethical considerations**: (programme provided in an ethical framework)
- **responsiveness**: (to needs of clients) and
- **choice**: (a range of choices available).

Thomas and Palfrey (1996) contended that those who pay for a service might be expected to emphasise value for money, though some might be more concerned with equity. In Champion Coaching this could be argued as being the case for the NCF, as receiving funds from the (then) Sports Council, would make them subject to policy on sports equity, even they were a quasi-independent body.

Thomas and Palfrey (1996) argued that beneficiaries of a programme are likely to be interested in receiving “timely, courteous and effective service”, for Champion Coaching this could be interpreted as well-organised, enjoyable, productive sports sessions, held at relevant and accessible times/venues. Participants may be less likely to be concerned with issues of equity, unless they feel they have received unfair treatment or less favourable attention than their peers. Other criteria of direct interest to participants will be accessibility (or location), appropriateness (relevance to their needs) and responsiveness (perhaps related to how they perceived the course dealt with their individual concerns).

According to Thomas and Palfrey (1996), professionals tend to emphasise criteria like effectiveness and appropriateness, while some (e.g. PE staff and SDOs)
would have a keen interest in equity, as it is a central principle of sports
development and a key issue in PE in schools. Managers on the other hand, with
their roles for resource allocation and accountability to sponsors or the public, are
more likely to be concerned with cost effectiveness and efficiency. Politicians
form another stakeholder group who will emphasise criteria most closely
matching their political party or objectives. Where local conditions place equity
issues high on the political agenda, they may favour that over efficiency.

The use of the ‘3 E’s’ approach to performance measurement, (Effectiveness,
Economy and Efficiency) was a feature of managerialism in the UK in the 1980s
and 1990s, together with a concern for accountability in public spending (Carter et
al, 1992; Audit Commission, 1984). A growing emphasis on equity and other
associated criteria (acceptability, availability, or electability), was seen as
representing a change in concern to ‘policy effectiveness’ from ‘administrative
effectiveness’ (Carter et al, 1992), where equity was clearly a defining
characteristic of public services:

“equity or administrative justice implies that in all similar cases,
individuals will be dealt with alike, with the terms set by law. This
suggests that equity should be a bottom line Performance Indicator
for any public service”


According to Österle (2002:47):

“equity objectives stress the importance of a fair distribution of
resources and burdens, they are about economic and social aspects
and about quantitative and qualitative dimensions”.

He identified at least four sets of equity objectives in social policy:

- guaranteeing minimum standards
- supporting living standards
- reducing inequality
- promoting social integration.

He also examined how far empirical distributions of benefits corresponded with
specific interpretations of equity, an approach used by Townsend et al (1992) to
show the ‘health divide’. the unequal access to and take up of health services,
beside health differences for people of different social groups.
As noted above, for Champion Coaching though equity per se was not explicit as an objective, it implied an equality of access for young people to join the scheme, though no specific measures of performance for equity were noted in its original documentation (NCF, 1992).

A further criticism of managerialism is the tendency to neglect qualitative aspects of service delivery, through technical problems in determining what constitutes ‘quality’. The Labour government’s move from Compulsory Competitive Tendering to ‘Best Value’ is evidence of a reaction to the Conservatives’ emphasis on economy over effectiveness. The guidance for Best Value Reviews nevertheless continued to stress quantitative measures (DETR, 1997). The danger highlighted by Alcock et al (1998) of focusing on quantitative measures was that they could lead to what may be termed ‘perverse incentives’. They identified problems when meeting targets becomes a primary goal in itself, and when apparent success in meeting a target made no reference to the relevant local communities needs or to overall circumstances.

Similar findings were emphasised by Sanderson (1998) in his review of evaluation practice in local government. Alcock et al (1998: 1) also highlighted the importance, noted earlier, of understanding the both the long term processes and outcomes, as well as the rationale for particular initiatives:

“It is not enough to observe, for example, as many major initiatives still do, that so many jobs are created by a programme, without being clear also that these are sustainable jobs, relevant to the local economy and meeting the need and aspirations of local people for good quality, secure employment”.

Besides reinforcing the need to consider long-term impacts to show sustained changes in developing individual or community ‘capacity’, they argued that a long term perspective is essential to ensure the changes achieved are sustained beyond the life of the particular scheme. Like Palfrey and Thomas (1996), they stressed that different actors in the process would exercise different criteria, and in anti-poverty evaluations, some might resist such evaluation as intrusive or impertinent. They advocated establishing an open, positive and trusting relationship between evaluators and their subjects. This highlighted methodological concerns about
Champion Coaching addressed in Chapter Five, including gaining co-operation and developing relationships with programme designers and delivery agents, and issues of time and changing priorities over the life of the evaluation.

To conclude this section, the discussion has highlighted various aspects of evaluation theory, including the move to more evidence-driven policy making, evaluation research concepts like programme impact and logic or theory-driven outcomes which point to the need for a methodology adequate to understand complex processes, multiple interests and realities.

The evaluation of CC therefore needs to be complex to cope with temporal change, against a backdrop of changing policy, changes in key informants, stakeholders and various perspectives on effectiveness. A ‘realistic’ evaluation must also consider the processes as well as the outcomes, at different sites or circumstances of implementation, in order to draw out the ‘mechanics of causality’. The theory on which the policy is based must be considered, to investigate whether a cause and effect relationship can be identified, and to determine the evaluation measures. Before going on to examine the assumptions and theories underpinning Champion Coaching in Chapters Three and Four, in the final section the characteristics of the sport development policy area and implications for evaluation are addressed.

2.4 Sport as a Policy Area

This section provides a context for Chapter Four, and highlights the frameworks and analytical approaches that appear most appropriate for this study. Firstly I emphasise the characteristics of the sport policy area and identify what problems this poses for policy analysis; and secondly I point to the implications of this analysis for evaluating the impacts of sport programmes.

Roche (1993) and Houlihan (1991, 1997, 2000) identified the complex and fragmented nature of sport policy in the UK, which has limited its effectiveness. Horne et al (1999:210) were dismissive of sport policy when they noted that a “a coherent and systematic policy towards sport has never been produced in Britain”. There appears some consensus that sport policy has certain characteristics which
have consistently influenced how it may be analysed, in the organisational relationships within sport, and the relationship with government at all levels (Horne et al, 1999). Houlihan (2000) summarised the three key characteristics of the sport policy area as:

- openness or vulnerability
- a general (political) weakness of the sport policy community
- increasing internationalisation or even globalisation of aspects of sport policy making.

Each if these are now considered in more depth. Firstly the vulnerability of sport policy, highlighted by Roche (1993), is seen as a consequence of the instrumental view of sport taken by successive governments in the UK (Houlihan, 2000; Coalter et al, 1986). Because sport is seen as an important site for socialisation, especially of youth, it has been used as a ‘means’ to achieve other policy ‘ends’, in more powerful and politically important policy areas like youth crime, urban regeneration, health and even tourism, rather than having intrinsic value or benefits (de Knop et al, 1999). The Social Exclusion Unit report by Policy Action Team 10 and its research on Sport and the Arts (SEU/DCMS, 1999; Collins et al, 1999) give clear evidence of this view. Sport is neither a central or strong policy area, nor is it high in the government’s priorities compared with education, crime or health. It is seen to rely on these relationships, certainly since the late 1980s, as providing some rationale for public provision or investment (Coalter et al, 1986; SEU/DCMS, 1999, Strategy Unit, 2002).

Many policy areas have problems with their organisational arrangements in government, but in sport, this administrative dispersal is evident with the involvement of governmental departments (DCMS, DFES, DETR, Foreign and Home Offices) and levels of government (central, regional, local), Several quango’s (Sport England, UKSport, or other non-departmental bodies like the Lottery Sports Fund). Other non-governmental or voluntary bodies; like the Central Council for Physical Recreation (CCPR), the British Sports Trust (BST), the Youth Sport Trust (YST) and over 400 National Governing Bodies (NGBs) are also involved in sport policy delivery and development. They rely to a greater or lesser extent, directly or indirectly, on government support.
Local government provision for sport can be seen to be more directly affected by DETR (now divided into Department of Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and the Audit Commission's concerns for achieving Best Value through reviews of local delivery, than Sports Council policy guidance, as was the case before 1990. Sport, as a non-statutory service in local government is under almost constant threat when budgets and priorities have to be reassessed (Taylor and Page, 1994). This fragmentation and dispersal contributes to the general weakness of the sport policy community.

The salience or importance of sport to government has shown clear swings, often depending on major events or other exogenous factors. A poor medal tally at Atlanta, the tragic Hillsborough football ground disaster and urban riots of the 1980s are examples of such key events, which have resulted in either direction, legislation, guidance, funding changes, or administrative responses. Sport has risen to prominence on the government agenda in response to perceived crises (like football hooliganism or drug abuse), or in terms of opportunism, when high profile sports events gave rise to an opportunity to gain political advantage (as in the case of the Manchester Commonwealth Games), or in an otherwise haphazard manner. For example, at the time of extensive urban riots and unrest in the 1980s, considerable government attention was paid to the inner cities of Liverpool, London, and Birmingham, which led to significant investment in sports facilities. More modest local Action Sport programmes were later funded both through generic programmes like City Challenge and the Urban Programme. Arguably the *Raising the Game* strategy document would not have appeared in 1995 had John Major, a keen sport enthusiast, not been the Conservative Prime Minister. Such a haphazard and opportunist approach is not an indicator of a mature policy area.

As long ago as 1973, Lord Cobham’s report to the House of Lords referred to the fragmented nature of government responsibility for sport (Cobham, 1973), a situation still unresolved. Roche described sport as “one of the most divided and confused, conflictive policy communities in British politics” (1993:78). Furthermore, the fragmented and often disjointed nature of sport policy has been highlighted as a key reason for its lack of profile in government and incoherence
in achieving success in long term policy aims, for example, in Sport for All (Collins, 2000, 2002; Houlihan, 1999c; and Roche, 1993). Roche questioned the use of the term ‘community’, which presumes settled relationships, agreed agendas and shared values, to describe sport organisations and interest groups. Because of its highly fragmented nature, and internal conflicts he described sport as representing a ‘loose network’ at best (as did Houlihan, 2000).

Finally, internationalisation has arguably had significant influences on sport policy as a result of the influences of multi-national sponsors, global competitions and the influence of the mass media, especially TV networks. The significance of cross-national issues like the abuse of drugs in sport has risen (Houlihan, 1999b). The ‘problem of youth’ has been a consistent theme of many national sports policies in the 1990s (de Knop et al, 1996). Youth sport provides further evidence of this internationalisation, with many countries adopting similar solutions in terms of mini versions of adult sports and adapted programmes (eg. Aussie Sport, Kiwi Sport, and in the UK, Top Sport), talent identification and development programmes via sport academies and elite programmes (Chalip, 1995; de Knop et al, 1996, Oakley and Green, 2001).

Sport policy analysis, therefore, requires a framework, capable of dealing with a complex range of actors, operating in complex and dynamic relationships. Houlihan (2000) suggested such a framework should be sufficiently flexible and adaptable to cope with:

- various clusters of interest groups
- micro analysis (of individual programmes or schemes) that can at the same time relate to meso and macro levels of analysis
- vulnerability to powerful individuals, and
- vulnerability to exogenous (or externally driven) change.

The political backdrop for sport during the past twenty or more years has been one of almost constant change, of personnel, political influences and funding priorities. A major political trend towards ‘governance’ highlighted earlier is reflected in partnership approaches to programme delivery, which are endemic to and increasingly advocated for this sector (Taylor, 1997; Robson, 2001). Whilst on the one hand government appears to be working at ‘arms length’ through its agencies, such as Sport England or the Lottery Sports Fund, it remains ‘hands on’
through direct and indirect controls over membership of agency boards, exchequer resources allocated through annual spending plans, legislation, and ever more regulation and controls, for example police checks on volunteers.

Within this policy area there are contested areas of meaning and tensions between different interest groups, which have implications for analysing policy effectiveness, such as, the "claims and contentions" identified by Chalip (1996a:xi) that reflect the diverse values in sport. He exemplified universal tensions between elite sport and mass participation, and the needs of spectators and participants. Such tensions have tended to dilute the influence of particular groups as they struggle for dominance of the discourse and direction of policy (Chalip, 1996b).

Meso-level models and frameworks identified in section 2.2. have some value in addressing policy for sport, as does critical theory, as advocated by Chalip (1995;1996b). However, this study also seeks to identify outcomes of the policy process at the micro or local and individual level. That is, it seeks to address the fundamental questions, “what have been the impacts of Champion Coaching and what have we learned from it?” rather than “how was the policy arrived at?” Therefore, meso-level models cannot fully address analysis at the micro level. These micro and individual level theories, models and frameworks are the focus of Chapter Three and are developed in Chapter Four specifically for youth sport and coaching.

Evaluating sport policies and programmes
This sub-section examines some issues and concerns in evaluating sport programmes and policies that influence choices of methods and approaches. Despite the many claims made by politicians and development practitioners, sport policy is rarely developed from robust and convincing evidence and a strong theoretical base (Rütten, 1993). There also remains a lack of consensus about ‘what works’ and for whom. In particular, Coalter (2001c), Long et al (2002) and Collins (2003) called for more research to address where sport contributes to the
broad social inclusion agenda. Though in the past sport has been seen as peripheral to government concerns, increasingly and paradoxically, sport’s ability to contribute across the political agenda is perceived as a strength rather than a weakness! However, this strength depends upon evidence-based approaches to policy becoming more entrenched in the culture of sporting organisations.

In response to the need to provide evidence for the value of sport in achieving social policy objectives, Collins et al. (1999) and Collins (2003) reviewed the contributions to the literature on evaluations in sport, and found that while such evaluations used a diverse range of methods and perspectives, they frequently lacked evidence of outcomes. Coalter (2001a) further reinforced the need articulated through the PAT 10 report (SEU, 1999) and similar studies relating to urban regeneration (Coalter et al, 2000), for more research evidence to support the claims made for public provision of cultural services, including sport:

“there are many good examples of cultural services improving the quality of life for individuals and communities. Look across any of the cultural services and you will find a good story to tell, but often this will be based on anecdotes rather than hard evidence through monitoring and evaluation”

(Coalter, 2001c:1).

This has added weight to the argument that a more rigorous and convincing evidence base for policy-making has yet to be developed in sport. Despite the potential, significant problems have been identified in the monitoring and evaluation of sport programmes and the ability to extrapolate or aggregate results of local and or national data to convince policy makers or to inform policy learning.

“Despite widespread claims for a variety of individual, social and economic outcomes, outcome definition and measurement in most cultural services is in its infancy”

(Coalter, 2001c:2).

Much of this difficulty is attributed to a lack of appropriate management systems for data collection, standardised methods and cross-departmental co-operation in local and central government. This was also highlighted by the SEU PAT18 Study on neighbourhood based statistics (SEU, 1998) and Church et al (2002), cited by Collins (2003).
This problem may be partly blamed on a lack of attention paid to this aspect of programme design and implementation by both practitioners and researchers; a situation mirrored in other health and recreation projects (Cato et al, 1998). Atkinson (1993) referred to a perceived danger for some Sports Development Officers, of ‘watching the scoreboard, not the game’, i.e. concerns about numbers of participants or partners, rather than outcomes, deflecting them from their evaluation and monitoring role. The SD profession was open to criticisms for a lack of attention to monitoring and evaluation, despite clear political messages in this direction (Stevens, 1996; Brivio and Pickford, 1996).

Equity measures have presented particular problems, exacerbated by the UK Data Protection legislation (Data Protection Act, 1988) preventing obtaining records of staff or users, and logistical and ethical concerns for gathering information from participants. As noted by Van der Walle (1998), long-term evaluation implies compiling accurate initial baseline data, regarding the relative penetration of social welfare programmes into particular target groups. Sport has more than its share of these problems. The General Household Survey and other survey type data can only ever provide broad snapshots in time for whole populations, and in any case refer to national and not local measures.

Coalter utilised the terms intermediate and strategic (after Bovaird et al, 1997) to distinguish between individual and more immediate impacts that may result from sports participation in a particular project compared with the long term slippery outcomes like stronger local networks for sport, better health or more cohesive communities.

In addition to arriving at appropriate measures of impacts, a causal relationship is also difficult to identify because of lack of control groups or where insufficiently sophisticated data is gathered for multiple programmes. Changes measured may be due to outside influences such as economic or educational experiences, rather than factors involved in the programme. In his review Coalter (2001c) pointed to the need for more research, including on personal confidence and self-esteem, (particularly exploring any differences between different social groups), or educational impacts (especially exploring the link between sports participation
and academic performance). The organisational factors underpinning successful initiatives are also poorly understood.

Possibly as a consequence of the difficulty of entangling these extraneous variables, Coalter favoured more experimental–control group designs for research, rather than the cross-sectional surveys that dominate current policy debates. But, echoing the realist approach, he proposed understanding how successful outcomes were achieved would provide a greater understanding of what works and in what circumstances, for whom. In whatever form or using whatever approach, he argued that:

“there was a need to go beyond small scale anecdotal evaluations and identify more precisely the nature of processes which underpin successful initiatives and to assess the extent to which they are replicable”

(Coalter, 2001c:4).

Programmes involving the development of ‘social capital’, in particular through voluntary sport which involved a quarter of all volunteers (e.g. Sport England, 1999; SEU PAT 10, 1999; DCMS, 2001; Collins, 2003) in developing of social and community benefits, require a long-term perspective, measured by longitudinal approaches. However, social capital is in itself a difficult concept, which has yet to have a clear and definitive outcome measure. Schmidt (2002:747) pointed out that “more work remains to make social capital operational and measurable”.

This reinforced points made by Alcock et al (1998) regarding similarly complex anti-poverty policies and programmes. Evaluations of sport programmes have tended to focus on short term outputs, like the number of participants involved, rather than more appropriate outcome measures to inform and improve practice. Collins et al (1999) pointed to evidence of output measures, but “only 11 studies could be found with anything approaching rigorous evaluations and some of these did not give specific data for excluded groups or communities” (Collins et al, 1999:23).

The difficulty in identifying sport programme’s impacts on social objectives has been highlighted by several authors: West and Compton (2001), Compton and
Witt (1996), and Baldwin (2000) for programmes targeted at youth in the US; CAHPERD in Canada (2001); Wright et al (2000) in Australia; Obare and Nicholls (2001) and Taylor et al (2000) in the UK; and Burnett (2001) with reference to sports development in poor communities in South Africa. These researchers used a range of measures, including psychological or behavioural, but consensus in the evidence of social impacts was difficult to find – we still lack a ‘meta-theory’ for the social impacts of sport, though evidence has been slowly building.

The need for evaluation highlighted in other policy spheres, like health or crime (Davies et al, 2000) remains acute in sport, when resources need to be constantly justified in often difficult policy climates. Health and recreational professionals share concerns that their services remain high on political agendas (Cato et al, 1998), but apparently recreation and sport professionals either produce less convincing evidence, or have problems in gaining attention when they do provide it (Taylor et al, 2000). This may be due to issues arising from internal validity in empirical studies, when measures are not well supported by the theory or the stakeholders. Different conceptual definitions between similar programmes or studies give rise to a range of non-standardised measures. According to West and Compton (2001) such methodological flaws, tend to detract from findings and thus the strength of any conclusions about programme impacts. They also criticised the rather narrow psychological constructs applied in many studies.

Measuring impacts at different levels and in different domains, for example social and psychological impacts, is a further level of complexity of sport programmes, though not unusual. Burnett (2001) used behavioural and attitudinal measures of individuals as well as social impact measures, in the evaluation of the sport programmes delivered in South African townships, in a multi-level evaluation.

Howe (1993) proposed that the need to evaluate sport and recreation led to different methods being derived based on different criteria of performance. Efficiency measures, she argued, lead to rationalistic approaches and thus quantitative measures. Concerns for effectiveness on the other hand, lead to more naturalistic approaches and qualitative methods, like participant observation.
Multiple stakeholders, often found in the delivery of sport programmes, can complicate this issue, as they may each seek different evidence on different criteria. They can represent multiple interpretations of goals, objectives and achievements, and varying value systems. One group may favour efficiency over equity, resulting in data being collected on costs and outputs, but not on individual impacts related to specific target groups (Howe, 1993).

Baldwin’s (2000) research on at risk youth noted the emphasis placed in such programmes for changes in individuals, and that measures of programme outcomes were often poorly specified. Programmes aimed at producing social change, like a reduction in crime are particularly prone to this criticism. In a similar vein, Witt and Compton (1996a) proposed that scientific rigour was essential to establish credibility with important stakeholders (partners and the general public and in high profile issues, the media). Baldwin based the evaluation of programmes for at risk youth on the life-span approach in developmental psychology. In a similar approach, Baker and Witt’s (1996) study of after-school recreation programmes incorporated various measures developed from psychological theory (for example, self esteem), while measures of outcomes were based on observable behaviours like school attendance and student grades.

The challenge for evaluators of sports programmes, therefore, is to link as far as possible, the outcomes achieved with diverse contexts and mechanisms (Baldwin 2000:22-23) and to recognise the potential for multiple perspectives on a programme’s success or failure. As noted earlier, this problem is compounded by extraneous variables and the problem of causality, in the case of youth sport and delinquency: did the intervention reduce incidence, or were those who were compelled or consented to take part less likely to commit offences?

Canadian research highlighted gaps, consistent with points made by Coalter (2001c) about the benefits and changes that sport participation could bring (CAPHERD, 2001), and on the collective rather than individual consequences of sport participation, like contributions to building social capital, what Hall (1999) and Aldridge and Halpern (2001) called “social glue”. It particularly noted the dearth of research on what was termed “structured recreation”, and a lack of
longitudinal data to address the long-term impacts and whether any constraints persisted from youth into later life.

Even if differences and changes are found, attributing these to the programme in question can be open to debate. For example, the characteristics of those selected or who may self-select to take part in a programme, to reduce crime or improve health, may be different from those who chose not or were unable to participate. So any results may not be attributable entirely to the programme. For example, Baker and Witt (1996) were unable to account for all the differences they found in their measures of outcomes achieved by after-school programmes.

We must conclude that outcome measures for sport programmes must be a logical extension of any programme’s goals and objectives, and based on theories or assumptions about which there is some consensus in the policy community. Often, however, not all of the outcomes achieved will have been specified at the outset of the programme, as unintended consequences or unforeseen circumstances often arise, especially in complex programmes operating across different aspects of social policy. Societal outcome measures often rely on having data or documentation capable of tracing pre- and post-programme conditions, to be able to demonstrate that change has occurred (Van Der Walle, 1998; Baldwin, 2000:22). As noted earlier, the lack of such data for sport has hindered developing communal outcome measures. Tait (2000:26) reinforced the need to link evaluation to better policy development as this is:

"the feedback loop into new policy formulation that enables the next round of programmes to work better than their predecessors".

The demands on overstretched local officers responsible for delivering programmes may hinder their engagement in or commitment to collecting data for monitoring and evaluation as in CC (Stevens, 1996). Having various partners to satisfy exacerbates this problem.

Conclusions
As this section of the chapter has discussed, policy for sport is often fragmented and punctuated by chance, unplanned and uncoordinated, with unintended consequences and lack of outcome measures. There is limited evidence to support
the notion of a policy community, and some evidence of a loose network. Key individuals operating in the policy sector could be described as ‘policy entrepreneurs’ and there appear to be examples of policy windows in sport policy, as identified by Kingdon (1995).

This chapter has attempted to locate sport as a strand of public policy, even if somewhat peripheral to the mainstream of the UK political agenda. Sport, though, is not entirely in the public policy domain, because of its mixed economy of provision and governance (including commercial, or independent and voluntary sector organisations, programmes funded directly or indirectly by government). Champion Coaching, the programme of interest to this research, was publicly funded and delivered across the country, involving a range of agencies and organisations over a period of almost ten years. This gives an interesting temporal perspective, untypical of many short-term sport programmes in the UK. As such, at national level, it could be argued that there was the necessary time for outcomes to emerge and be identified. So, to evaluate this programme, it has been necessary to obtain an understanding of the policy context and to develop frameworks against which the programme and its multiple ‘realities’ may be considered.

At the meso level of analysis, these frameworks have some consistency with macro theories of the state that recognise the interrelationships of various policy actors and organisations in a pluralistic political process. Theories of evaluation have been examined, focusing on the need to develop more theory-led and evidence-based methods, incorporating multiple approaches, within a critical realist paradigm, that works through the logic of CC and its intended outcomes. Theories underpinning policy in youth sport and coaching at the micro level are developed in the Chapters to follow.

The thrust of this Chapter has been mainly to establish the importance of the evaluation stage in the overall policy process, and further highlight those characteristics of sport policy that contribute to the complexity of impact evaluation. Issues in evaluating sport programmes have been indicated that have influenced and shaped the methods and approaches in Chapter Five.
The cyclical nature of the policy process identified in section 2.1 means that in order to establish policy impacts, it is important to identify policy objectives and what lessons appear to have been learned from implementation. As the focus of this research is on after-school sport for youth, the next chapters consider literature on youth sport and on youth sport and coaching policy, to examine more clearly how networks, partnerships and coalitions operate in this context.
Chapter Three  Participation and performance in youth sport

3.0  Introduction

This chapter is concerned with establishing the key theoretical propositions and frameworks at the micro or individual and programme level of analysis. The chapter focuses on the theories and agents of socialisation, which attempt to explain young people’s participation and the contexts of the socialisation process for sport.

The chapter also considers the impact of factors that may contribute to understanding how sport programmes can be evaluated against specific criteria, such as equity. It outlines a model by Welk (1999) for analysing sport participation that incorporates both social and ecological factors. Though this model was originally developed for the analysis of physical activity (PA) rather than organised sport, the proposition here is that, due to the interaction it presents between personal, institutional, structural and ecological factors, it provides a useful framework for handling the complex processes that underpin sport participation.

The chapter firstly considers the process of socialisation, the factors identified as playing a role in socialising young people into sport and how they impact on sports participation, particularly along so-called performance pathways. Of particular concern is how effective sport programmes are in widening access to performance pathways for different groups of young people. The agencies, contexts and factors affecting young people’s participation in sport programmes and the inter-relatedness of their effects are then linked to my research objectives and methodological concerns later explored in more depth in Chapter Five. Here and the following chapter, where the focus is on policy for youth and coaching, the intention is to develop the programme theory on which Champion Coaching was based.
3.1 Socialisation in and through sport

Establishing sport participation in childhood, as with many other behaviours, is strongly linked to continued participation in adulthood (Roberts and Brodie, 1992; Malina, 1996; Talema et al, 1997; Yang et al, 1997; Vanreusel et al, 1997). This section establishes the context of sport participation by young people and the underpinning processes, practices and factors. The concept of socialisation:

"is often defined as the process by which individuals learn to conform to social norms and learn how to behave in ways appropriate to their culture. The individual internalises these social norms and becomes committed to them and thus internalises the 'social rules' of behaviour. ......In short socialisation is the transmission of culture"

(Horne et al, 1999:131).

The importance of early socialisation for later patterns of behaviour is well established in the psychological literature, based on the concepts of social learning theory, or social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). Through imitation, modelling and observation, children pick up language, behaviour, attitudes and values from their parents and surroundings, in a reciprocal relationship between the individual and the social and physical environment. Multiple environmental or ecological factors are thought to influence behaviour. The social cognitive approach has been shown to be useful in examining physical activity patterns and attitudes, though criticised for its limited ability to explain causality between the factors identified (Welk, 1999). However, it is widely accepted that, as pointed out by Hendry et al (1993:59), "we are socialised into sport at whatever level". Primary socialisation has been defined as that of childhood, predominantly by home and family circumstances, where: "parents and family life in general helps to shape some of our most important conceptions of self" (Coakley, 1994:233).

Secondary socialisation occurs after childhood, and is thought to go on throughout the life cycle (Greendorfer, 1992ab; Coakley, 1994; Horne et al, 1999). Thus a range of "agencies of socialisation" for sport, including the family, the school, and the mass media have been identified (Horne et al, 1999, Coakley, 1994; Côté and Hay, 2002). Hendry et al (1993) identified contexts for social learning in the social lives of young people in Scotland. Principal agencies for socialisation Hendry identified as family and school, as well as peers. The pre-eminence of the
family and parental influences in sport participation were also supported by Brennan and Bleakley (1997), Kay (2004), and MORI (2001). The family and home influences are particularly highlighted as important to performance-oriented sport, mainly due to the material demands of such engagement in sport by Kirk et al (1997); Côté (1999); ESC (1998); Rowley (1992; Rowley and Graham, 1999), and Kay (2000a). These influences will be examined in more depth below.

Socialisation has also been looked at from two perspectives, socialisation into sport, as a behaviour, and socialisation through sport, where sport is a site or context for socialisation. Sport has long been considered as a vehicle for socialisation of positive or desirable social and/or cultural values or attitudes, for example, a work ethic, working in a team, obedience to authority, and following rules (Coalter, 1986). This view of sport has been one of the indicators of the ‘side effects’ of policy in other areas, underlining the problem of policy ‘spillover’ referred to in the previous chapter. For example, Robbins (1990) identified the contribution of sport to crime prevention, where sport was seen a vehicle for or means of achieving objectives in, crime prevention policy or in Juvenile rehabilitation or diversion programmes (McCormack, 2000; Nicholls and Crow, 2004).

Horne et al (1999) and Coakley (1994) distinguished between socialisation as internalisation and as interaction, reflecting a change in approach from seeing the process as one in which the participant is a passive subject, a social learning approach, to one which sees the participant as an active agent, able to shape their behaviour and negotiate within their environment, an interactive, social action/social relations approach. This represents two essential views of socialisation theory, which has resulted in considerable debate, particularly in relation to influences surrounding participation.

Buckley et al (1996) recognised the complexity of factors involved in the decision to participate in sport and pointed to the predominance of psychological literature on motivation and a relative lack of work in socio-cultural research. They argued, in support of Greendorfer (1992), that sport socialisation research could benefit from more interactive, interpretive approaches rather than the generation of
empirical data alone. Though the situation has been addressed somewhat in more recent work (Côté, 1999; De Knop and De Martelaer, 2001; Scraton and Flintoff, 2001), psychological literature, utilising empirical, positivistic approaches to measure and attempt to predict the nature of the relationships between the constructs identified, tends to dominate.

The model developed by Welk (1999), though developed for the analysis of physical activity (PA) provides a useful framework for appreciating the complex interactions between personal, structural and environmental factors contributing to sports participation. It also highlighted the value of more interpretative approaches to understanding the choices and constraints faced by young people in sport. The work of Coakley and White (1986, 1992) was such an example. Taking an interactive and interpretive stance through semi-structured interviews with young people, they explained the decision-making process of youth. They found that young people became involved in sport through complex interactions with their social, cultural and physical environment. This complex process was not based on fixed ideas about sport, but changed over time and was subject to different conditions. They identified how young people acted as 'agents' "creating their own sport lives within the constraints of the social situations in which they make choices about what they will do and who they will be" (Coakley and White, 1992: 22).

Vanreusel et al (1997) and Yang et al (1996) have also contributed to socialisation literature through longitudinal studies, using an integrated model of socialisation whereby the individual was viewed as an active participant in their own socialisation process, rather than a passive subject of external factors. In the decision whether to continue in sport, Coakley and White (1986, 1992) identified a "participation turning point" that came when the young person perceived they had 'reached their level' in sporting terms. The decision was based on whether the benefits of improving performance would outweigh the costs of time, energy and resources required. These decisions reflected several complex and interrelated concerns:

- a consideration of the future, especially the transition to adulthood
- a desire to display and extend personal competence and autonomy
constraints related to money, parents, and opposite sex friends
past experiences in school sports and physical education
(White and Rowe, 1996:122).

Thus, as pointed out by Linder et al (1991), and Butcher et al (2002), young people were strongly influenced by their ‘social milieu’, though they interpreted this in a completely individual way, as a form of ‘cost-benefit’ analysis.

There is some literature on the motivation to participate in sport that complements this interactive perspective. Zahariadis and Biddle (2000) pointed to the need to understand the environmental and social parameters influencing sport participation and withdrawal, as did Carpenter and Scanlan (1998). Biddle et al (1998) analysed these psychological contributions together with social and environmental factors influencing PA and sport. They identified fun, social aspects and skill development as consistent motives for young people’s sport participation across the extensive evidence they reviewed.

The impact of social or structural factors on the exercise of preference and choice for young people is somewhat neglected in some studies. For example Côté and Hay (2002) focused on keeping children involved in organised sport, without addressing the extent of choice exercised by young children in engaging with this process. Zahariadis and Biddle (2000) suggested that programmes oriented to developing a task orientation, with the emphasis on skills, self-improvement and working hard, might develop more self-determined motives that were more likely to produce ongoing participation and commitment in the long term. Enjoyment was linked to task orientation as well as perceived competence (Boyd and Yin, 1996). Through meta-analysis, Ntoumanis and Biddle (1999) found the effectiveness of a “mastery climate” with an emphasis on personal improvement, choice and learning. We could conclude therefore that programmes and coaches that foster such positive motivational environments are more likely to result in long-term adherence to sport into adulthood, an issue returned to later.

The ‘social-ecological framework’ represented by Welks' Youth Physical Activity Promotion Model (1999) supported the notion that young people’s choices need to be understood in relation to their wider social and environmental context, personal
characteristics and developmental changes (physiological and psychological) at adolescence. His summary of the psychological dimension to participation, based on literature review, suggested that while we may seek to understand motivations to participate in sport, we also need to recognise the limits or constraints to choice, particularly for children from households with fewer material resources or where attitudes to sport may not be positive and encouraging.

Young people are particularly affected by the choice of activity available to them within a given community and the support they need to maintain sport participation over time. Such provision has been recognised as diverse yet crucial (Boothby et al, 1981). This is particularly important when considering access to organised sport, rather than ‘activity’ in general, since organised sport, by definition, relies more on structural and institutional support. As Roberts (1999:139) suggested, young people also need to be:

“locked in, not just by routine, but through organisational membership and social commitments, and a desire to continue benefiting from what they know are satisfying experiences”

Welks’ model has psychological and social dimensions which link personal demographics, enabling, predisposing and reinforcing factors to the choice of activity. An adaptation of the model is shown as Figure 3.1. When evaluating the impact of a particular programme, therefore, there is clearly a need to examine both psychological and social factors within the environmental or ecological framework of provision and local circumstances. Welk described a ‘bottom-up’ approach to developing policy that demanded an analysis of local needs and the views of potential participants in development of promotional programmes.
Fig 3.1: Model of sport participation (based on Welk, 1999)
Primary or early socialisation is central to the concept of ‘habitus’, which is a set of acquired patterns of thought, behaviours, dispositions and tastes proposed by Bourdieu (1978). Participation in sport, as with many behaviours, is a consequence of the internalisation of specific manners, deportment, demeanours in childhood (Bourdieu, 1978). As such it is not fixed but subject to change over time. Tastes and dispositions for particular sports are highly influenced by home circumstances and the interpretations of the suitability or appropriateness of some sports to any given class or group in society:

“class habitus defines the meaning conferred on sporting activity, the profits expected from it; and not the least of these profits is the social value accruing from the pursuit of certain sports by virtue of the distinctive rarity they derive from their class distribution”

(Bourdieu, 1978: 835).

Bourdieu was concerned with how people acquire the taste for sport and why they prefer one to another. It was also important to consider sporting practices in their context:

“sporting consumptions...cannot be studied independently of food consumptions, or leisure consumptions in general. The sporting practices apt to be recorded by a statistical survey can be described as the outcome of the relation between a supply and a demand, or more precisely, between the space of products offered at a given moment and the space of dispositions”

(Bourdieu, 1988:155).

His theories have influenced understanding of how and why providers of sport opportunities need to consider the ‘habitus’ of the target groups they seek to provide for (Vaugrand, 2001; Clement, 1995). Without this understanding, Bourdieu proposed, it is unlikely such opportunities will be seen as appropriate or desirable by those for whom they are designed. Different meanings and functions were given to the supply of sport and sporting practices by different classes and class fractions (Bourdieu, 1978; 1984; 1988). This implies that the early socialisation of young people towards participation in certain sports is a strong factor in determining future participation, and inclination for ‘performance’ or ‘club based’ activity may be seen a feature of this habitus.
Bourdieu saw sport participation as dependent upon the economic and cultural capital resources perceived to be available, compared to those needed. Bourdieu also identified gender differences in perceptions of class or social capital conferred by participation in sport. Young women are less inclined to seek membership of a sports club, from which they see no gain in social capital.

Club membership in certain sports is seen as very much a middle class behaviour, while other sports are seen as very working class. Perceptions of a sport as well as the environment in which it was enjoyed are therefore part of the 'habitus' according to Bourdieu. In certain parts of Northern England, for example, joining a rugby league club would be seen as a natural progression for young men, but joining a tennis club or even a rugby union club would not be. Perceptions of dress code, behaviour and tradition would contribute to the decision making process for young people. What Bourdieu referred to as “hidden entry requirements” were as important as the more tangible entry requirements they must negotiate. Dress codes (for example, special footwear or clothes, specific equipment); or patterns of speech or jargon were designed to maintain the existing ‘class identity’ of the club. Featherstone (1987) claimed that when applying Bourdieu’s theory to leisure activity it was important to analyse leisure practice or behaviour as part of a person’s general life style and taste. Kew (1997) referred to a “dynamic of choice” for which Bourdieu has provided insight.

A class-based determinism was challenged somewhat by Roberts (1996a,b, 1999) who suggested that contemporary trajectories of young people were less clear than in the mid 20th century, with what he called a “blurring of social class division”. However, although the notion of social class may be challenged, Socio-economic status (SES) as afforded by the material and educational resources of well-educated and relatively affluent young people could arguably be a real and enduring factor influencing participation and choice in the way in which Bourdieu proposed. Welk (1999) described these as enabling and predisposing factors in his model. The enabling, predisposing and reinforcing factors could contribute to the notion of a personal capital which could lead to a demand for or inclination toward a certain activity, what Roberts (1996b) referred to as personal leisure capital.
Therefore, sport providers need to be aware of perception, taste and expectation attached to certain sports or even sport in general. Meanings, interpretations and expectations of sport courses or programmes by different groups of people vary. Providing courses without challenging existing patterns of behaviour or providing alternative views of a sport, without adjustments to the perceptions of personal capital, could result in such courses as being seen as irrelevant or inappropriate, simply ‘not for us’, as the programme does not fit their ‘habitus’. This was shown in the research of Boothby et al (1981), where those identified as “sport illiterates” were much less likely to take up sport, even when similar opportunities were available. This group were less likely to use such services due to a mismatch between their perceptions of such opportunities and views of personal competence. Safvenböm (2000) referred to this as a “goodness of fit” between the participant and the sport context. In this way, for example, if club membership was perceived as counter to youth culture, it could result in greater drop-out.

A change of habitus, therefore, is not a simple issue of provision of opportunities, but is about affective or attitudinal changes, responding to different approaches, including education. This was seen, for example, in the Active Lifestyles and other National Demonstration projects (Coventry CC, 1989; MacDonald and Tungatt, 1993; Laventure, 1990). Financial and other resources available to potential sport participants remains crucial to the decision to engage, regardless of family circumstances. But middle class children may have different expectations of parental support or financial resources to enable them to take up whatever opportunities are available. Working class children may have lower expectations of material support. If young people perceive it is important to have such resources in order to take up the opportunity on offer, they may be less inclined to do so. The work of Boothby et al (1981) was particularly important in this respect, as it provided rich, contextual data on two different districts in the north east of England, examining the structural, motivational and social factors linked to participation in sport. Their research showed that overcoming early socialisation for sport ‘illiterates’ was a difficult and long-term process.

The following sections focus on different aspects of socialisation in sport and impacts on participation, including family, school, coaches, clubs and equity issues, in
particular gender and socio-economic status (SES). This leads to some conclusions about participation, progression and performance in sport and the potential impact of programmes designed to intervene in this process.

**Family and Parental Influences on Sport Participation**

Hendry *et al* (1993), in a development of earlier work by Coleman (1979) on focal theory, suggested that focal roles affected leisure choices at different stages of young people’s development, from childhood to adulthood. They proposed that in earlier childhood, greater influence comes from parents, then later friends and other adults. The mass media may become more important in developing role models and reinforcing earlier messages of social and cultural values with sport and active lifestyles. Involvement with sport or activities organised by adults may shift over time, resulting in discontinuous involvement with clubs, as young people seek greater self-determination and independence in their leisure time (Hendry *et al*, 1993).

This theory is important in helping to explain how, over time, as young people mature the interaction and relative importance of socialising agents and influences change and vary between youngsters in different circumstances. Indeed, the very concept of family in modern society has undergone considerable change. Greater numbers of divorces, single parent households and second families make the notion of a ‘typical’ family a problematic proposition (de Knop *et al*, 1999; Kay, 2000; Kay, 2004). However, it is home and family that is noted as a primary source of socialisation by many authors and therefore this is the first of the variables to be considered.

The process by which the family influences participation in sport is partly explained by social learning theory as put forward by Bandura (1986) according to Yang *et al* (1996) and Welk (1999). Yang *et al* proposed that positive attitudes and social support had a direct bearing on the development of self-esteem, social skills and cognitive abilities. These were what Welk termed “enabling factors” for PA. Early experiences in the home are crucial in establishing many adult behaviour patterns, and sport is no exception. Kimiecik *et al* (1996) found that parents were important in shaping children’s beliefs about and perceptions of competence in PA, a view supported by Brustad (1996), and Biddle *et al* (1998).
The family can also influence the nature and context of sport participation, for example club membership. Research in Finland by Seppanen (1982) strongly linked parental influence to club membership. Even where parents' own sport participation was low, they were positive about sport for their children. The particular sport played by parents was highly influential in that played by young people:

"It is very obvious that the selection of sport club in modern society is neither a spontaneous choice of the child himself nor his peer group but one which is highly controlled and determined by parents"

(Seppanen, 1982:86).

This is consistent with the *habitus* concept of Bourdieu and with Hendry's focal theory, but gives parents a very *controlling* role in sport participation. Hendry's theory suggested children had more choice in sports club membership as they went through adolescence and were more influenced by peers or even other adults such as coaches or teachers. They would still be working within the constraints imposed by their 'habitus', of acquired tastes and predispositions, mediated by their perceptions of available opportunities for sport. A positive family environment was found to be important by MORI (2001) in the encouragement of sporting activity by young people. The MORI report on Sport and the family highlighted the importance of positive parental attitudes to sport and showed the generally high level of support for sport and activity by parents in the UK (MORI, 20001), though once again, class-based differences in preferences and attitudes.

Parental support and guidance is widely reported as very important in continuing involvement in performance-oriented sport, not least for the material demands it places on the family (Côté, 1999; Côté and Hay, 2002ab; Kay, 2000ab; Hoyle and Leff, 1997; Martin *et al*, 1996; Kirk *et al*, 1996; de Knop and De Martealaar, 2001). Hoyle and Leff(1997) found "reciprocal socialisation" between parents and children involved in organised youth sport programmes. Green and Chalip (1997, 1998) examined the parental role in youth soccer programmes in the U.S. Their research highlights the particular nature of youth sport consumption, in that parents purchase the activity, yet the children consume it (Green and Chalip, 1997). It is often the parent, rather than the child, who makes the decision to enrol on organised programmes.
Parents may also supply voluntary labour in helping out, enabling activity to proceed. Green and Chalip identified the different ways the sport programme is experienced; by the parent as volunteer or spectator and by the child as a competitive or social interaction. Therefore, parents and children have different frames of reference that influence the dynamic nature of youth sport contexts. Their research looked at "enduring involvement" in youth soccer, used as a measure of the relative importance of soccer in children and parents lives. Interestingly, and contrary to expectations, they found no link from children’s satisfaction to parents’ satisfaction or commitment. Parents and children had different criteria for assessing the value of programmes. Green and Chalip (1998) also identified that adults’ involvement with the initial purchase decision influenced their subsequent satisfaction with the youth sport programme.

Importantly, therefore, evaluating parents’ satisfaction with sport programmes needs separate and different criteria for that of children. Green and Chalip (1998) found “enduring involvement” was more likely when children enjoyed their team and found practices to be fun and exciting. This was widely supported by psychological literature (for example Wiess and Gould (1986); Smoll and Smith (1993); Biddle et al (1998); Carpenter and Scanlan (1998); Boyd and Yin (1996). Therefore, Green and Chalip highlighted the need for youth coaches to be trained to make youth sport ‘less like work and more like play’.

Green and Chalip suggested disseminating information, assigning significant roles and facilitating of social networking, making them useful indicators of perceived effectiveness by parents with children on programmes. Their research also reinforced the messages of de Knop et al (1994) about the role of parents when addressing the needs of young people in clubs. However, Green and Chalip’s sample was dominated by better-educated, predominantly white, relatively affluent parents, whose socio-economic conditions may be less typical.

De Knop and de Martelaer (2001) and de Knop et al (1994) found that children in some clubs saw them as very adult controlled, with an emphasis on obedience, discipline and co-ordination with others. This they argued, could be seen as treating children like ‘mini adults’. and in effect, converting something that should be like
play (enjoyment) into something like work (training). This could contribute to higher drop out as young people seek less regimented regimes and greater autonomy. Roberts (1996b) saw a continued emphasis on club provision in Europe contributing to an decline in participation not seen in the UK, which confirmed the different expectations of children and parents from organised sport. A problem identified was the issue of the ‘quality’ of the youth sport experience, with a lack of involvement of parents a common feature, linked to a lack of information and guidance for parents or children (de Knop and de Martealar, 2001). As children reached ‘specialising years/teenage’ this became especially important, according to Côté and Hay (2002b:438), “the overall quality of the sporting experiences in the specialising years should be positive to ensure teenagers stay involved”.

Parents’ preferences in coaching have been found to be likewise relevant to adherence to coaching programmes. Martin et al (1996) and Dale et al (2000) provided some insights into the differences between what parents valued in coaching behaviours as well as in organisation. Both similarities and differences were found in parents’ and children’s preferences. For example, positive feedback and training instruction were important for both adolescent athletes and their parents (Martin et al, 1996). On the other hand, whereas children preferred a coach who provided social support and a more democratic coaching style, parents were less likely to do so. Again, this has implications for evaluating programmes.

Parental support for athletes has been found to be particularly important in elite level sport. This was established in the UK in the Training of Young Athletes (TOYA) studies (Rowley, 1992ab), which recognised the impact of talented young people on their families. The Development of Sporting Talent (DOST) report (ESC, 1998) clearly showed that the support of family was very important to elite sport performers development, in terms of encouragement and more tangible, material support. This was reinforced by further analysis of elite young performers by Rowley and Graham (1999). A predominantly middle or upper social class profile of elite performers, even in sports which arguably might have less association with traditional middle class preoccupations, showed that there were significant differences in the ability of young people to access pathways to performance. Rowley and Graham (1999:127)
concluded, "the relationship between social class and intensive training indicates that participation in youth sport is a further example of unequal opportunity".

The DOST study confirmed that unequal pathways to top level sport were still hindering the progress of young people from different social groups:

"The results of this study demonstrate clearly that the opportunity to realise sporting potential is significantly influenced by an individual's social background"


Kay's (2000a) qualitative research into the impact of such performers on their family situations showed that the impacts of a talented performer on family life were very significant, a situation also found by Kirk et al (1996, 1997) and Côté (1999). They reported that parents made substantial contributions to the participation of their children through time, money and emotional support. Given the similar demands on parents' resources of many organised sports, it is perhaps not surprising that Kirk et al came to the conclusion that:

"club and representative sport is realistically available only to the children of parents who are in reasonably well paid employment"

(Kirk et al, 1996:44).

The role of parents could be seen as "gatekeepers" to the sport experience, as identified by Waring, Almond and Buckley (1996). The role of 'gatekeeper' involves being: "guardian, enforcer and facilitator". Arguably as children move along a performance pathway, the facilitator role becomes even more important, as material and organisational demands increase, as suggested by Welk (1999). Other gatekeepers in sport participation socialisation are peers and schools (specifically teachers).

Their perceived usefulness was proposed by Bourdieu but also noted by Zeijl et al (2000) as being an important factor in parents’ support for leisure activities, was shown to vary according to socio-economic group or status by Wright et al (1999); and Kirk et al (1997). Wright et al (1999) focused on the relationship between parents' attitudes and their behaviours in relation to their children’s activity. What parents wanted and expected were health and social benefits. As children got older the parental emphasis changed from health to social. Organised activities were also associated with other expectations to do with personal development and quality of life improvements associated with becoming more organised, learning how to win and
lose, and being part of a team. In support of earlier studies and consistent with Bourdieu (1988), these expectations were found to be related to class differences in perceived opportunities and experiences. Middle class parents had higher expectations and middle class children had a greater range of opportunities. Due to Australian geography, concerns with more remote rural communities, and more limited facilities and opportunities were a marked feature of this research.

Another way that parents can influence participation in sport is through close links to the child’s perceived competence (Yang et al, 1996; Hoyle and Leff, 1997; Côté, 1999; Brustad, 1996, Kimiecik et al, 1996). Moderate expectations that match children’s perceived competence positively affect motivation, but too much can cause anxiety and distress, as children can be placed under pressure by what they see as unreasonable or unattainable goals (Yang et al, 1996).

Levels of parental expectation have been found to vary with social class and sex of the child (Yang et al, 1996). Consistent with other studies (Daley and O’Gara, 1998; Cale, 1996; Hovell et al, 1999), Yang et al found that activity decreased from the age of twelve and that girls were less active than boys, though at ages twenty one and twenty four they were more active. Children of more active fathers were found to be more active, more persistent in sport and less likely to drop out. The only link to socio-economic status reported, however, was that girls whose fathers belonged to the highest status groups tended to be more likely to continue training than other girls. No such relationship was found for the boys.

Therefore, the link from parental socio-economic status to sport participation is neither straightforward nor easy to predict. Yang et al (1996) also referred to the two-way socialisation process noted earlier, with parents attitudes and behaviour towards sport affected by the influence of active young people in the family. The key issue to emerge from this and similar studies noted above, was that while expectations and values associated with physical activity and sport by parents were similar, the experiences of children were often very different, depending on the families’ available resources, location and activities. Though Côté (1999) inferred parents would ‘find’ resources if they were committed to their child’s participation in performance oriented
sport, his research focused on intact and relatively affluent professional families and is therefore not easily generalised.

Longitudinal research (Yang et al, 1996, Talema et al, 1997; Malina, 1996) has indicated not only that parental influence is important, but that it is a good predictor at a young age, for later participation, even up to adulthood. This has implications for participation findings in recent studies in the UK. The point that patterns of behaviour once established in childhood will tend to be fairly stable was made by Roberts (1996b), when he proposed that to increase future participation levels the government had simply to continue to support the increased community provision that had enabled increased sport participation by young people. This was shown by the national survey (Mason, 1995) and research in inner cities (Roberts and Brodie, 1992). Unfortunately longitudinal research to assess such impacts is both difficult and expensive, and as noted by Ewing and Seefeld (1996) less likely to be commissioned. Also, the growth in community provision has apparently failed to address persistent differences that remain between those using community sport facilities and local catchment populations, so contributing to relatively static patterns of sport participation in the UK (Sport England, 2004).

The research examined clearly pointed to problems for those from modest social backgrounds aspiring towards sporting performance pathways, of less positive support from parents or fewer material resources to take advantage of the supply of opportunities. Despite Roberts’ (1996b) assertion of blurred social divisions, through improved local facilities and school provision, differences in take up of opportunity have been found in club and performance-oriented sport in Nottinghamshire (Collins and Buller 2000, 2003) and between different parts of Wales (SCfW, 2001). West et al (2002) found that the actual environment of family life is a key determinant of the form and nature of sport participation, though not entirely dependent on socio-economic status alone. It is clear, therefore, that the influence of family and home cannot alone explain all the choices and opportunities available to young people. Another key site for such influences is the school and this is the next major area to be examined.
3.2 Sport, school and Physical Education

Educational and school based experiences in childhood clearly affects young peoples participation in sport, based on the literature reviewed below. However, what the literature also shows is that these experiences are very varied, their impacts on young people are complex and often difficult to predict, and they take place in various contexts. Education remains a congested and contested area of policy, with frequent and often heated political debate and a range of policy instruments at all levels of government (Penney and Evans 1999). In schools, sport enters what was described as a “crowded policy space” (Houlihan, 1999a), with many sites for ‘slippage’ in the meanings, understandings and representations of policy (Penney and Houlihan, 2001). Within and outside the curriculum, children are influenced by the school environment, their teachers and their peers (Kirk et al, 2000; Kirk, 2004). The opportunities presented to them at school and the policies and practices at the school/community interface, where both sorts of provision link together, vary considerably (Penney, 1999). The nature of this process and the complexity of the relationships at work in this “crowded policy space” make it difficult to trace and explain the impact of specific policies or programmes (Houlihan 1999a, 2000). There are many levels of policy: national, county, district and individual schools. There are also many sites; i.e. schools and departments, where policy is translated into practice, or ignored, as highlighted by Penney and Evans (1999). The subsections below consider physical educational influences and links to after-school activity. Prior to this, however, the policy process at work in school sport is examined.

PE policy and youth sport

School based experience is widely regarded as being key to future participation in sport, as noted by Curtis et al (1999); de Knop et al (1996) and Smoll and Smith (1996). Other research has also linked educational attainment, with the likelihood of adult participation in sport (Eccles et al, 2003), with education identified as an important factor in taking up and experiencing a range of sports (Rowe and Champion 1999, Roberts and Brodie, 1992). This is supported by Vanreusel et al (1997); Yang et al (1996); Mason (1995a, b); Kremer et al (1997) and SCfW (2001). Schemes using education for leisure and club links were shown to have positive impacts on knowledge about opportunities outside school (MacDonald and Tungatt, 1993).
Educational attainment and age of leaving education were shown to have a positive role in developing talented performers, as many elite athletes stayed longer in formal education (ESC, 1998; Rowley 1992a, b; 1995).

Houlihan (1991, 1997, 1999a) examined the extent of influence of education policy on sport policy, and showed clear links and significant overlap between the two. As a result of this overlap, some of the impacts on sport through policies introduced in schools were significant. Examples of this are the National Curriculum for PE (NCPE), Local Management of Schools and the introduction of Specialist Sports Colleges, introduced through various Education Reform Acts in the 1980s and 1990s in the UK. (Sports Council for Wales, 1991; NW Sports Council, 1991; OFSTED, 1995).

Significant influences of school experiences were reported in the participation of young people in Northern Ireland, in terms of curriculum and practices which encouraged or discouraged future participation (Brennan and Bleakley, 1997). Rates of participation in curricular sport were high, as PE was compulsory. However, the experiences of all young people are not the same, and delivery and perceived effectiveness of physical education policy and practice varies, despite having a National Curriculum (MORI/Sport England, 2000; 2002, 2003; Penney and Evans, 1999; Williams and Bedward 1999; Scraton and Flintoff, 2001; Kirk et al, 2000; Fairclough et al, 2002). Children have varied experiences in terms of time spent in PE, and the frequency and range of sporting activities available to them, especially girls.

Roberts, in his analysis of what he saw as the ‘success’ of school Physical Education and community sport, reflected that the compulsory nature of sport, particularly team games, would not ensure that when they had the choice, children would continue these activities once they left school (Roberts, 1996a:56). He implied that schools had to look to the experiences and the support they offered young people to enable them to make informed choices. However, in schools and in education more broadly there has been an ongoing debate about the nature, role and purpose of sport in Physical Education. Tensions exist between the notions of ‘Sport for All’ and inclusive physical education for lifelong participation, health-related approaches and
elitist and more selective approaches geared towards talented youngsters. Also, between a narrow focus on sport, which often means team games for the most able and a more rounded development of motor skills, health and individual development (Evans, 1993; Penney and Harris, 1997; Penney and Evans, 1999; Kirk and Gorely 2000). For example, Fairclough et al (2002) showed a relatively low level of 'lifetime activities' in schools, even though these were the ones most likely to carry over into lifelong participation.

There has been extensive debate on the nature and context of the NCPE, particularly through the examination of the competing discourses that surround it (Penney 1995, 1998; Penney and Evans, 1999; DES, 1995). An attempt to bring together these potentially competing interests came with the setting up of the School Sport Forum (SSF) in the late 1980s. The report that followed their debates and its recommendations included examples of the need for partnerships to deliver solutions to perceived problems (School Sport Forum, 1988). A far-reaching and detailed set of recommendations was met with rather lukewarm response by the current Government (DES, 1989), and noted with disappointment but not surprise by the PE profession (Talbot, 1993). However, the report clearly represented a watershed in terms of policy formulation. All the major agencies and organisations were included in the consultation. The report reflected concerns impinging on the youth sport sector, in particular: wide-ranging education reform, including the National Curriculum for PE, the local government arrangements for the management of community recreation facilities, and Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT).

The SSF report set out a rationale for a focus on the child in sport and the role that sport can play in the life of young people in a modern society. The long list of recommendations reflected concerns of the teaching profession, particularly in after-school sport. However, the lack of ability of the SSF to convert these recommendations to action was clearly illustrated. For example, one recommendation was for professional staff to be employed as school sport co-ordinators, to more effectively manage after-school provision. This situation had been seen to deteriorate after teachers’ pay disputes and contract revisions of the mid 1980s. However, though such a scheme was one of the initial pilots in the National Development Projects (MacDonald and Tungatt, 1993), for various reasons it was not until after
2000 that this recommendation was effectively put into action, as part of a lottery-funded Active Schools initiative (DCMS, 1999, 2000, 2001) and subsequently extended to a national scheme of schools partnerships (DfES/DCMS, 2003).

The SSF presented clear support for more teachers becoming qualified coaches and for schools to use the services of club coaches, in appropriate settings, to support their work. It recognised that coaches would require particular skills and knowledge if the educational objectives of teachers were also to be met (SSF, 1988). The government’s rejection of the notion that the role of teachers in extra-curricular sport was recognised highlighted an unappreciated gap in meeting the demand for sport outside school. The government instead suggested that extra-curricular sport be provided by “local sports clubs and organisations”, with no indication of how this was to be achieved (DES, 1989). The underlying assumption was that schools should concern themselves with education, clubs with promoting themselves or their sport, in a ‘free market’ ideology. On the other hand, and almost paradoxically, the government wanted schools to open their facilities to the wider community, as part of their concern for Value of Money (DES, 1991b). There appeared also to be a rather exaggerated view of the impact of sports development in local authorities at the time:

“most Metropolitan authorities have already appointed sports development officers and in general these officers have proved highly effective in raising levels of participation”

(DES, 1989: 12).

This appeared to be at odds with the degree of SD reported by the Sports Council:

“sports participation has grown in popularity and facilities have increased, but resources have been inadequate and progress insufficient to meet all of the council’s targets”

(SC, 1988: 1).

However the SSF’s recommendations also tended to neglect or chose to ignore some of the tensions within the PE profession referred to earlier about the role of PE which continued unabated into the 1990s.

The ideological struggle in PE, between the concepts of equality and elitism as discussed by Thomas (1993) was brought to a head by the demands of the National Curriculum for PE (Penney and Evans, 1999). Penney (1995) indicated that this had far-reaching impacts on both the profession and practice of PE, together with the other
demands of Education Reform, chiefly the Local Management of Schools (LMS) or the introduction of Grant Maintained status:

“the making of the NCPE has illustrated vividly not only the contested nature of the curriculum but also the inequities inherent in education and which recent policies seem set to sustain”

(Penney and Evans, 1997: 22).

Talbot (1993, 1995) also contributed to this debate, highlighting political influences on the NCPE formulation process and an apparent lack of understanding of public school-educated ministers and civil servants of the realities of PE in state schools. Thomas (1993) referred to the problems and tensions inherent in the struggle: on the one hand the ethos of competition and a free market culture, and on the other concerns for equality and entitlement in PE. Such tensions were clear when Champion Coaching was introduced and undoubtedly had some impact on policy making and practice in youth sport.

This may explain to some extent why the PE profession was so vital to the success of CC and at the same time apparently less than 100% behind it initially (Edwards, 1993; Cook et al, 1992). Thomas (1993) suggested that certain structural and cultural features of the Education Reform Acts not only sustained elitist tendencies within PE, but exacerbated them. She also challenged the view expressed by the DES and the National Curriculum Council that the reforms of the 1988 Act, particularly the NCPE, would bring about greater equality of opportunity. At that stage of implementation, it was arguably too early to tell what the impacts would be, but such concerns were clearly well founded.

The debate within PE about the balance between elitism and equality rages still (Penney and Evans, 1999). Penney and Evans (1997:21) referred to a “progressive privileging of restorationist (back-to-basic) and pragmatic discourses over and above educational discourses”. They specifically referred to two key policy texts, the revised NCPE and Sport: Raising the Game as central to the discourse that framed the role for PE in schools as sustaining and supporting sporting excellence. Champion Coaching could be said to have added fuel to this debate, requiring as it did, a process of selection. Children gained access to the coaching mainly through their PE teachers. Only those with both the desire and the skill required for the courses should be referred to them (NCF, 1992). The teacher was therefore in a powerful gatekeeper
role. Their understanding of and concern for equality may have helped or hindered progress of children into CC courses. They may have referred children regardless of ability, referred no children so as not to deny their own egalitarian ideals, or selected only those they felt should be rewarded with the opportunity, regardless of merit, need or appropriateness. This is clearly a concern which needs addressing, and was highlighted by Buller (1998) and other studies (Collins and Buller, 2000) as worthy of further examination.

Thomas (1993) referred to the pejorative connotations of ‘elitism’ in PE, therefore Champion Coaching risked an association with this concept. This was identified by Edwards (1993) and in NCF reports as an issue to be overcome (NCF, 1992, 1993). However, the selection principle was maintained when CC expanded, even if not strictly adhered to by many schemes. Selection is a feature of school-based sport that inevitably influences extra-curricular sport, since selecting activities offered to children, teachers and schools shape the opportunities for after-school activities.

Whilst teachers may be more concerned with the experience of the majority, this may lead, for some, to a lack of emphasis on the more able children. In what Hargreaves (1986) referred to as “cultural transmission” through competitive team games and public school athleticism, PE was seen to be safeguarding the nation’s sporting heritage, and schools were seen by some as being responsible for producing future champions. These tensions were noted by Mason (1995b) where teachers were concerned about providing for the full range of ability in schools. At the same time they were conscious of their role in facilitating outside participation and developing a sound basis for talent to flourish. Concerns were based around the need to offer mixed ability classes, or of providing specialised support for specific sports, something which teachers did not always feel they were able to provide.

**PE and community sport links**

Teachers saw schools as being able to affect children’s participation in sport through a variety of mechanisms:

- the NCPE - by offering a range of sports and a variety of skills and activities
- by their methods of teaching and approaches emphasising more inclusive practice in lessons, not just focusing on the most able
by work with the local community, through developing club links, community use of schools and providing external coaching to supplement or complement the curriculum

(Mason, 1995b).

A detailed examination of the NCPE is outside the scope of this study. However, some key aspects of its development are noted here, as they can help illuminate the analysis of the links between school and community sport. One of the key indicators of successful PE is the development of more active lifestyles, including sport participation, as made clear by recent strategy documents (DfES/DCMS, 2003).

As noted by Houlihan (1999a), the longstanding debate in PE about status and recognition came to a head with the designation of PE as a foundation rather than a core subject within the new National Curriculum (DES, 1992). As a result the structure and content of the original and amended NCPE (DfEE, 1995) was “constructed around conventional disciplines and traditional content” (Houlihan 1999a:2). This process was not without its problems, as highlighted by Talbot (1993, 1995), Evans (1993), Kay (1997) and Penney and Evans (1997, 1999). Fisher (1996:140) saw this pressure for greater emphasis on traditional competitive team games “as a feature of a political context in which tradition, order, stability and accountability were important.”

According to Talbot (1993), political influence was exercised by Conservative ministers for Sport and Education, who were products of the public school system, rather than from any experience or affinity with the experience of the state system. It was not until John Major became Conservative leader that the political climate for sport in schools was perceived to change, leading eventually to the Raising the Game policy statement of 1995. This tension between the ‘public school’ ethos of games and the need for educational achievement is well illustrated by an article in The Guardian, prior to the publication of Raising the Game:

“ In the one corner is sports minister Ian Spoat, who wants sport to be a key part of the National Curriculum. In the other corner is the Education Secretary John Patten, who is more worried about the three R’s. In the middle are the state sector schools who have no proper facilities”

(Pilkington and Moss, The Guardian2, March 10th, 1994).
Sproat was quoted as equating sport in schools with ‘real’ sports like cricket and rugby, hockey and netball, i.e. “those we invented” not “step aerobics and country walks and listening to the history of diets”. This view tended to prevail in *Raising the Game*. The political tension in the background is clear – overall the government looked to schools to deliver some importance successes in educational standards and be more accountable in the form of examination results and league tables, including by now, examinations in PE at GCSE and A level. This resulted in ongoing conflicts about status, funding, competing priorities and debates on educational practices in PE (Penney and Evans, 1999). This conflict stemmed from one essential question: Should schools aim to develop better sport performers or develop more active populations? A central concern, which has resonance for a study of a coaching programme linked to schools, was reflected in the comment of Penney and Evans (1997:28) that:

“our fear is that the emphasis on “coaching” and links with clubs may together presage an emphasis on sport performance and the needs of the able few”.

The debate continued after the publication of *Raising the Game*, where John Major stated the intention was to “put sport back at the heart of weekly life in every school” (DNH, 1995; ii). There was also consideration of the links between schools and their communities, particularly sports clubs, in “extending the sporting culture” and a much more explicit emphasis on excellence. While the interest groups representing elite sport and the NGBs, were lobbying for greater emphasis on sport, the Health/PA interest groups (e.g. the Physical Activity Task Force) were lobbying for more emphasis on activity and fitness, with statements reiterating the role of schools and education in *More People, More Active, More Often* (PATF, 1996) and *Young and Active?* (HEA, 1998; Biddle et al, 1998).

The discourse of school sport and PE remains one of contested meanings and struggles for influence. Since 1995 it has been attempting to reinforce traditional ‘performance pathways’, with schools as sites for identifying talent. For example, SCfW (2001) referred to a “widening of the net” through school sport. This may be seen as counter to a view of sport in schools where the intention is to generate more participation, through a “widening of the gateways” or reducing barriers to
participation (Penney, 1998; Penney et al, 1999), and increasing activity levels (Biddle et al, 1998).

Kirk and Gorely (2001) highlighted three metaphors widely used to describe the relationship between school sport and performance sport: pyramids, foundation stones and trickle down effects. To this it is possible to add ‘pool’ - of talent and ‘net’ as others widely used. Schools represent the base of a pyramid, or the foundation stone for development, where basic motor skills and knowledge about sport are developed through the curriculum. However, as pointed out by Kirk and Gorely, this metaphor implies that as one moves up the pyramid, progressively fewer continue. Though the pyramidal model was supplanted by Sport England’s “new big picture” of sports development, the notion of “learning” as the base of all future development in sport was still very clear. The Active Schools initiative underpinned all the other parts of the sports development programme through learning; supporting Active Communities, Active Sports and World Class Programmes (see Figure 3.2)

![Figure 3.2: Sport England’s ‘Big Picture’ of Sport Development, 1998](image)

Kirk underlined the flawed logic behind the pyramid metaphor, that involving more people in the bottom layer automatically results in more at the top, claiming this represented a simplistic and normative assumption of no impediments for talent to be identified and developed, and ignoring structural issues. A further weakness to this approach is the inherent exclusion implied by the tapering geometry of a pyramid
(Kirk and Gorely, 2001). Furthermore the model cannot show effectively how ‘pathways’ operate, as people move from one level to another.

A ‘trickle down’ effect is implied when high levels of resource to small numbers of individuals at the elite level is justified, as the impacts ‘trickle down’ to larger numbers at the grass roots or foundation levels of sport. Thus, low levels of resources at the base are compensated by the aspirations inspired by role models at the apex. Young people are attracted to take up sport through the successes and high profile of sporting heroes. However, as pointed out by Kirk, this hypothesis does not appear to be well supported in the literature. In a national survey, children named football heroes and only one female athlete as role models (MORI, 2000). As an alternative to these metaphors, Kirk and Gorely proposed an ‘inclusive’ model of school sport and PE with participation and performance, based on the ‘integration’ model described by Murdoch (1990), and Thorpe (1996). Their inclusive model comprised four components:

1) Clearly articulated pathways across levels and ages
2) Widespread use of modified games (‘mini’ versions of adult games)
3) The development of practices based on inclusion for teachers and Coaches,
4) Co-ordination through policy development

The intention of this model was to provide an alternative to the ‘either /or’ debate of performance or participation and to link more clearly with participation outside school. However, it was recognised as an aspiration, rather than a reflection of reality. Despite the publication of the *Strategy for PE, School Sport and Club links*, (DfES, 2003; 2004) it remains so.

Schools and indeed individual teachers have had to struggle through more than a decade of change and uncertainty in PE, as with many other subjects. At times, PE has been an ideological and political battlefield, when it has seemed that all the things wrong with education, or society in general, have been laid at the door of PE (Evans and Penney, 1994). When national teams have lost, or medal tallies fallen, or in the rhetoric surrounding a nation of ‘couch potatoes’, PE has withstood considerable criticism. Policy instruments at all levels, including legislation, guidance, management arrangements, employment practices and school policies have been in a state of almost constant flux during this time.
Recent government policy (DCMS, 2001; DfES, 2004) has continued and reinforced this process, with school-based sport at the forefront of new developments. Whilst the debates have raged, schools and teachers have attempted to deliver a balanced and effective programme of PE within the constraints of available resources. The changes to the curriculum content and teaching practices required by the NCPE created a great many problems for schools, particularly in time and resources required to meet the demands of a central plan. The resulting diversity in curriculum content and delivery has left a patchwork of provision and experience for young people in the UK (MORI, 2000).

This must be appreciated when analysing national surveys or indeed, individual programmes designed to impact on performance pathways. Despite the NCPE, the experiences of young people varies according to school, location and many other structural and individual factors. National Surveys of Sport and PE (Mason 1995a,b; MORI, 2000; SE, 2002) highlighted a number of concerns. Though children clearly play a range of sports both inside and outside school, there is some evidence to suggest that children are getting a breadth of experience, rather than increasing their levels of skill and knowledge of particular sports (MORI, 2000). Though participation in sport by young people in general shows some increases, gender differences remain, unsuccessfully addressed by the NCPE. Boys in general are more active, play more sports and have more involvement with clubs outside school than girls (MORI, 2000; SE, 2002, 2003). These findings are particularly disappointing given the boost to youth sport finances during 1995 - 1999 through the Lottery funded National Junior Sport Programme (NJSP) and the development of the Active programmes from 2000. In some sports, such as cricket and rugby, rates of participation out of school have actually fallen (SE, 2002), despite the successes of others, for example the doubling of participation in football by girls from 1994-2002.

The overall picture presented by the research on sport in school lessons is generally positive. Children on the whole have a range of sports within the curriculum, including team and individual games, gymnastics, athletics and swimming. However, the time spent in PE lessons decreased from 1994-1999, particularly in primary schools (MORI 2000:26). The proportion of children spending two or more hours in PE per week dropped from around a half to around a third. This and other research
has shown significant differences between girls and boys experiences of PE and out of school activities (Williams and Bedward, 1999; Kirk et al, 2000; Mason, 1995; Daley, 2002; Flintoff and Scraton, 2001).

This shows that while there may be some successes, in terms of increasing participation in sports, the success is not uniform across sports and for all children. Of particular relevance to this study, is the importance given to sports in the curriculum. Selecting sports for a CC scheme at any given location was therefore an important decision for scheme organisers. The interest from PE staff, school policies about performance and progression, and the attitudes of individual teachers to the notion of selection and elitism implied by a Champion Coaching scheme were all central to success (Welsh, 1993). The potential influence of PE teachers on sport policy implementation is therefore worthy of more consideration.

In terms of the success or otherwise of school sport policy, the ongoing development of active lifestyles and sporting participation into adulthood is seen as a key indicator and one of central aims of the NCPE (DfES 1995; Penney 1999; Fairclough et al, 2002; Green, 2002). However, as indicated earlier, there remain hotly contested debates about the purpose of school sport and which agenda it is seen to service (Kirk and Gorely, 2000). Though the influence of the elite sport lobby on the development of the PE curriculum was noted by Penney and Evans (1999) it is perhaps in the area of after-school sport that their influence is more clearly seen (Penney and Harris, 1997). The limits to curricular PE have been widely recognised. For example, Thorpe argued that:

"curriculum time is insufficient for ‘physical education’ of the child. This has always been the case and few would deny that there is a real need to extend physical activity beyond the curriculum” (Thorpe 1996:144).

The variability of the curriculum on offer to children in terms of quality and quantity is a key, but not the only, reason. Schools clearly introduce activities and kindle interests that children might otherwise not experience. An important finding of the Northern Ireland survey was that a pattern for future preferences seemed to be well set by age eleven (Brennan and Bleakley, 1997). They indicated that both primary and secondary PE context influenced participation, but that 91% of boys and 84% of girls had experienced their ‘top sport’ by age 11. Many of the ‘top sports’ noted by young
people in Northern Ireland were typical in the National Curriculum, but not all taught or experienced in schools. There were also differences between girls and boys preferences noted by Mason (1995b) and MORI (2000) in the English surveys, and Scully and Clarke (1997) in Northern Ireland. These indicated that for girls, what goes on outside school may be much more restricted, and so more of their choices would be influenced by their curriculum. Nevertheless, many of the top sports for girls were not curriculum-based, for example cycling, roller-skating, and martial arts (MORI, 2000).

The involvement in competitive sport activity outside school appears to be a crucial indicator of continued participation into adulthood (Curtis, McTeer and White, 1999; Hendry et al, 1993). As indicated by Vanreusel et al (1997), Malina (1996) and others (e.g. Roberts and Brodie, 1992), young participants with a sporting profile are assumed to be more likely to be sports participants as adults. However, Vanreusel et al found that in fact competitive profiles in youth led to earlier and faster attrition rates, than for youth of similar ages with recreational sporting profiles. The latter were more likely to sustain their participation into adulthood. The reasons for such differences are not easily explained however, but may be related to self efficacy and positive reinforcement by peers, parents or others, like coaches (Welk, 1999; Nagel, 2001).

Various national surveys have linked enjoying sport outside school and the experiences in lessons. This implied that the more enjoyable the school lessons, the more likely they are to produce positive attitudes to sport outside school. There was some evidence that children had increased the number of sports they played frequently, which may reflect increased opportunity or inclination (Rowe and Champion, 1999). But the percentages of children playing most sports were largely static. This was hardly cheering news for sports development units and the governing bodies, though the national picture hides many local and regional differences. One area of gain, noted above, was the increase in girls playing football, which could be a reflection of the injection of effort into this sport by the governing body (the FA) and local authority development schemes, coupled with a high media profile. An investigation of the sports within CC schemes may shed some light on how such programmes influence the choices of young people.
Club membership by young people showed a slight increase from 1995 to 2000, from 42% to 46% of all young people, but the gender inequity noted in 1995 persisted (Rowe and Champion, 1999; SE, 2002). Boys were still more likely to belong to clubs than girls and of the increase noted above, much was due to an increase in boys in clubs, rather than girls. The NI study showed similar levels and differences (Scully and Clarke, 1997). In Wales, only 17% of the 15 to 24 age group belonged to a sports club (SCfW, 2001), which represented a decline from 19% in 1991/2).

Despite widespread recognition that the continuing participation in sport outside school is both desirable and important, the levels of participation in sport do not reflect this, and reveal ongoing and apparently deep rooted inequities. Policy for after school sport appears to have been unsuccessful in overcoming the difficulties highlighted since 1960, the so-called ‘Wolfenden Gap’, between school-based participation and adulthood (CCPR, 1960).

Recent Active Schools initiatives, including SportsMark and SportsMark Gold, ActiveMark, Challenge Funding, Coaching for Teachers and School Sports Coordinators, are all examples of policies which emphasise the link between curriculum and wider community or ongoing participation (Sport England, 2001). However, they are all based on the impetus coming from the school, or individual teacher, and are not based on strategic planning or an independently identified gap or need. Funding is based on successful bids or applications that can be, but are not always, coordinated and developed at county or district level by Sports Development Officers or LEAs. Again, teachers’ attitudes can influence how far schools actively engage with these programmes. Green (2000) showed an apparent mismatch between teachers’ perceptions of Sport for All philosophies and an apparent preoccupation with performance in extra-curricular sport and links to the community, which was indicative of the individual influences at work. This contributes to the patchwork of opportunity and enthusiasm found in schools, even within the same District.

One of the problems highlighted by the survey of children’s participation in Northern Ireland was the gender difference in the intention to continue playing sport outside school, linked to its perceived purpose. Girls were more oriented towards activity that is more informal, and boys to the more competitive. Therefore, girls often perceived
clubs as inappropriate. The problems of meeting the demand for appropriate club based competitive environments were recognised as being a hindrance to progression. Only 18% of young people were members of sports clubs, compared with about 36% being in other clubs where sport was one choice of what they could do, hence:

“there is a clear mismatch between young people’s willingness to engage in sport and their opportunities to take part in organised activities outside the formal education system”

(Brennan and Bleakley, 1997:87).

Club membership was also related to family influences, as children whose parents were members of sports club were more likely to be in clubs. Family was noted by 48% of young people as their source of introduction to a club, with 61% being reliant on their parents for transport to the club they belonged to. Characteristics of clubs and the services they offer also varied considerably.

De Knop et al (1994) proposed “youth friendly” characteristics that can encourage young people to maintain sporting careers in clubs. However, how far clubs actually offer the low cost coaching, competitive environment and social support that young people seek is difficult to determine, and another aspect to which this research can make some contribution. The ability of clubs to offer the experiences sought by children has been shown to be problematic, particularly given the nature of voluntary clubs in the UK (Theodoraki, 1999; White and Rowe, 1996; Collins n.d.). As pointed out by the Sports Council for Wales:

“where community links do exist, the base for children’s involvement appears to be very small and narrow. If continuity of participation is the achieved when children leave school then the strengthening of the children’s section within clubs will be a necessary condition”


As pointed out by Roberts (1996a,b), despite the successes of school and community provision in sport, the differences in participation between girls and boys remain stark. Citing the results of the first national Youth Sport Survey (Mason,1995) he found the variation between boys and girls participation in sport to be more marked that other forms of leisure behaviour. Curricular sport shows less difference in participation or numbers of sports played, due to the compulsory nature of PE, but there are much clearer differences as noted earlier, in out-of-school sport. This indicated to Roberts that “school sport was not interrupting the reproduction of gender differences” (1996a:55). Indeed, “girls involvement in outside activities was often in
spite of rather than because of their experience of PE” according to Williams and Bedward (1999:8).

3.3 Issues and challenges in youth sport

Ongoing equity problems are evident in the literature on young people in sport reviewed above and provide a consistent challenge to sports policy. As pointed out by Donnelly (1996:221):

“sport, by its very nature, produces and reveals inequalities in terms of physicality and athletic performance.......... however, social inequalities have come to be seen as part of the contested terrain of modern sport.”

Wold and Hendry (1998) reviewed the extensive literature on social factors affecting PA and showed social inequalities underpinned the PA of young people. The research for the PAT 10 report of the SEU by Collins et al (1999) showed the persistence of inequity in sport, but also the potential for sport to overcome the inequity in wider society. One such area of inequity is gender, widely debated in the sociology of sport (Kay, 2000b; Horne et al, 1999; Hargreaves, 1994; Scraton, 1995). Gender-based differences in participation in sport and activity have been found in successive national surveys, including the Allied Dunbar National Fitness Survey (HEA/SC, 1992) and General Household Surveys (SE, 1999) and these trends have been identified and persisted for some time (Roberts and Minten, 1989; SC, 1988, 1993d). Though commercial health and fitness clubs may close some of these gaps in adults with the means to pay for their services, few schools or municipal services offer similar facilities to young people.

Males and females differ in both the frequency and type of activity they engage in, though in general, males are more active in sport than females. That these differences persist among young people, is perhaps the greatest disappointment of the failure of the Sport For All approach to policy since the 1970s. Girls are still less likely to take part in sport outside school, they are less likely to belong to a club, and less likely to continue their sport as a lifelong pattern of activity. The school environment remains a contested space for girls’ PE, as indicated in the previous section. While girls’ PE can at least in principle claim equality in terms of curriculum time, the suitability of much ‘practice’ in the delivery of PE in schools has been found to be wanting (Kirk
et al, 2000; Flintoff and Scraton, 2001). Though recent moves to encourage girl-friendly PE are in their early phases, there is some indication that these have some potential, based on attitudinal/affective approaches (Kirk et al, 2000). The problem appears not with the interest in sport of girls, but more to do with the way gender is socially constructed and shapes and constrains opportunities according to roles perceived as appropriate for them (Hargreaves, 1994; Kay, 2004).

Motivational differences between girls and boys have been found to shape the way they spend their time (Koivula, 1999) and in sporting preferences (Scully and Clarke, 1997). In PA in general, the amount and type of activity has also been shown to vary (Cale 1996; Biddle et al, 1998). Essentially, boys and girls are socialised unequally with regard to physical activity and sport (Greendorfer, 1992a). As a result, young people and the adults they become have different attitudes and motivations for sport, with different expectations of the outcomes of this participation. Koivula saw this process of differential socialisation and experience with sport as part of

"the social construction of female-male relations which works to maintain, strengthen and naturalise gender differences"

(Koivula, 1999:375).

That is, socialisation occurs through sport as well as into sport in this respect. Even in PA, differences are clear and consistent across different cultures. Mota and Silva (1999) reported that Portuguese boys were more active than girls and particularly took part in more vigorous activity. This is consistent with the findings of Cale (1996), Biddle et al (1998) and Shropshire and Carroll (1997, 1998). Gender and family influences were thought to act together, with mothers having more influence in some studies than fathers (Mota and Silva, 1999). In many studies there is some evidence of attitudes and behaviours changing over time, though the differences between the sexes tend to remain fairly constant. One exception was Yang et al (1996), who found that the 21 and 24 year-old Finnish women were more active than men of the same ages.

Changing views over time was a feature of the study by Coakley and White (1992), where at age 15 or so, young girls associated being involved in organised sport with childhood - leaving sport behind was for them part of growing up. This may have reflected an acceptance of the expected gender stereotype. On the other hand, Malina
(1996) found that women who were more active in sports as adolescents were more likely to be active in sport in adulthood. This implied that if girls rejected such stereotypes at this crucial stage in their development, their behaviour could track into adulthood.

There is some evidence of that attitude to PA changes about the time of puberty, which might explain this and a declining interest in sport happens in school years 7-9 in girls (ages 11-14) but not until school years 10 and 11 (ages 14-16) for boys (Mason, 1995; Daley and O’Gara, 1998). As indicated by Hendry et al (1993) external reasons for participating in sport appeared to be more important with younger children, for example encouragement of parents or liking a coach. However, older children valued skill acquisition and team affiliation more highly (Daley and O’Gara, 1998). This supported Hendry et al’s (1993) view of a shift to peer group affiliations at this age. Some of their findings appeared to challenge some widely held views on motivation to participate by girls, as they found girls in their ‘active sample’, reporting high team affiliation and skill acquisition motivation. This seems to indicate that such motivations are important for continuing with organised sport and that they can be found in both girls and boys, but for a variety of reasons, motivated girls are a minority.

The impact of socio-economic factors on pathways into performance-oriented sport is relatively neglected. Except for the studies noted here there is limited mention in the major studies on young people and sport of the differences in impacts on young people’s experience of club or performance sport arising from their socio-economic circumstances (Kirk et al, 1997; Rowley and Graham, 1999; Collins and Buller, 2000, 2003; Coalter et al, 2000). This lack of attention is despite the long association between sport and social class, where, as noted by Sugden and Tomlinson (2000:309) “sport and social hierarchy have always been close relatives”.

The issue of social class inequalities was absent from Raising the Game, as noted by Roberts (1996a), from the national sport surveys (Mason 1995, MORI/Sport England, 2000) and from Game Plan, highlighted by Collins (2003). However, Roberts noted that the high levels of participation found by Mason (1995) could be seen as evidence that “participation could not have been the prerogative of any specific social group”
He compared this with earlier work (Emmett 1971; Hendry, 1978), where children in selective schools and the ‘best pupils’ tended to play more sport. As the differences were explained partly by the superior facilities and organised competitive sport in independent and grammar schools at that time, Roberts perceived that the improvement in facilities in both schools and the wider community had since made up this gap and therefore “blurred former social divisions”. However, he still proposed:

“young people on middle class trajectories have higher levels of sports participation than those in working class locations” (Roberts, 1996a: 53).

This was supported by Hendry et al (1993) and Roberts and Parsell (1994). Home interviews by Mason (1995b) indicated that parental support, sport active parents and transport availability, all of which seem most appropriate to associate with middle class families, were linked to greater likelihood of participation. Roberts contended that it is not just the issue of participating or not, but the frequency and context of that participation that is important, as “playing sport is no longer the hallmark of the country’s social, economic or educational elites.”(Roberts 1996a: 54). What was important to Roberts was the nature and form of the participation - whether oriented towards performance or more frequent, or in a club. Lower working class or an “underclass” of youth was seen to sit outside the norm for young people of some form of regular sport activity.

Working class young people were found by Coakley and White (1992) to be affected more by material constraints and the dynamics of class relations when it came to their choice of activity. As suggested by Bourdieu (1978), they would not seek to take part in sports associated with the ‘middle class’, where they might be subject to ridicule, or rejection, particularly by their peers.

Class and the earlier discussion of parental circumstances are clearly related, as the concept of class is essentially based on assumptions about family resources and the occupational and educational backgrounds of parents. Much of the earlier discussion about the influences of parents and social capital accruing from activities highlighted this. But low SES has long been considered a constraint or barrier to leisure choices (Raymore et al, 1994, Crawford et al, 1991). However, studies suggest that
intervening factors can complicate a simplistic model of direct relations between SES and propensity to participate; Raymore et al. (1994) contended that young people with higher self-esteem are more likely to take part in organised leisure activities (for example, sports clubs) and that high self-esteem was linked to higher SES. Their research revealed a complex relationship between SES and perceptions of constraint. The implication for practice they proposed, was the need to overcome ‘selective attention’, where opportunities were not perceived as relevant to needs; so providers needed to examine both ‘real’ and ‘perceived’ constraints, to opportunities, particularly by girls.

As shown by Kay and Jackson (1991), the impacts of such perceptions are not always straightforward. Participants may seek opportunities despite perceived constraints, and can sometimes successfully negotiate real barriers. Geographical variables, for example accessibility, mobility and location of facilities were found to be less influential than lack of time or facilities (Jackson, 1994).

Boothby et al. (1981) showed that geographical factors alone could not explain differences in participation. Clearly however, structural or environmental influences can create real or perceived barriers for young people, particularly for performance oriented sport. The geography of poverty and social exclusion, highlighted by the work of Collins et al. (1999) and Collins (2003) is therefore important when considering the social welfare objectives for sport policy. Children in poor households were noted at particular risk of social exclusion in sport. The extent to which programmes can be shown to be accessible to and benefiting those more at risk from exclusion arguably could be a measure of their contribution to social welfare objectives and meeting equity targets. Measuring the impacts of programmes in these aspects is particularly problematical, as there are few agreed measures of SES that are easily and readily available to researchers working with limited resources.

The implications are clear, and present a challenge for sports development interventions aimed at providing for all young people, like CC. Those from more disadvantaged social groups, whether based on SES, ethnicity, disability or gender will tend, for a whole range of reasons, to have fewer opportunities to attend structured leisure activities, including sports programmes. The extent to which
schemes can compensate for these differences is a potential measure of their effectiveness.

However, the mechanisms and processes involved are complex and involve an understanding of the needs of young people and the realities of the interactions between different policy interventions operating at different levels in modern Britain. Interventions need to have an impact at the level of the individual - changing attitudes and perceptions as well as affecting structural change. Tait (2000) highlighted the challenges posed by such interventions, and contended that more research was needed on the process of identity formation through young people’s participation. He also called for more effective programme evaluation (Tait, 2000), echoed by Coalter (2000, 2001).

The recently published equity index (SE, 2000b) was the first comprehensive report of the differences in participation in sport across various groups in UK society, but unfortunately it applied only to adults. It reinforced the perception that sport in the UK is still subject to much division and diversity. Particular concern has been the affect of differences in participation by different ethnic groups and those with a disability. While there is a considerable literature in the sociology of sport that discusses and analyses these factors amongst adults, there is a death of relevant information on those youth-oriented programmes in sports development, which seek to address them.

De Knop et al (1994) and Verma and Derby (1994) confirmed that interest and enthusiasms for sport is just as high in children from different ethnic backgrounds, but once again it is the lack of opportunity that they have, particularly girls, which results in lower levels of involvement. Cultural and social expectations, which may restrict dress or mixed sex activity, are another complicating factor. Coalter et al (2000) and the PAT 10 report (DCMS, 1999) highlighted the impact of these factors on access to services, and showed projects with limited success. Coalter et al (2000) noted that the evidence suggested that the barriers to participation in sport faced by ethnic minorities were similar to those of the rest of the population, but there were some differences, not surprisingly these impacted more strongly outside school than in curricular PE. Cultural or religious beliefs could impose different limits on the way in which young
people could participate in sport. However, there was some evidence of stereotyping in practices and attitudes of peers and leaders that could have negative impacts on participants (Coalter et al, 2000:76). They also noted a tendency to group all people from different ethnic minorities together, with little appreciation of the historical, cultural or religious diversity between these groups, with the result that practices and policies were often inappropriate or ineffective. The review of sport participation by Sport England (2004:2) included the following stark observation:

“The situation in which we find ourselves is that participation rates have remained stubbornly static and inequalities in participation between different groups have continued largely unchanged over the last 30 years or so”.

Despite the work of various agencies seeking to break down barriers to participation and challenge stereotypes, much inequality still permeates contemporary youth sport. The impact on inequity by youth sport programmes is relatively poorly understood or mapped.

Youth sport and social capital – developing people or developing sport?

Sport has been linked on different levels to the concept of social capital. One use of the term is that used by Bourdieu (1978) where he infers that social standing or cultural capital accrues differently to participants in different sports. Another use of the term is the inference that participating in sporting clubs or voluntary activity develops a form of social glue, referred to as bridging (between groups in society) or bonding capital (within groups) by Aldridge et al (2001) and Puttnam (2000). Li et al (2002) used membership of sports clubs as one of the indicators of changing patterns of social capital, as has Hall (1999). According to Schmidt (2002), the motivation that drove such activity needed to be understood, as this was potentially more important than the consequences of any resulting increase in social capital. Collins (2003) has shown that levels of communal social capital can influence the choices and opportunities available in local communities, as had earlier work with Boothby et al (1981). Changes to the levels of such capital, whether sport-based or not, are recognised as long-term challenges for public policy (Roberts, 1999).

Sometimes reasons for such activity are not entirely altruistic, but are undertaken to confer some advantage to the individual. For example, coaches involved in sport may
do so voluntarily but with a view to increasing their skills and knowledge for an alternative career, or because they have a child involved in that club. There is also some debate as to whether it is possible to measure social capital at the individual level and then infer a communal resource from this (Li et al., 2002; Schmidt, 2002). Denny (2003) found a complex relationship between education and personal social capital in the form of skills and knowledge. This was partly due to diverse financial rewards in the job market and differential potential for employment. People can choose to invest gains in human capital in helping others as volunteers, or increasing their earnings, or by taking a low paid but socially rewarding job.

The basis of much sport development work is the development of people through sport (Houlihan and White, 2002). In both participants and coaches, the involvement in programmes like CC is seen to increase personal and also social capital. Much of the justification for public funding for such activity is that the benefits of such capital contribute to broader social objectives, such as health, community cohesion or regeneration (Coalter, 2003). However, the basis of this growth is not well understood, and there is potential for deeper analysis of the social capital concept as it relates to club membership and voluntary sport activity, particularly how young people can be encouraged along such pathways and the role of voluntary coaches.

Recent work by Nicholls (2003) and Taylor et al. (2003) for the CCPR and Sport England respectively, has shown a continuing tension between the demands being placed by government on the voluntary sector of sport and volunteers, in professionalisation and child welfare, and the expectations of government; that voluntary action, particularly in sport, will help solve public policy problems. At the same time, increased funding opportunities are placing greater demands for modernisation, regulation and accountability on already stretched small organisations. This has obvious implications for policies and programmes that rely for their implementation, on voluntary agencies or clubs. The ability of clubs to act as 'exit routes' for sport programmes for youth may be compromised by their limited resources and conflicting objectives, as they essentially exist for the satisfaction of their memberships' sporting or social needs.
Conclusions

This chapter attempted to identify and explain some of the factors and influences on the participation and progression by young people in sport. There are various theoretical perspectives that illuminate this complex interaction. There are concepts of self efficacy, gender-based role models and social learning, motivation, expectations of self and by others, perceptions and affiliations that help to explain how young people perceive and experience sport differently. The concept of socialisation has been shown to be a complex and multi-layered process, and realist perspectives have included the work of Bourdieu. The sociology of class, habitus and institutions or organisations involved in socialisation processes in sport is a field of contested meanings and complex interactions. Welk’s model of PA promotion (1999) provides a useful framework, adapted for sport participation, which also incorporates social and environmental influences. The conflicts over the role and purpose of school sport are important in contributing to the diverse experiences of young people.

The interaction of personal, structural and environmental factors influencing sport participation has been shown to be complex and dynamic. Despite ongoing commitment from central and local government to developing opportunities for youth sport, access to a pathway of participation is not always evident, even for those with the talent, interest and motivation. The concept of a performance pathway is a social construction with different potential meanings, which lacks a clearly identified measure, though sports club membership appears to reflect a certain commitment to performance orientation.

This chapter has therefore traced some of the important influences on young people and the theories that have underpinned the development of programmes in sport, and identified areas where this research can make some contribution. The mechanisms and processes involved have pointed to a need to use interactive and interpretive approaches, and the potential for critical realism, to provide a sufficiently strong framework. As pointed out by Nash (2003) in education research, Bourdieu’s approach, of examining habitus and capital, is very useful in sustaining a multi-level explanation of inequality/difference. I argue similarly that is his analysis is particularly useful in understanding the differences found in sport. I am particularly
interested in how parents, teachers and community sport providers contribute to ‘dispositions’ of organised sport, through programmes like CC. Also of interest is the contribution that engagement with sport can make in the development of social and human capital, in both participants and coaches, involved in socialising processes, which are interactive and reciprocal.

The next chapter examines the impacts of policy and programmes in Youth with a particular focus on coaching and the Champion Coaching Scheme, before going on to propose the theory of change which the research sought to examine.
Chapter Four  
Policy analysis in youth sport and coaching

4.0  Introduction

This chapter addresses two major aspects; firstly, the meso-level analysis of policy in youth sport; secondly, an analysis of coaching and coaching policy, including the programme Champion Coaching. The chapter concludes with a section outlining a programme theory for CC, which leads to the research aims and objectives.

In the UK as internationally, young people have been the focus of considerable research and investigation in sport. The previous chapter reviewed socialisation and theories relating to sports participation and performance that have influenced and underpinned policy. An analysis of the development of policy in youth sport is therefore important to assess whether policy change has been the result of a planned and rational application of this knowledge or chance outcomes and the influence of significant policy actors. I examine how youth sport policy has emerged using Multiple Streams Framework, and how it operates using meso-level theory of communities, networks and coalitions.

Youth sport in particular has been influenced by changing socio-demographics. De Knop et al (1996) identified the following international trends relating to youth sport:

- A growth in opportunities for organised sport
- More children interested in sport
- An increase in “institutionalised sport” over more spontaneous sporting practice, and
- Increased polarisation between very active, trained young people and the very inactive.

They concluded that “children’s sport has become more serious, less playful and too much organised” (de Knop et al, 1996: 465). It was argued, this has led in turn to a decrease in the age of joining clubs, increased competition and lack of co-operation between clubs and sports. Earlier specialisation, despite reservations about the impact this has on long term activity, and a growth in ‘drop out’, particularly by girls, has also been identified. While some sports, often individual,
have grown, these have tended to be at the expense of more traditional, team sports. Internationally, there is also a problem in getting sufficient leaders and coaches of quality involved in sport for young people. These trends provide the international context for the development of UK sports policy summarised below.

4.1 Policy in youth sport and coaching in the UK

Table 4.1 summarises a range of policy outputs over the period from 1960 – 2004, highlighting significant events and issues impacting on youth sport. What is clear is that, as a distinct aspect of sport policy, youth sport fails to match up to the constraints of a strictly stagist approach to policy. It is neither sufficiently well defined nor following a logical issue identification cycle (based on Downs, 1972, as cited by Houlihan 1991).

It is difficult to trace any cyclical approach through these events, which have lurched from periods of ‘alarmed discovery’ of the 1980’s of reduced school, extra-curricular activity (following teachers pay disputes) to pronouncements of significant national and well-resourced initiatives in the 1990s (the National Junior Sport Programme) with little logical consistency. There was often overlap with other policy areas, particularly education, but also youth justice, employment and health, which further complicate any analysis of policy developments.

There appears to be a lack of ‘rational’ policy-making, informed over time by the workings of co-ordinated advocacy coalitions (Smith, 1999). Furthermore, there is a lack of systematic research and evaluation of policy impacts or the application of theory based on consensus of values and beliefs regarding sport for young people. This makes stages difficult to map out due to complexity of the interactions and the lack of temporal consistency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Significant events, policies and reports in youth sport</th>
<th>Developments in related policy areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970's</td>
<td>Sports Council established 1972</td>
<td>House of Lords (1973) and White Paper (1975) on <em>Sport and Recreation</em> establish sport as part of social welfare policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980's</td>
<td>Sports Council Policy: Youth as a key Sports Council “Target group”</td>
<td>Urban unrest and inner city youth targeted by Manpower Services Commission and other initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCF established 1983</td>
<td>Growth of Leisure Departments, facilities and services, emergence of Sports Development practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action Sport - Growth in “outreach” community sports development</td>
<td>Education Reforms, and changes to teacher contracts impact on out of hours sport, and development of National Curriculum for Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Lifestyles Report 1988</td>
<td>Tendering creates client and contractor roles in local authority sport and leisure departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Sport Forum (SSF) (1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government Response to SSF report (1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 1995</td>
<td>DES <em>Sport and Active Recreation</em> (1991); youth and excellence as priorities for Government</td>
<td>Sport and Crime links examined; (Robins, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Champion Coaching Scheme</em> launched as pilot 1991</td>
<td><em>Health of the Nation</em> (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young People, Policy and Frameworks for Action (Sports Council, 1993)</td>
<td>1994/5 Sport becomes a ‘Good Cause’ and Lottery Sports Fund established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Sport Trust established (Sue Campbell as CEO)</td>
<td>Growth in the employment of ‘sport development officers’ and related practitioners (Collins, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Junior Sport Programme set up (1995/6) accessing Lottery funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UK Sport and English Sports Council established  
Sport England rebranded and launches Active programmes 1998/9; Champion Coaching discontinued  
*A Sporting Future for All* (2000)  
School Sport Alliance created  
Sue Campbell appointed Advisor on School Sport to DfES and DCMS  
World Class Programmes include Start and Potential with focus on Talent ID and Development  
Active Sport framework established and Governing Bodies selected for inclusion. County Partnerships established to implement Active Sport  
MORI/Sport England research, Young People and Sport shows some increases in participation, but problems in primary provision and gaps between boys and girls rates remain.  
Active Schools programme includes Coaching for Teachers, Sports Mark Awards and Challenge funding, Sport College and School Sport Co-ordinators |
| 2001-2004  | New Active Sports Partnerships (45) deliver performance plans for youth sport, in 10 sports  
Active Schools Programmes expanded : Coaching for Teachers, Sportsmark and Activemark (for primary schools)  
New Sport Colleges and School Sport Co-ordinators funded from NOF – new funding stream, increase in School Sport Partnerships and capital investments in facilities in schools  
Strategy for PE, School Sport, Club Links (2003, 2004) brings strands of different agencies together  
New framework for school sport highlights two sets of partnerships (school and sports) delivering policy (Campbell, 2003) |

More People, More Active, More Often – *(Physical Activity Task Force, 1996)*  
New Labour Government 1997, DCMS established  
Best Value Review replaces CCT  
SEU establishes inclusion agenda and *Neighbourhood Renewal* (1998)  
*Young and Active* (1998) includes *Policy and Frameworks for Action* promoting activity by young people  
Policy Action Teams report (inc Sport and the Arts, SEU, 1999) on benefits of sport to social inclusion agenda  
Cunningham review of elite sport spending (2000) highlighted importance of coaches to elite sport  
Revision of Lottery funding – *New Opportunities Fund* (NOF) created  
Recognition of child protection issues, creation of NSPCC/SE Child Protection Unit  
Comprehensive Performance Assessments require local authorities to assess performance against corporate objectives (increase of performance measurement requirements)  
Coaching Task Force (2002) recommends significant investment in coaching  
*Game Plan* (DCMS, 2003) recognises health and physical activity as key social benefits of sport  
CCPR/ Sport England research on volunteers (2003) highlights significance of volunteers (including coaches) to UK Sport  
Criminal Record checks and other regulations in clubs are increased.  
MORI research on coaching highlights scale of volunteer coaching and progress towards National Coaching Certificate (2004).
Tracing the development of youth sport policy

Arguably the Wolfenden Report (1960) was the starting point for the analysis of policy for youth sport after WW2, as cited by many commentators on this process (Houlihan, 1991; Roche, 1993; Eady, 1993; Coalter et al, 1986; Collins and Buller, 2000). In this report a gap was identified between school and adult participation in sport, henceforth reported as the “Wolfenden Gap”, which was described as:

“a manifest break between on the one hand, the participation in recreative physical activities which is normal for boys and girls at school, and on the other hand, their participation in similar, though not identical, activities some years later when they are more adult”

(CCPR, 1960: 4).

The four areas of concern highlighted by Wolfenden have remained, throughout the intervening 40 years, central to the ‘problem’ of youth sport in the UK:

- the lack of opportunities available to young people at the right price and the right time
- the weakness of the links between schools and clubs for young people
- the lack of a ‘performance ladder’ for coaching, training and personal development, and
- the lack of a co-ordinated approach between governing bodies of sport and other bodies.

The route of the youth sport problem through the political system became tied in with the development of sport across all levels and ages, under the general “Sport for All” message with the inception of the Sports Council in 1972.

In the early 1980’s, Campbell (1986) identified a growing concern with youth sport in the UK against a backdrop of increasing participation in sport, but evidence of gender and other inequality. Strengths at this time, according to her were:

- High standards of PE in schools and an integration of sport into the curriculum
- A framework of training by National Governing Bodies in their sports
- A range of opportunities available to young people
- Growing awareness of the potential for sport “as a powerful tool” that may be useful to the benefit of the community.

However, Campbell also pointed to areas requiring improvement:

- A continuing decline in sports participation after leaving school
Lack of a pattern of generic training for sports coaches and little application of sports science
Lack of lower level sports leaders working in the community, and
A need for more research into the impacts of specialised training on young people and the monitoring of elite level young performers.

Campbell was clearly concerned about coaching and leadership, as well as the appropriateness of the activities in which young people were involved. There was a perceived failure to facilitate performance pathways and a lack of co-ordination across a range of sport providers. More than ten years later, White and Rowe (1996:115) reported “there is no unified scheme or programme which provides opportunities for young people to participate in sport and develop their sporting potential”. Furthermore, they said:

“provision is uneven and fragmented and much depends on the locality in which young people live, their family circumstances (including income and social class), their gender and their ability level”.

Highlighting the complexity of organisational structures and influence on youth participation, White and Rowe concluded:

“...provision is variable and the development of sport for young people has been hampered by a lack of shared vision and poor co-ordination between different agencies”

(White and Rowe, 1996:124).
This lack of co-ordination, compared with New Zealand and Australia, was echoed by Thorpe (1996). He found sport in the UK in the early 1990’s to be typified by host of excellent initiatives, between a range of different partners, but that “the most obvious factor is that in the ‘United’ Kingdom, Sport is rarely united” (Thorpe, 1996:152). Despite this, the positive trend in the early 1990s was the growing significance of youth sport on the agendas of various agencies, the development of the NCPE, a Sport England policy in Youth sport and a growth in youth sport research. This, proposed White and Rowe (1996) hopefully would lead to better planned, organised and researched sport opportunities for young people in England.

The earlier analysis of school sport (in Chapter 3) highlighted how the SSF attempted to draw together interests associated with youth sport. However, the
government largely ignored their recommendations. Houlihan (1991:33) suggested that the lack of attention to implementation by both sides was one factor contributing to less effective impact:

"a comprehensive list of recommendations may be an important step in clarifying issues and setting further agenda, but its impact is reduced unless the problems of implementation are also addressed".

Unfortunately, this is a recurring problem in sport policy. Though there was some agreement with conclusions of the SSF, there were obvious problems in implementing them. For example, the Government preferred to put their faith in sports development officers, employed by the Local Authorities and voluntary clubs, rather than increase resources to schools to improve links between schools and clubs. Consequently no new resources and particular initiatives resulted from the government announcement (DES, 1989). The lack of success of the Ever thought of Sport campaign in the mid 1980s showed that policy had failed to address the complex relationship between opportunity and participation for young people (White and Coakley, 1986).

The Active Lifestyles Project (1989) showed the potential of educational and leisure partnerships which appeared to boost interest in out-of-school sport and gave some positive messages about provision. Laventure (1990) described the need for ‘sustainability’ in the out-of-school context. This was achieved in Coventry, by establishing more permanent structures and mechanisms to support young people in their transition from school to community participation. This included qualitatively different ‘youth orientated’ opportunities; developed and organised by and for young people. This aspect of the Coventry work received less attention, but was a theme picked up by the work of de Knop and de Martelaer (2001) and others (de Knop et al, 1994, 1996; Roberts, 1996b).

However, though such youth and education development projects gave positive messages about the potential for better school-club links, the potential to extend these projects was left to local, rather than national, initiative (MacDonald and Tungatt, 1992; 1993). Nevertheless, the start of the 1990s saw a range of potential solutions to the ‘problem’ of youth sport, from which CC would emerge.
Health and mass participation were the responsibility of the Departments for Health and local authorities respectively, following the reviews of policy in the early 1990s. There was also a much-delayed change to the structure of sport in the UK, with the creation of UK and Home Countries Sports Councils. This delay and debate is evidence of the influence different interest groups in sport and the conflicts of opinion regarding the future direction of sports policy in the early 1990s (Collins, 1994). The growth in private and voluntary sectors, recognised in the Atkins Review (DES, 1991) as providing substantial resources that the government was unable to replace and therefore unable to control, was further evidence of increasing complexity in both organisations and actors in this policy area (Collins, 1990).

Ogle (1997) considered the shift in policy from Sport for All to a focus on youth and excellence, to be the result of successive governments’ perception of a ‘failure’ of Sport for All to achieve its overall objectives of mass sport participation. Focusing on those groups in society where more potential for change was identified, resulted in a youth focus for both sport and health policies. An emphasis on an enabling role for government was also seen as evidence of increasing fragmentation, as government was replaced by ‘governance’ in a mixed economy of sport and recreation provision. Collins (1990) referred to the “shifting icebergs” in institutional arrangements in sport and leisure, as traditional barriers between sectors were eroded.

This growth of concern with youth was happening as the Coaching Matters review reported on the development needs of British coaching (SC, 1991) and National Vocational Qualifications (NVQ) were being established in Sport and Recreation, including coaching. Though Coaching Matters expressed concerns about the systems for co-ordinating coaching for young people, it also pointed to ‘misplaced concerns’ about the perceived decline in the provision of PE and school sport. “overlooking the fact that in many sports providing opportunities for individual participation, numbers have remained stable or increased” (Coaching Matters: 1991:14). This was tempered by a recognition that schools and clubs were increasingly calling on sports coaches from outside their traditional recruitment of PE trained teachers as:
“Coaches, therefore, are now being drawn from a much wider section of the population........ essential that they be provided with a more broadly based training which enables them to deal with young people and extra-curricular sport”

(Sc, 1991:15).

The launch of the CCS was announced, to:

“provide coaching outside of school hours..........to provide training for local coaches to enable them to work with young people in the longer term”


More analysis of the development of CCS follows in section 4.3.

The Sports Council’s aspirations from 1993 were set out in New Horizons, its aims (largely as set out in their original charter) were to ensure that:

- all young people have the opportunity to acquire basic sports skills and to receive physical education instruction
- everyone has the opportunity to take part in sport and physical recreation of their choice
- everyone with interest and ability has the opportunity to improve their standard of performance in sport and fulfil their potential
- everyone with the interest and ability has the opportunity to reach the highest standards of sporting excellence, and to
- protect and develop the moral and ethical basis of sport;

(SC, 1993a).

These aims strongly reinforced the message of ‘sports equity’, through equal access to opportunity and breaking down barriers to participation and progress in sport. They aimed to achieve these through advocacy, innovation, education and training, information and service provision. Although reinforcing a commitment to youth sports development, there were few specific plans within New Horizons. A separate Plan and Framework for Action for young people was published in 1993 (SC, 1993b), giving more detail of the SD Continuum, from introduction to elite sport for young people and the Network for youth Sport (see Figure 4.2 below).

Additional Frameworks were also produced for Women, Ethnic Minorities and the Disabled, which adopted a similar tone (SC 1993c, d, e). In the sports equity approach, regional and local agencies were expected to implement these policies,
using existing funding arrangements. Projects or initiatives, such as CC, were available for local authorities to apply for or not, rather than being promoted and developed nationally according to strategic analysis of need. However, once again though there was extensive detail of what local authorities, clubs, schools and other agencies should be doing for young people, there was nothing specific added in terms of initiatives and resources.

The development of the National Junior Sports Programme (NJSP) in conjunction with the establishment of the Youth Sport Trust (YST) in 1995 was the next major milestone in this area of policy (ESC, 1996). The YST was an independent charity, founded by the philanthropist John Beckwith, who appointed Sue Campbell, formerly Chief Executive of the NCF, as Chief Executive.

Promoted by Raising the Game (DNH, 1995), funded through the National Lottery and commercial sponsorship, the NJSP was a significant attempt to provide a co-ordinated approach to youth sport development nationally. Champion Coaching became one component of this scheme, along with the BT sponsored TOPS programmes of the YST, which were PE and sport resources targeted at primary schools. Significantly however, CC remained under NCF, rather than YST control. As a partnership between Lottery Sports Fund (LSF), YST, SE, NCF, NGB’s and Schools and Local Authorities, the NJSP involved a diverse response from different local authorities, who interpreted different aspects of this “jigsaw” (the image used to illustrate the initiatives in publicity material), of initiatives and funding streams in different ways to fulfil their needs.

The main products of the NJSP, the TOPS programmes, were based on mini and adapted games, and included equipment bags and resources for lessons in schools, and training for TOPS deliverers, usually co-ordinated by Local Education Authorities. Though these schemes and products represented a specific and innovative approach to the delivery of youth sport opportunity, evaluation into the long term outcomes of their use was not conducted, published or circulated, before the programmes were significantly extended. Thorpe, a key contributor to developing TOPS resources, noted that the immediate positive reaction of schools and teachers to TOPS was hardly surprising, given the decades of under-
resourcing of PE in primary schools and the pressure on non-specialist staff to deliver the new NCPE (Thorpe, 1996). Unfortunately, the NJSP suffered from a lack of “brand value”, according to market research commissioned by the Sports Council (Stutchbury, 1997) that eventually led to replacement by Active programmes.

Braham (2001) saw the inclusion of Champion Coaching in the NJSP as a pragmatic solution of where to locate the pre-existing scheme in new policy, and a reinforcement of the intrinsic benefits of team games and extra-curricular activities. This gained additional momentum after the emphasis within Raising the Game on reinforcing excellence and of ‘extending the sporting culture’ through extra-curricular sport. Champion Coaching continued in the NJSP, supported by Lottery Funding, but the schemes that started in 1996 were the last to be accepted on a three year commitment.

The development of the new Active programmes in the More People, More Places, More Medals strategy (SE, 1998), took precedence for local and national agencies as the remaining CC programmes were finally wound up in 1999/00. Some local authorities gained ‘accredited’ status with the NCF, which meant that some coaching programmes continued to receive funding, until replaced by the new Active Sports Partnerships (ASP), which started to go ‘live’ in 2001. Some ASP in areas without a Champion Coaching Scheme (for example Sport Cheshire) drew upon the expertise developed through Champion Coaching for their Coach Development strategies (Turley, Personal Communication, 10/5/01).

The YST retained a key role in the development of resources to support teachers in both primary and secondary schools, which clearly drew on experience of developing CC. The eventual publication of the PE, School Sport and Club Links Strategy (2003) could be seen as a culmination of over fifteen years of attempting to drive policy in this direction, since the School Sport Forum in 1989.

The growing influence of the YST since the late 1990s may be attributed to a number of factors:
Increasing influence through internationally recognised research and the development of resources to teachers and coaches
Increasing financial independence from government and agencies through a range of funding sources including self-generated income and commercial sponsorships
Key personnel with strong policy entrepreneurial roles (Kirk in PE/Curriculum, Campbell as government advisor).

This growing strength of influence prompted Houlihan and White (2002:70) to suggest that the YST challenged SE for “policy leadership in this increasingly politically salient area”.

The Sports Council, rebranded as Sport England changed the core strategy to More People, More Places, More Medals in 1998, but the thrust of policy continued to be on young people and excellence. The performance pathway for young people was being explicitly dealt with through the 45 new ASP (Sport England, 2000), funded by the LSF and local authorities, but each with an exchequer funded manager, put in place by SE.

The range of initiatives and overlapping policy areas at local level has contributed to a diverse and complex pattern of provision and opportunity, and complicates even further the ability to trace impacts of any one particular programme. The problem of “synchronising local agendas”, noted by Voller (1999) as an issue in sport policy in the Netherlands, can be clearly seen in the UK.

In attempting to trace policy development, a number of trends are apparent. Policy for youth sport over the past 3 decades has been complex and at times, fragmented and lacking coherence. It has clearly demonstrated policy spillover, lack of a strong, unifying direction and many examples of competing interests and differing values and beliefs regarding sport for young people. Sport for All principles and sports equity policies have appeared to be at odds with concerns for the development of excellence. Beliefs and values come into conflict when resources are limited. Consequently, sport for young people, though swelled with lottery cash, remains a contentious area of policy, as different sports and priorities compete. The modernising agenda for sport has increased the accountability required of NGBs. This in turn, has arguably increased competitiveness between
NGB's and a short-termism in planning. Theodoraki (1999) referred to a ‘post Fordist’ economic environment resulting in management practices more in keeping with industrial organisations. Therefore, it could be argued, the NPM approaches of performance management have shaped policy in particular directions. This has meant an increasingly instrumental view of sport, dominated by calls for evidence of value and impacts. Unfortunately, this evidence is often lacking (Coalter, 2001a).

A central problem in a stagist approach to sport policy is the lack of a clear monitoring and evaluation phase and the overlapping interventions and programmes impinging on youth sport. No sooner had the NJSP started, and then faded from view, than the Active programmes followed, apparently with no clear evaluation of impacts or time for outcomes to emerge.

The national surveys on young people and sport completed in 1994/5 and repeated in 1999/00 and 2002 were not completed as specific evaluations of the NJSP, but were they considered as such, results were far from encouraging. Though some ground was gained between 1995 and 1999 in some sports or age groups (not necessarily those involved with TOPS or CC), stubborn differences remained between boys and girls participation rates and in other equity measures (MORI/Sport England, 2003), as identified in Chapter Three.

On the other hand, sport has demonstrated its contribution to ‘cross cutting agenda’ through using selected cases and albeit limited evidence provided through the Value of Sport approach and promoting performance measures for sport (Sport England 1999, 2000, 2001). De Knop et al (1999) identified the four major exogenous changes and their possible impacts on youth sport, as: demographic changes; socio-economic development; socio-psychological changes and developments in organised sport. Though their empirical work focused on Flanders, there are clear parallels to the UK position.

Demographic changes have resulted in the slowing of population growth and an increasing ethnic diversity. Therefore, NGBs, clubs and other organisations target increasingly smaller populations of young people. There is also increased
pressure on more ‘integrating’ activities and concerns for equity in provision. Socio-economic developments referred to by de Knop et al included a shift to a service economy and more employment in the non-profit sector, including sport. This can be seen in UK, where policies have encouraged sports leadership and coaching by volunteers to be seen as stepping stones for a career (eg. Millenium Volunteers programme). According to de Knop et al, changes in family life and the growth of maternal employment has led to parents increasingly seeing sport camps and courses as a babysitting service. The capacity of parents to give the time commitment required to support their offspring in sporting careers may also be reduced, as noted by Kay (2000) in the UK. This may impact more on single parents or families with reduced resources than professional, dual income families (Kay, 2004). Increased demands for professionalism in sports organisations can also deter parents from volunteering, another trend identified in the UK (UK Sport, 1999; CCPR, 2003).

Socio-psychological developments identified by de Knop and others included the emergence of youth subcultures, also identified by Roberts (1996b) in the UK. A trend for increased participation in non-organised sport and informal settings, and the search for different sport experiences mirrored trends noted by Mason (1995) and Mori (2000) in the UK and L’Aouset et al (2001) in France.

Policy learning from these different trends can be discerned at some points in the evolution of policy for youth. For example, recognising structural constraints on participation led to more emphasis on community-based solutions and locally determined models of implementation (Rigg, 1986; MacDonald and Tungatt, 1992). Some attention to equity is seen in various schemes since the mid 1990s, for example including programmes for young people with a disability in Youth Games and Champion Coaching. However, the problems noted by Wolfenden in 1960, reiterated by Campbell (1986) and White and Rowe (1996) have persisted, despite local and national policy implementation over four decades. Important lessons to improve the effectiveness of youth sport appear not to have been learned. A number of consistent themes and issues have emerged from this summary analysis of youth sport policy:
- Partnership and multi-agency working has become the norm (across sectors as well as within sport), as sport has become a ‘cross cutting’ issue and a multi-disciplinary tool to improve co-ordination of policy across sectors.
- Concern for social justice/equity as key principles of provision of sporting opportunities, to overcome real or perceived barriers, is reiterated in successive policies and programmes, but has had only limited success (Collins, 2003).
- Increased professionalism and managerial influences on organisations operating in sport policy has had both positive and negative impacts. Thus there has been a growing concern to measure the effectiveness of performance of sport policy in terms of outcomes rather than outputs, though difficulties remain in identifying suitable measures.
- Opportunities to raise youth sport on the political agenda have arisen partly through its potential to contribute to other policy objectives, but sport remains at the margins of policy.

There is therefore limited evidence of advocacy coalitions (Sabatier, 1999) operating with any success in youth sport. Other models and frameworks can help to examine the formulation and operation of policy in youth sport, of which the Multiple Streams Framework and Policy Networks identified in Chapter Two appear most useful.

**Multiple streams and youth sport policy**

Kingdons (1995) framework can usefully be applied to the development of youth sport policy as there is some evidence of coupling, of policy windows and the impact of policy entrepreneurs in youth sport. Figure 4.1 is an attempt to map these influences.

A coupling occurred in 1991, when CC was seen as a potential solution to several problems and there was political will and support for it. The influence of the policy entrepreneur, Sue Campbell, cannot be ignored, as without her ability to marshal the resources of the NCF, the original pilot could not have been implemented, given the very short time frame available, and the resources initially
identified. A development of partnership with NGBs, local authorities and schools, CC needed a ‘champion’ of its own.

Through CC, various agencies could be seen to be achieving their own objectives, and more integrated pathways for young people in sport was good news across various fronts. For schools, this could enhance their ability to achieve the new Sportsmark awards, and help develop better links with their communities. Clubs and governing bodies could benefit from an influx of young people, who may otherwise have to find their own way into after-school opportunities. Coaches could benefit from a new employed and qualified status, with potential for a career structure. Local authorities could integrate youth sport opportunities into their overall sports development strategies. CC demonstrated a contribution to policy objectives and a way of working, entirely consistent with the dominant political themes of the time, therefore, and so was able to be sustained over a much longer period than many similar schemes, as suggested by Zahariadis (1999).

However, though the above analysis is helpful in understanding the place of CC in youth sport policy, another approach is required to examine how it actually operated.

*Policy networks and communities in youth sport*

As noted in Chapter Two, the analytical framework of policy networks may be a useful tool for analysing this complex policy area, where a stagist approach was not. Rhodes (1990) identified the dimensions against which networks can be analysed as: membership, interdependence and resources. He identified a continuum from highly integrated policy communities to loosely integrated issue networks. I have earlier described sport, as at the very least an issue network. In order to identify a policy community, Houlihan noted the importance of membership, its capacity to exclude, the extent of organisational structure, sources of cohesion and issue scope (Houlihan 1991).
Policy Stream
Local government reform and CCT
Sports Development as a growing professional specialism in client role under CCT
School Aged Sport as a focus for Education
Reform NCPE and extra-curricular sport
NVQ'S Introduced in employment/ education policies
Health policy promoting more PA (ADNFS)
Contribution of Sport to Crime Prevention

Political Stream
Sport is a ‘good thing’ but emphasis on youth and excellence marginal to Government interests
‘hollowing out the state’ reflected in reduced central government role in sport as in other policy areas
Lifelong learning and revision of the qualifications framework, education reforms
Changing role and status of Sport within Government (DNH)

Problems Stream
Perceived lack of opportunity for after-school sport
Need to increase the quality of coaching for young people
Pressure on school PE
Concerns about the ad hoc nature of Talent ID and Development and performance planning
Vocational qualifications, careers in sport are poorly established, but coaching has increased demands for training and development

Potential Solutions
Increased investment in Coaching: Funded by DES, emphasis on Youth Sport and coaching links

Policy Entrepreneur (Sue Campbell)

Champion Coaching Pilot programme 1991/92
NCF as lead agency ‘detached’ from direct Sports Council control

Figure 4.1: Multiple streams and the policy for youth sport in the early 1990s
Based on Rhodes (1990), the typology provided by Rhodes and Marsh (1992:251), is used in Table 4.2 to assess the relative position of youth sport in the policy network continuum. An important value of using the metaphor of policy network is to examine the organisations involved in formulating and delivering policy, their power and resource relationships, in order to establish what influence the network has had on policy and how its influence has been manifested.

In terms of membership of the policy community, Houlihan (1999) noted the difficulties of identifying the qualifying conditions for entry to a sport policy community, as they seem so broad and difficult to define. In youth sport, professionals can be said to be identified in teaching (Physical Education) but other specialisms have less claim to a professional membership, for example, Sports Management/Development, coaching and sports academics. How far individuals have a ‘license to practice’ or work to closely defined and agreed sets of values and beliefs is questionable, though is more clear in areas like coaching or sports medicine.

A youth sport policy community may have some power to restrict entry, based on qualifications and engagement with delivering sport to young people, but this could be contended. The recent requirement for those employed as working with children to have police checks into their background is one example, but how far the policy sector can actually restrict access to political debate is another matter. As noted above, the sector has great difficulty in insulating itself from other sectors, notably youth services, crime and justice, health and education. The normative approach to mapping the network for youth sport was shown in the Policy and Frameworks for Action (SC 1993b:10) and illustrates the membership on rather more simple lines, and is shown as Figure 4.2.

In terms of organisation and structure, the sector has complex arrangements for finance and other resource dependencies (based on access to facilities, the use of voluntary labour, and grant aid arrangements), which, it could be argued, are highly structured and multi-layered. The normative framework
simplifies what is, in reality, a complex, dynamic and multi-layered set of relations. The involvement of public, voluntary, private/commercial sectors in sport, as well as four layers of government means that the complexity of the arrangements are often high and the connections are often loose or transient. Levels of interdependence can be low, when organisations have diverse funding streams, and therefore there is less integration.

Figure 4.2: Young People and Sport: the Network (Sports Council, 1993b:10)

*Power and resource dependencies* are central to the concepts of networks. In sport area these are complex, dynamic and involve a range of resources, working at different levels of government. For example, this may include grant aid, revenue funding, lottery funding, or less tangible resources, such as access to expertise or support in kind. Reciprocal arrangements are quite common between organisations operating outside the public sector, or within departments (sport as part of leisure/education departments) and across departments in local government (between community and social services). In youth sport this is particularly acute, due to the generally modest resources: for example, a club offering coaching at school in return for access to
facilities, or a school allowing local club use to extend the extra curricular activity for pupils. Measuring these resources becomes quite problematical when they are of the less tangible 'in kind' nature.

There is, based on the literature reviewed in Chapter Three, some level of cohesion in terms of shared perceptions of some of the problems in youth sport. However, in terms of solutions, values and beliefs, many would argue that youth sport displays many different beliefs, which often conflict, that there is often low cohesion around key issues, and many alternative views expressed about the nature and function of policies and projects. This is illustrated by for example, the tension between sport and health in the PE curriculum, or the debates around talent identification and development, or the ethics of selective development of very young performers.

Braham (2001:16) identified this tension thus:

“the tension between elite national performance and local community participation, albeit focused on targeted populations, has been the persistent hallmark of post war UK sports policy. The conflicting priorities in sports policy was concealed in the Sports Council’s own sporting pyramid, a continuum from foundation to participation, performance and on to elite excellence. A broad base of mass participation was perceived as a sine qua non of national excellence”.

As identified in Chapter Two, Roche (1993) roundly rejected the notion of the existence of a “policy community” in sport, where he described a gulf between the rhetoric and the reality of the use of the term. He described the ideal of a sport policy community as:

“an organised sporting polity, in which power, authority and policy making potential are distributed amongst spectators, participants, players, officials and politicians”

(Roche, 1993:72).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Policy community</th>
<th>Issue network</th>
<th>youth sport characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership - number and type of interest</td>
<td>Very limited number, some groups excluded</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Large number of members, representing different interests – youth, education, health, sport organisations, crime and justice, local authorities some ‘Professional’ interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration - frequency of interaction</td>
<td>Frequent high quality, interaction of all groups on matters related to policy issue</td>
<td>Contacts fluctuate in frequency and intensity</td>
<td>Contacts infrequent and fluctuating in membership, across levels of organisations Some relevant forums (National SD event and National Association) but with little evidence of ability to impact on policy – not cross sectoral Some coherence in values (child centred) and ethical standards over time, though values show variation and fluctuation in some areas (performance or participation) Some agreement on the outcomes, but conflicts remain over purpose and methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-continuity</td>
<td>Membership, values, outcomes, persistent over time</td>
<td>Access fluctuates significantly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-consensus</td>
<td>All participants share basic values and accept the legitimacy of the outcome</td>
<td>A measure of agreement exists, but conflict is ever present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources - distribution (within network)</td>
<td>All participants have resources; basic relationship is an exchange relationship</td>
<td>Some participants may have resources, but they are limited, basic relationship is consultative</td>
<td>Many participants lack resources, those with resources do not always have access to decision making in policy, many reciprocal arrangements and exchanges of resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-distribution (within organisations)</td>
<td>Hierarchical; leaders can deliver members</td>
<td>Varied and variable distribution and capacity to regulate members</td>
<td>Some organisations have strong hierarchies, others have variable distribution, within group conflict – e.g. more autonomy in PE or coaching Some evidence of positive sums with partnerships and cross cutting programmes, but lack of progress in many areas indicates little or no progress overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>There is a balance of power among members. Although one group may dominate, it must be a positive-sum game if community is to persist</td>
<td>Unequal powers, reflecting unequal resources and unequal access. It is a zero sum game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Rhodes and Marsh, 1992:251)
The issue of power, so central to communities, was seen as crucial in undermining the ‘community’ in youth sport. Most organisations in youth sport lack real power, as relatively few hold resources. Therefore, agencies were unable to produce the intended outcomes of policy. The NGBs and even some clubs can be seen as competing for the best young people and a bigger ‘market share’ of participants. Far from acting in a cohesive way, with an agreed set of values and beliefs, as would be expected in a policy community, youth sport often had competing values, varying sets of beliefs and very separate agendas. As noted above, the Sports Council has delivered successive plans and strategies relating to young people, but rarely had the resources or power to see them through. The amounts of money invested in sport by local authorities far outweighed that spent by the Sports Councils (even with lottery funding taken into account), but it was the Sports Council (now Sport England), which attempted to channel investment and target priorities at local level to young people. Conflict is therefore endemic to the sport policy community and it works on several levels, including within and between central and local government, its agencies and governing bodies.

The failure of the sports policy community to effectively deliver the central tenant of sport policy since 1972, Sport for All, was seen by Roche as a symptom of this lack of cohesion and co-ordination:

"the persistence of the ‘Wolfenden Gap’ over more than a generation of sustained and well intentioned not to say idealistic campaigning and facilities construction is testimony to the degree to which the Sport for All policy has been a failure"

(Roche, 1993:99-100).

Roche asserted that even if participation rates improved, the sport community could not claim it was entirely due to their efforts.

A key problem has been the relative inability of various actors to implement the policy for young people (insofar as it has emerged). Sports governing bodies and local clubs for example, have consistently struggled to provide the ‘exit routes’ required for youth from school to adult sport (Theodoraki, 1999). Another problem, consistently shown across participation surveys, is that of unequal access to opportunities. There are clear problems for the inclusion of all young people
where there is a difference between a right to access and the ability to do so (Ogle, 1997). This has raised a number of challenges for youth sport:

"in the real world the lowlier aspirations of “opportunity” to continue to maintain an interest in a particular physical activity remains limited for a great many young people, and the lack of opportunity for translating aspirations into reality has to be a matter of considerable concern”

(Ogle, 1997:216).

Various problems are seen to make problems for the operation of networks in youth sport:

- A culture which has historically stressed the ‘arms length’ nature of government involvement in sport
- The fierce autonomy of the NGB’s
- Constant changes in the ‘host’ department of government (DES, DoE- DFEE – DNH- DCMS)

This has resulted in a range of indirect controls and influences over sport policy and made policy spillover even more likely. Lack of continuity in leadership or direction has further diluted policy impacts in this area. In addition there have been significant changes in organisational arrangements of the non-departmental public bodies, (especially the Sports Council) which has added to fragmentation and uncertainty. Underpinning this has been a concern over financial resources, as severe spending restraints on local agencies and the lack of resources nationally has impacted on the various agencies’ abilities to deliver policy outcomes (except through Lottery funding).

Thus, as agencies have insufficient resources, funding is allocated by a bidding process, which has developed an emphasis on short-term accountability, rather than on longer-term outcomes, and less strategic direction. Funds may not always be directed to the areas of most need, but to where applications are well developed and timely. As much of youth sport is characterised by small, volunteer-based organisations or under-resourced and informal organisations; the impact has been a growth in provision in areas of arguably less need. This was recognised by the development of the Priority Area Initiative (PAI), the School Sport Initiative (SSI) and Awards for All by the LSF. Sport Action Zones, introduced by Sport England were further recognition of this problem (Sport England, 2001).
The political environment has also been problematical for sports networks, as deteriorating central-local government relations in the 1990s were characterised by the introduction of Performance Indicators (PI’s), Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT) and later, Best Value performance reviews (Wilson and Game, 1994; Taylor and Page, 1994, Taylor, 1997).

On the other hand, there are factors that seem to have worked in favour of policy networks in sport. Governance, through a diverse range of organisations and agencies has emphasised less direct government involvement in service delivery and policy outputs than some policies, by enabling some autonomy for agencies to prioritise longer-term outcomes. There has been increased emphasis on partnership working, encouraging new links across sectors, and with sport gaining resources, from health, education and justice, through them. Bidders have found that evidence of partnership is now required by all projects seeking resources (Harries, 1997), despite the difficulties inherent in them (Robson, 2001). We have lacked however, evidence of how such partnerships work, though this is starting to emerge on the ASP (Enoch, forthcoming; Charlton, forthcoming).

In 1991, Houlihan noted that the two main impediments to a policy community in after-school sport were lack of leadership and lack of leverage (i.e. of resources). To a certain extent, the resources directed into youth sport via the Lottery Sports Fund addressed the second. However, the first remains problematical, though the development of the YST may provide the leadership required for a policy community.

There is some evidence of consensus in policies that by focusing on developing positive attitudes to physical activity and sport in the very young, longer term behaviour change can be established, even though the evidence may take a decade to emerge. There is also recognition by other policy spheres that sport contributes to other policy objectives, including social exclusion, by providing a positive use of leisure time for young people. The health benefits of sport and physical activity have shown evidence of this consensus of beliefs and values about sport (Biddle et al, 1998). However, there remains a lack of focused leadership of an emergent youth sport community and no single voice representing its views.
Youth Sport appears to comprise an issue network. However, there may be some sectors of the sport policy network that satisfy some of the criteria for consideration as a policy community. This research may provide evidence to support the proposition that a policy community is emerging in youth sport. Of particular interest is the impact of resource dependencies and power relationships within local programmes and between programme operators and funding agencies.

Therefore the research may have a contribution in explaining how such ‘networks’ implement policy and also how the various policy actors interact in programmes. To understand better the way in which this aspect of policy was implemented however, more analysis of the logic or theory behind CC is required. The following sections deal with coaching and coach development and the Champion Coaching Scheme, then identify the specific research questions to be addressed.

4.2 The development of coaches and coaching

This section is concerned with CC’s second objective, the development of coaches and the provision of ‘quality coaching’, considered vital to participation and progression along performance pathways (NCF, 1992; Donovan, 1993). Firstly, I identify concepts from the literature on coach education and development, and the role of the coach in identifying and developing talent, through examining The Development of Coaching in the UK (UK Sport, 1999), the resultant Vision for Coaching (UK Sport, 2000), and the report of the Coaching Task Force (2002). Finally, I draw conclusions regarding the importance of the development of coaches and the dearth of research into the impacts of ‘quality’ coaching and coach education programmes on the careers both of young performers and of coaches.

The term coach development was originally used to describe work in recruiting and deploying coaches: coach registration, management and ensuing professional development; or the status and profile of coaching. Coach education was specifically concerned with devising and delivering education programmes and developing and providing coaching resources (NCF, 1992). Later, coach and coaching development were differentiated thus:
Coach development – the development of individual coaches based on meeting their needs through supportive structures

Coaching development – the development of the profession and practice of coaching and the environment in which it occurs (Sports Coach UK, 2002).

Various theoretical perspectives or domains contribute to coaching development literature, including sociological, psychological, ethical and legal (Tinning, 2000; Schiffer, 2001; Jones, 2000; Lyle, 2002).

The major impetus for the development of coaching in the UK was the establishment of the NCF in 1983, given a major boost with the publication of Coaching Matters in 1991. The importance of coaching and coaches to the development of sport had been recognised in Sports Council/Sport England strategies in 1982, 1988, 1993, and 1997.

The establishment of the NCF was considered by the Sports Council to be a major positive of the 1980s, particularly in developing performance and excellence (SC, 1988). The provision of good coaching was also recognised by the School Sport Forum as a major issue in meeting needs in after-school sport (SSF, 1988). Initial concerns raised by the British Association of National Coaches and the NCF, later endorsed by Coaching Matters (1991) included professionalism, coach education and training, employment and deployment of coaches; support structures and finance.

Successive policy documents during the 1990’s recognised that coaching and leadership was crucial to achieving sports development objectives, particularly in performance pathways and talent identification and development (DNH, 1995; DCMS, 2000, 2001). At the same time, problems in meeting the increased demand for quality coaches and a growing tension between greater professionalism in coaching, while relying on volunteers remained at the forefront of debates on the future of coach development. This led the Coaching Task Force to conclude that:
"more paid coaches are needed at all levels of the system, supported by paid professionals within their sport and from the central agency. The goal should be to further enhance the quality of coaching within an ever-improving continuous and sustainable coaching system, in which non-paid and paid coaches work in synergy. More pathways; more athletes; clearer pathways and better performance are just some of the benefits which are likely to accrue from such initiatives"


Coaching and Talent Identification

The Sports Council (1988) identified a lack of a systematic approach to talent identification, for which the developing of coaches was seen as at least a partial solution. According to Coaching Matters, the status of coaches had to improve for the desired improvements in performance to be evident:

"the low status of coaching in this country has been a major factor in diminishing its impact upon performance at all levels and in blurring the public perception of its value"


This clearly supported the view that coaches were influential in developing performance, and pointed to the need to establish a higher public profile for coaching, to support performance pathways, and to recruit and retain quality coaches.

There was some reluctance in the UK, mainly on ethical grounds, to adopt the early selection and specialisation methods employed after World War Two, in Eastern Bloc countries, notably GDR, Romania, Bulgaria and USSR (Campbell, 1993). When details of the systematic doping of young athletes emerged from the GDR, these fears seemed well-grounded (Houlihan, 1997; 1999b). A concern to establish systems, catering to the demands of the many for performance rather than the few for excellence, has arguably diluted the resources available in Britain, particularly in coaching and support systems. Campbell identified that those people involved with identifying talent, including coaches, were rarely trained to do so in a systematic way.

White and Rowe (1996) also referred to a fragmented and ad hoc approach to talent. Central to developing more systematic approaches, according to Campbell
(1993), was a professional infrastructure of coaches, based on “a strong, well educated and effectively deployed coaching force” – at least one aspect of the Eastern Bloc approach to talent that could apparently be accommodated in a Western, liberal democratic society. This was to be based on:

- High standards of training for all coaches
- A strong professional association to ensure that standards are maintained and that coaches work to well designed performance and development plans
- An agreed code of ethics to ensure that all participants are protected against bad practice, and
- The development of employment opportunities and a career structure for coaches

(Campbell 1993:19).

During the 1990s there were considerable advances in talent identification criteria and acceptable, scientifically rigorous methods of selection, for example the Australian Talent Search Programme (Hoare, 1996; Wright et al, 2000). This system however, was not without critics when applied to UK contexts (Abbot and Collins, 2002).

The East German (GDR) system prior to unification was based on a very strong coaching infrastructure, with over 10,000 full time coaches employed in training both young and high level athletes in a variety of sport organisations (Kozel, 1996). This system highlighted the need for the talented young athlete to be seen to be appreciated, selected and developed, as Kozel (1996:6) noted, in Germany the saying is ‘a talent is he who is seen as a talent by his coach’. A key aspect of this system, however, was that it was not only the best who had the advantage of coaches with expertise and experience, but those lower down the performance pathway, such was the extent of coaching available (Kozel, 1996).

The challenge to coach development in the UK was, and remains, a balance between the needs of the minority of the best young performers and open and equal opportunity to achieve by the majority. Despite recognition of the value of coaches and coaching to sports development and performance (Rowley, 1992b), gaps remained in coaching opportunities, and local coaching strategies showed uneven progress (UK Sport, 1999; CTF, 2002). This situation is far from unique to the UK (Schiffer, 2001; Kieran, 1999; CTF, 2002).
According to Kieran (1999), issues and challenges in coach development internationally were: coaching structures, coach education resources, coach recognition, mentoring and other developmental tools, increasing professionalism and recruitment of women coaches. Her evidence, based on interviews from senior figures in national coaching organisations, gave perspectives from the US, UK and NZ on these issues, and showed some consistency in approaches and concerns, later reinforced by the international benchmarking study reported by the CTF (2002).

**The Coaches’ role in performance pathways**

The concept of a performance ladder or pathway represents an ideal progression from basic movement literacy to the pinnacle of sporting achievement (Campbell, 1993). A simplistic and idealistic assumption underpinning the performance pathway concept is that the complex web of agencies and individuals involved is planned and managed in a co-ordinated way, and that key roles are agreed and well-resourced. The simple metaphors noted by Kirk and Gorely (2000), describing models of pathways and ladders, hide the increasingly diverse and complex experiences of young people. A development of the basic pyramidal model, showing diverse routes into elite performance and the different needs of performers at different levels was proposed by Cooke (1996), in a ‘House of Sport’ model. Coaching was still central to the concept of performance pathways and any important step up to the next level of performance implied an increase in the both the level and quality of the coaching received by young performers.

Planning for increasing levels of coaching expertise and experience has significant implications at all levels of sport, and has been recognised nationally and regionally for many years (SC, 1993; EM Council for S&R, 1994; NW Council for S&R, 1993; SC SE Region 1993). However, how to achieve better quality coaching is still contentious and has received relatively little attention from researchers. Lyle (1996) noted that the level of academic attention to coaching practice and behaviour still did not reflect the level of importance attributed to coaching in sport policy.
The relationship between coaching, qualifications and experience is still not clear, as there remains some debate whether more experience = better coaching and a qualified coach = quality coaching. For example, Di Marco et al (1998) found that years of coaching experience did not influence feedback patterns and could not consistently predict feedback from coaches or player perceptions. Bell (1997) found a complex relationship between expertise and experience that was not solely related to length of time spent coaching. Smoll and Smith (1996) found variations between coaching practices of similarly qualified coaches.

This debate has had some impact on the development of coach education programmes and their somewhat limited evaluation. Recent coach education methods employed have included reflective practice, mentoring and programmes involving more informal learning experiences as well as traditional courses (Borrie, 2001; Leyton, 2001; Dickinson 2001a,b; Ghaye, 2001), which reflect the influence of Schon’s work on the ‘reflective practitioner’ (1991). These developments represent “a new paradigm in coach education and development”, based on more individual development and reflective practice (Schembri, 2002).

Developments in coach education and certification, to a certain extent, have been influenced by developments in the wider education and employment context; with the introduction of National Vocational Qualifications and recognition in other employment spheres on the role of mentors and development of expertise (Campbell, 1995b; Layton, 2001).

Over the past ten or more years, the development of new programmes for coach education have gradually converged. In the UK, this is supported by the NCF with comparable systems in other European countries, as well as USA, Australia, NZ and Canada. This may reflect the influence of international sports governing bodies across national boundaries, for example FIFA/EUFA in football, and FINA in swimming as well as the convergence of models of elite talent development (Oakley and Green, 2001ab).

Lyle (1996) explained two shorthand terms for different coaching contexts, which implied that the coach education needs for coaches working in different contexts
could be very different; participation coaching and performance coaching. He argued that participation coaches were less concerned with ‘planned progression’ and more concerned with satisfying immediate goals of performers, whereas performance coaches were more competitive or goal-oriented. This distinction infers both qualitative and contextual differences which required different competencies from the coach. It also implied that as coaches move up the performance ladder, their development needs change, as well as the needs of performers. Sportscoach UK have therefore attempted to develop recognised coaching levels, in line with these competencies (UK Sport, 1999), in a process that has proved problematic.

There is still some variation between sports, particularly those outside national development schemes such as Champion Coaching or Active Sports (UK Sport, 1999; Stevens, 2000, UKSport, 2000). Lack of finance and other organisational problems have prevented these sports from progressing (Dallimore, 1995). In order to be accepted into national schemes, sports have had to demonstrate both the ability and willingness to adopt NVQ systems to receive support to help them achieve the changes required (NCF, 1992). Sports accepted onto Active Sports underwent significant research and development of coach education and development programmes (SE, 2000). However, for those sports outside the selected Active Sports, the picture is less clear (CTF, 2002).

There appears to be consensus that coaches can and do exert significant socialising influences on the progress of young performers along a performance-oriented pathway, as they occupy a “central and influential position in the athletic setting” (Smoll and Smith, 1996:125). Longitudinal research in this area by Rowley et al, in various reports of the TOYA studies, clearly showed the importance of the coach to the career of the excellent young athlete (Rowley, 1992a,b, 1995). The DOST study found the lack of coaching at higher levels was perceived as a real barrier to progress (ESC, 1998). They also recognised that limitations and disincentives to the development of quality coaches included poor career prospects, lack of funding and inappropriate reward systems. Female athletes were concerned about the lack of female coaches, particularly at top levels, as they often perceived masculine coaching styles to be inappropriate.
These concerns have been echoed in international research, indicating that a lack of female coaches impacts upon coaching across different national sports policies and contexts (Marshall, 2001). The picture for women coaches in the UK has been shown to have significant problems, particularly for those women who try to balance coaching with other roles (West and Brackenridge, 1990; White et al, 1989).

The link described above between sports coaching and performance has been highlighted by the growth of performance planning, which in the UK at least, has been linked to access to funding, and increased concerns about accountability and resource management by agencies referred to above. Donovan’s (1993) template for performance plans, gave significant weight to coach education, development and career pathways for coaches, as might be expected from one of the chief architects of CC. In order to obtain core funding, NGBs were expected to produce performance plans, settings out plans for developing coaches and delivering coaching at each level in the sport. Performance planning became increasingly prevalent in the 1990s and was certainly linked to a growing concern for coach development at the time of the launch of Champion Coaching.

It was not until 1995, however, that this link between coaching and performance was made a clear and explicit aspect of government policy, with the publication of Raising the Game (DNH, 1995). Excellence was seen as important for two reasons. Firstly, because success of the talented was seen to “encourage others to strive to improve” and secondly, success “engages the wider community” (DNH, 1995:34). This was linked to the need to identify talent quickly and systematically and “that we make proper provision to allow sporting talent to flower”.

With the introduction of the Lottery funded World Class Performance Programme, performance plans assumed even greater significance and greater financial value to the NGBs. Increased funds enabled them to employ coaches and Performance Directors at salaries commensurate with their expertise and responsibility (UKSport, 1999), for example Chris Spicer in Hockey (later Rugby Union) and Bill Sweetenham in Swimming. Unfortunately, many of the new
Performance Directors were imported from abroad, as home-grown coaching talent was seen as lacking experience at this level.

One of the significant reasons for the emphasis on improving the levels and quality of coaching, particularly for young people, was recognition of the possible impact on drop out or attrition rates, i.e. how far coaches were found to encourage children to continue participating. Such failure to progress was not likely to improve standards of excellence and performance, and could be evidence of deficiencies in coaching opportunities. Conversions of recreational players to committed performers were perceived, therefore, to be indicators of the outcomes of quality coaching. This at least was a more objective measure than whether coaches or children perceived the coaching to be effective in achieving the outcomes of participation, such as fun, enjoyment or achievement. Difficulties in arriving at measures of coaching effectiveness, noted by Douge and Hastie (1993) and Lyle (1996) were illustrated by Lesyk and Kornspan (2000); coaches did not feel that children achieved the life skill outcomes they, as coaches, aspired to. This study pointed to a need for more research, both qualitative and quantitative, into the outcomes achieved by coaches in organised youth programmes.

Potrac (1999) and Jones (2000) identified a need for sociological aspects of coaching to be researched, as there was less literature on the impacts of coach development programmes on improving coaching practice, than on the science of performance associated with coaching. As already noted, Smoll and Smith (1996, 1997) and Smoll (1993) linked coaching practice with continuing participation. They reported that those coaches who followed a coach effectiveness training programme achieved better retention of performers, with higher levels of self-esteem and confidence, than the control group. This lent support to the notion that trained coaches achieved better results from performers and these performers were more likely to stay involved in their sport. This also, however, highlights the importance of the content and nature of such training and development programmes, and how they are established and delivered to achieve the best results.
Issues in coach education and development programmes

This research is concerned with the impacts of a particular programme in coach development, using a goal or theory based evaluation approach (Rossi et al, 1993) and it poses some questions about the link between coach development and participant outcomes. We may ask, for example:

- Do trained/qualified coaches actually go about their coaching in different ways those unqualified? And
- Does the qualification or training programme make a difference to the outcomes achieved by the young performers?

Despite the good results achieved by Smoll and Smith (1996), where players enjoyed their experience more and were less likely to drop out, McCallister et al (2000) showed that despite their good intentions, many coaches exhibited inconsistencies between behaviour and articulated philosophy. That is while their coaching philosophy may have reflected good practice, coaches did not always behave in ways consistent with those ideals.

This is at the heart of the problem of evaluating the impacts of a coaching programme: to arrive at a ‘true’ assessment of the process, and compare it to the planned outcomes. At the crux of the difficulty is how to find consensus on what constitutes effective coaching, in varied situations and contexts. Thus, designing an effective coach education programme and evaluating its impact is complex and problematical.

Abraham and Collins (1998) argued that research in coach education and development had been limited because of the problems in answering three fundamental questions:

- What knowledge should be taught?
- What is the optimal method of teaching this knowledge?
- How should we assess to encourage learning?


They used cognitive and educational psychology to inform their suggested approach to coaching. In recognising that coaching is not simply behaviour to be copied but a cognitive skill to be learned, they highlighted the complexity of how to teach and assess this process. They criticised the use of the experiential (learn
by doing) approach to coach education as neglecting the cognitive aspects of coaching. The approach of identifying key areas of coaching knowledge in generic education programmes (like those developed by the NCF) was described as a “depth-first” approach, which they criticised for failing to show how coach behaviour is actually improved and has influenced performance:

“the disappointing influences of such courses in changing coaching behaviour, which are anecdotally supported (an accurate, objective evaluation is still awaited), may well be due to the adoption of a depth first style”


Ideally they advocated longer courses, particularly for novices, which they recognised as having implications for implementation. Australian research into the modification of coaching behaviours (Kidman and Carlson, 1998) echoed the problems highlighted by Abraham and Collins, as lack of time and pedagogical knowledge were possible barriers to more reflective and holistic approaches, particularly with volunteers. The evaluation of more wide-ranging coach development, incorporating mentoring and reflective practices, was similarly more complex and difficult (Dickinson, 2001a). However, Schembri (2002) and others (Jones, 2000; Potrac et al, 1999) reinforced the notion that coach education and development should be on a more individual and holistic basis, in order to develop the independent and creative skills needed to cope with the complex and changing social interactions found in different levels of coaching.

The problems of evaluating coach education programmes were highlighted by Gilbert and Trudel (1999), when they reported on a single coach case study. They found that the course was not delivered as it had been designed, adding a difficulty to the evaluation (evidence of some ‘process failure’), but even though the knowledge base had not been changed by the course, the coach introduced changes in applying some practice.

Cushion et al (2003) were also critical of content-knowledge based approaches to coach education. They noted the importance of what they termed the ‘occupational culture’ of coaching, and the importance of early coaching experience. They also applied Bourdieu’s theory of habitus to the development of coaches, to further press the need for understanding the social processes involved
in how a coach develops knowledge and expertise. This is particularly important as much of the work that has been done with coaching tends to assume a performance coaching orientation, and has less to offer the analysis of voluntary, unpaid, participation or club coaching.

Evaluation of the impacts of coach education or development on a psychological level is therefore fraught with difficulty and addressing subsequent changes in coaching practice is far from straightforward. For this reason, the emphasis in this research is on the outcomes achieved by participants and the impacts on coaching careers.

*The environment for coaching in the UK: developing human and social capital through coaching*

Earlier sections highlighted the problems and issues in coaching, the need to establish measures of coaching impacts and the inherent difficulties therein. However, we must examine the context for coaching in the UK and how this has influenced the approach to developing coaching and coaches.

*The Development of Coaching in the UK* (1999) identified the changes to sport and the policy environment, which provided a backdrop to coach development during the 1990s. UK Sport identified:

- Growing demands for qualified coaches
- Increased opportunities for paid employment in coaching
- A decline in after-school sport and a changing role for sport in schools
- Increased use of coaches in schools for after-school activities and to support the National Curriculum in PE
- Increased expectation of voluntary sector clubs to provide coaching, particularly to young people
- Growth of the sports development function in local authorities
- Greater expectations from the NGBs for development plans including for coaching
- Increased expectations by consumers (both children and their parents) of coaching courses
- A more litigious society – arising from growing concerns over health and safety, child protection, abuse, fair play and ethical matters and
Increased pressure for success at international level on NGBs

Both the number of coaches involved with young people and the quality of coaching being offered were therefore under increasing pressure throughout the 1990s. The concern for quality highlighted by Coaching Matters remained high on the agenda.

The 1999 document also made clear the problem of relying on voluntary coaches, while the demand for increased training and assessment, led by the introduction of NVQs, placed ever more demands on an already stretched situation. Growing demands for professionalism evidenced by certification was not always rewarded by paid employment, yet brought increased costs to the individual. Meanwhile the shortage of female coaches did not lessen throughout the decade (UK Sport 1999). The extensive consultation exercise culminated in the publication of the UK Vision for Coaching (UK Sport, 2000). The main thrust of this strategy was:

"by 2012 the practice of coaching in the UK will be elevated to a profession acknowledged as central to the development of sport and the fulfilment of individual potential"

(UK Sport, 2000:5).

This meant, therefore, an increase in the human capital engaged in coaching and the social capital associated with coaching as an occupation. Coaching was to be seen as a more important and ‘professional’ occupation, with an increase in the number of employed and active coaches.

Government policy supported the growth of vocational qualifications in coaching in both Higher and Further Education. A growth in coaching related undergraduate programmes and in Government funding for FE based coaching award courses indicated a growth in interest in coaching as an potential area of employment, though individual institutions did not need to justify provision with labour market needs (UK Sport, 1999).

Sport appeared to be one area of growth for attracting the young unemployed, as evidenced by: Learning for Work programmes funded by Training and Enterprise Councils; the development of Modern Apprenticeships (SPRITO, 1998); New
Opportunity Fund schemes; Millennium Volunteers in sport; and SRB-funded initiatives which provided some sports coaching or leadership opportunities, for example, Manchester City Council and the Commonwealth Games Pre-Volunteer Programme (Jones and Stokes, 2000). These programmes are based on the development of individual or human capital to contribute to social capital, or increased communal capacity.

However, such developments increased the costs and time demands on the individual and on sport organisations, with mixed results:

"the implementation of N/SVQ's has been an arduous process for many national governing bodies and only those where paid employment opportunities exist has the process provided more advantages than disadvantages. However, the implementation of national standards is perceived to have had and continues to have major potential benefits to the improvement of coach education,"

(UK Sport, 1999:10).

But though employment in sport remained attractive, paid employment opportunities had not grown to match expectations, in either level or profile (Hansen et al, 1996). A large proportion of coaching was still carried out by volunteers (Shibli et al, 1999; LIRC, 1996; UK Sport, 1999; Sport England, 2003; Nicholls, 2003).

Clearly sport coaching was recognised as having the potential to develop both individual and community capacity. The investment announced by the CTF in 2002 was significant because it recognised the value of such an investment in communities:

"this investment in human capital working in constructive and purposeful activity particularly with young people has enormous potential to contribute to many of the Government's policy objectives of improving health, youth engagement, community safety and regeneration"

(Coaching Task Force, 2002: 17).

UK Sport acknowledged that work in recruiting and managing coaches had been rather unplanned, lacking co-ordination and unsystematic (UK Sport, 1999; 2000). The use of coaching databases was hindered by the requirements of Data Protection legislation and the lack of data on active coaches held by either
governing bodies or local authorities. On the other hand, Champion Coaching was cited as an example of a useful ‘tool’ for coach recruitment and development, though details on how it had worked in such a way were not provided (UK Sport, 1999). Perhaps tellingly, no references were made to CC in the CTF report.

There was often considerable variation in terms and conditions, rates of pay and effectiveness of management practices for coaches. Often coaching was casual, temporary and or part-time, and as in other areas of leisure and sport, had a low profile and status (UK Sport, 1999; CTF, 2002). Good practice in managing coaches was, according to the Sport and Recreation Industry Training Organisation (SPRITO), the application of what might be described as good practices in human resource management, more widely accepted in other areas of employment (SPRITO, 1998). It should include:

- Clear recruitment and selection processes, supported by accurate job descriptions and terms and conditions of service
- Ongoing training and support to meet the changing needs of the post, including induction ongoing CPD, based on an appraisal or review of individual training and development needs
- A clear management and career structure for coaches to see a pathway of personal and career development

(UK Sport 1999:17-19).

Despite the publication of *Investing in Coaches – an NCF Guide to Local Coaching Development* (NCF, 1998) there had been no specific evaluation of the coaching development or management strategies employed by local authorities as a result of the guidance. It was largely assumed that by moving to employed status, retention of coaches would improve, and better standardisation of employment practices would encourage more coaches into coaching. It was clear however, that tensions remained between those being paid to deliver programmes and coaches in clubs who continued to work as volunteers (Brady, 2003).

The CTF recommendations signalled a more pro-active approach to the development of coaches and coaching and a significant financial commitment from the Government. There were, still many unanswered questions, however, due to a lack of detailed knowledge of the state of coaching in the UK and a lack
of consensus as to how such investment was to be implemented. Progress was recognised as being difficult (DCMS, 2003), due to the lack of research on how these changes had impacted on the individuals and organisations concerned.

Conclusions on coaching development

As the previous section has attempted to show, the focus on the coaching aspect of the scheme will be a worthwhile addition to knowledge. Whereas there has been some considerable attention to coaching practice, coaching science and the impacts on performance, there has been more limited attention to the impacts of quality coaching on the sporting careers of young people on performance pathways.

There is some debate over the effectiveness, nature and approaches of different models of coach education and development. The evaluation of the model of coach education, development and management represented in Champion Coaching should therefore contribute some evidence to this debate. The coaches’ perspective of the outputs, outcomes and processes of CC provide a ‘real world’ view of how the coaching outcomes were achieved, contributing to a realistic evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997).

It is recognised as outside the scope of this study to evaluate, at a psychological level, the outcomes achieved by the coaching process. However, it should be possible to trace its impacts on the level of coaching activity and whether or not being involved in Champion Coaching Scheme impacted on the careers of coaches. In terms of the participants, analysis of the destinations and progress achieved by young performers in club or other participation in sport can illustrate whether quality coaching resulted in the desired outcomes of progress along performance pathways. The perceptions of participants can also provide evidence of the quality of the coaching they experienced.

The impacts on coaching from education and employment, with a range of impacts on recruitment and employment practices, as well as changes to qualification and certification processes, is further evidence of policy spillover in
sport, and of the porosity of sports boundaries (Houlihan, 2000). Coaching can also be seen to represent a further dimension in the policy stream, interacting with other streams of policy in education, employment, sport, health and criminal justice. Coaching is an aspect of sports policy where the interests of national policy, NGBs and national agencies (UK Sport, SE), elite sport and local policy, for the development of mass sport, can at times seem to be at odds.

The literature reviewed here has shown that the role of the coach in developing performance and ongoing participation has been widely recognised as vital to successful outcomes in sports policy, and subsequently has been the subject of various programmes and projects. There has, however, been limited attention to evaluating such schemes. Evaluating the Champion Coaching Scheme should therefore be able to add to the literature in this area and to provide some evidence of local outcomes achieved in coach and coaching development.

4.3 The Champion Coaching Scheme

This section considers earlier work published on Champion Coaching to provide contextual background against which the local programmes selected as case studies can be examined.

Described in 1996 as “the success story of the decade”, by the then Chief Executive of the NCF, Geoff Cooke, Champion Coaching grew from 24 pilot project schemes in 1991, to one covering 145 local authorities, with over 800 sports programmes across England, Wales and Northern Ireland (NCF, 1992, 1997). The original mission statement of Champion Coaching illustrates both its performance and coaching orientation:

“to promote quality coaching for performance motivated children within a co-ordinated community structure”

(NCF, 1992).

The Scheme provided funding for programmes in selected sports, for children referred by their schools, between the ages of 11 and 16. The programmes were managed and co-ordinated locally by local authorities. There were two main objectives:
to recruit and develop coaches working with young people, and
to provide quality coaching for performance-oriented young people after
school.
A further objective was to develop and support the work of clubs providing for
young people. The scheme was also intended to help raise the profile of coaching
nationally and locally. Factors contributing to the development of the CC scheme
were identified by the NCF (1992) as:

- concerns about after-school sport due to the Education Reform Acts of the
  1980s
- the growth of sports development programmes in the community
- professionalisation of coaching
- CCT – the impacts on the provision of sports facilities and
- The introduction of NVQs into coaching

The requirements at the time were to develop greater co-ordination between
agencies, to improve resources for young people, both physical (facilities) and
human (coaching). The need to develop ‘performance pathways’ was noted as
being one of the key aspects of the Scheme. The initial grant of £700,000 was to
set up a number of pilot projects. In all, eleven sports were originally selected to
be included, though each local project selected its sports, depending on a local
audit of needs and resource priorities.

The Scheme was clearly and explicitly based within the performance band of the
Sports Development continuum (NCF, 1992). PE staff were intended to refer
children with some skill, or those who could benefit from access to good
coaching. The schemes also required the local authorities to find “champion”, i.e.
good quality, coaches, “and train them to help young sports people achieve their
own level of excellence” (NCF, 1992:7). Appropriate exit routes for young
people had to be determined locally and therefore were dependent on local
situations. The coach education aspects of the Scheme were to leave a coaching
‘legacy’, by drawing in new coaches and developing the expertise of existing
coaches. The structure of the coaching on CC programmes is shown in Figure
4.3, showing how head coaches and coaches were to be supported by apprentice
coaches.
Figure 4.3: The CC coaching structure (NCF, 1992)

The original pilots ran in 1991/92, with 24 projects selected to run across the country. The review published by the NCF in 1992, provided an overview of the main issues and findings of the projects, while each individual project produced a summary report. Some key issues were identified in this initial review (NCF, 1992):

- Partnerships
- Management structures
- Role of the Youth Sport Co-ordinators
- The coaches
- Selection philosophy
- Attendance – perceived value
- Facilities
- Transport
- Exit routes.

Youth Sport Co-ordinators (YSCs) were clearly the major factor identified:

"The right person, given adequate time, funding and authority, can move mountains in the complicated and often uncoordinated arena of after-school sport. At present the recruitment, training and employment of outstanding Youth Sport Co-ordinators is the largest single factor for improving quality opportunities for children."

(NCF 1992:70).
Whilst accepting that the provision of good quality coaching was vital for after-school sport, the 1992 report acknowledged that such coaches were in short supply:

"the second clearest lesson in Champion Coaching is that if we are to expand the project, we need to mobilise a whole army of people who can fill what was described a gap twenty years ago in the Wolfenden report and is now becoming a void"

(NCF 1992:70).

A major debating point was the selection process, which led to different interpretations of capability and suitability, and groups of varying performance standards. Schools and teachers had clearly differing views on who could or should have the opportunities that Champion Coaching represented. Facilities hire accounted for, on average, over 38% of the budgets available, a sum that raised questions regarding the future for after-school sport funding.

Edwards (1993) and Cooke et al (1992) highlighted some problems from the pilots. These included the policy of selecting sports, the original selection of coaches (mainly based on availability for the training weekends) and inappropriate or poorly prepared local schemes. However, in mitigation, the very tight timescale for the launch was noted as a key constraint.

Selecting participants had clearly presented problems for some PE departments, reflecting the concerns noted earlier about the demands placed on an already over-stretched teaching profession. Edwards also identified pedagogic concerns, particularly the skills needed by coaches to work with young people. A course of training was required of all Head Coaches, who were often very experienced, but not of Assistant Coaches, often in more need of such training.

Overall, despite some organisational shortcomings, it appeared that the pilots, in the main, had been successful, though they differed in their models of implementation. The lack of objective data was noted as a problem for future evaluation. Recipes for Success showed the diversity of projects, despite the application of a fairly stringent ‘blueprint’ (NCF 1992). This diversity also demonstrated a similar interpretive and mediating influence to that seen by Penney and Evans (1999) in schools applying the NCPE.
For Edwards (1993) and Cooke et al (1992), the strengths of the Scheme outweighed its weaknesses, as coaches, children and the governing bodies were all able to benefit. One of the major benefits for the coaches was that the burden of administration and organisation, so often required in voluntary sport, had been lifted from them, since this was undertaken by the Scheme co-ordinator (the YSM). There was also a very positive response from parents and children interviewed, in terms of enjoyment of sessions, friends made and skills learned. However no data was presented on the progression to clubs following the completion of the scheme (Edwards, 1993). Cooke et al (1992) reported the level of commitment of children to their sport, but not on how many children went on to join clubs.

Grainger (1992) made particular reference to the value of CC to ‘partnership working’. He related his experience of a countywide (Nottinghamshire) coaching scheme, the Nottinghamshire Sport Training Scheme (NSTS) and the impact made by Champion Coaching, later investigated by Collins and Buller (2000). The major lessons from the pilots were, according to Grainger, the need to expand the number of coaches qualified and interested in working with children and that to be sustainable, Champion Coaching must offer its activity within ‘a co-ordinated community structure’. Grainger highlighted the need for understanding the environment of out-of-school sport for a local audit of existing provision. The appointment of the Youth Sport Manager and clear roles and responsibilities of all involved was essential. The key issues for Grainger, at the start of the second phase, when Champion Coaching was to be expanded and scheme numbers increased, were to do with quality, organisation, co-ordination, planning and partnership (Grainger, 1993:49).

These issues recurred in subsequent reports by the NCF. The second phase of CC (from 1992) moved to a three-year commitment, recognising that a sound basis for sports development required a longer time frame for benefits to be established. This period was described in the second report (NCF, 1993) as one of “growth and product development”, as the Scheme more than doubled in size. The NCF identified what it termed as “community readiness factors”, developed to filter out
funding applications unlikely to succeed. Consequently, not all of the pilots in 1991/2 continued (for example, Cheshire CC).

The community readiness factors identified by the NCF were:

- A planning framework - which may include a coach development strategy, focus sport development plans or District Sport and Recreation Strategies
- Youth Sport Manager - identified as the single most important factor for success
- Effective networking - as evidenced in the delivery of existing programmes
- Existing school-community links
- Partnership posts, linking relevant agencies, e.g. school and community, or sports-specific
- Community assets - including staff, clubs, motivated children, facilities
- Previous history of long term schemes (though length of time was not made clear, evidence of such commitment)
- Implementation of a local coach development strategy
- Compatible philosophy (the philosophy was not made absolutely clear except to refer to the need to focus on fair play and the value of sport for young people)
- Commitment (to build a better sporting future through quality assured coaching)

(NCF, 1993:12-13).

It could be argued therefore, that in looking for these factors to be in place before the application was accepted, Champion Coaching operated only where local authorities were already achieving sports development objectives with both young people and coaches and would not necessarily extend opportunity in more challenging, and arguably more needy, areas. As the Scheme continued to grow, via Lottery funding, the report published in 1997 provided some detail by sport and across programmes (see Tables 4.3, 4.4).

By 1997, CC involved 113 local authorities in England and 15 in Wales, with local authorities selecting a minimum of 4 from 16 sports (not all sports were included by all schemes) (Table 4.3). CC received £510,000 from Local Authorities in England, and £74,000 in Wales, in addition to NCF funding (NCF, 1997b). NCF Annual reports show the NCF received a grant of £104,277 in 1997, £245,000 in 1998 and 1999 and £187,000 in 2000.
Table 4.3: Statistics for Champion Coaching in 1996/97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Programmes</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Scholarships</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young People</td>
<td>11,226</td>
<td>2061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the figures for England showed that the number of girls and boys involved varied according to sport (Table 4.4). The first four sports listed show a clear bias toward boys, in contrast to badminton and athletics, which were more evenly balanced. Four other sports either were dominated by girls or were solely for girls, so approximately 48% of CC participants were girls in 1996/7.

Table 4.4: Participation by gender in different sports in England 1996/7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Programmes</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Tennis</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls soccer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>5346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report on Wales suggested that 70% of the children had been routed to clubs (NCF, 1997b). This was compared with 38% of the children in 1998 and 40% of children in 1999 in English schemes, in annual reports. No detailed tables were available in 1998 and 1999 for comparisons across sports. Figures for participants were not aggregated in NCF reports (1993, 1997). In the period from 1991-1997, the NCF reported that 60,000 young people and 8,500 coaches had been involved in the Scheme (NCF 1997a), as shown in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5: Champion Coaching Delivery 1991-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schemes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young People</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>15000**</td>
<td>20000**</td>
<td>20000**</td>
<td>13287</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>6930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: NCF (1997), * NCF annual reports; **estimated

**Junior club development and community links**

The use of club sites for the sport courses was identified in some programmes, but this was mainly through anecdotal evidence and vignettes. Whether new clubs had been established or had grown through involvement with Champion Coaching was not reported. Although reference was made in both the 1996/7 and 1998/9 reports to new and enhanced opportunities and progress of young people into clubs and representative squads, those were neither measured, quantified nor explained. This aspect of the Scheme has been found to be problematic for evaluation, due to the diversity of local conditions and the inability of local authorities to track participants over time.

The figures on coaching, shown in Table 4.6, were very positive, showing a large proportion of coaches (68% in Wales and 63% in England) who took advantage of some form of coach education or training through scholarships. These included 1st NGB awards, some NCF or NGB workshops and NGB NVQ awards. However, the subsequent reports did not follow up what ‘legacy’ this coach development represented or how practice had been impacted. In 1997/98 it was reported 16% of the coaches recruited were new to coaching (NCF, 1998). Table 4.6 shows that a greater proportion of football coaches achieved an NVQ than badminton coaches. Unfortunately, the reports neither explained nor expanded on these figures, but they appeared to reflect the problems noted earlier in the development of NVQ’s by different sports.
Table 4.6: NVQ's awarded by selected sport, England 1996/97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Number of Coaches</th>
<th>Number of NVQs achieved</th>
<th>% of Coaches with NVQ</th>
<th>Ratio of Coach:NVQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Football</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NCF, 1997a

A reduction in the proportion of young people routed to clubs, shown in Table 4.7, may have reflected changing development opportunities, for example Youth Games or sports specific development squads. Figures for participants also were different from the report on 1997/98 schemes published separately (NCF, 1998). The club may have been reduced in significance in some programmes while Youth Games or development squads (as in Nottingham) took precedence, or there may be problems of accuracy of figures provided.

Table 4.7: CC outputs 1997 to 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accredited schemes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plus 11 from 97/98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport programmes</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>6,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young people routed into clubs</td>
<td>10,000 (69%)</td>
<td>2,772 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching scholarships</td>
<td>989(61%)</td>
<td>not indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The parallel issues of player development and coach development, makes the evaluation of such a complex programme problematical. Campbell saw that by 1995, the Scheme had had a major impact on sport in both of these areas and in sports development more generally:

"Champion Coaching has been the biggest single stimulus for change in coaching at local level that this country has ever witnessed. Many local authorities now have coaching strategies, but more importantly they have professional staff who understand and value the role that coaches play in sport"

(Campbell, 1995b:30).
Thorpe (1996: 155) suggested that CC represented a model for co-ordinated cross-sport development applied to children’s sport for the first time:

"in attempting to provide quality controlled coaching input for children, Champion Coaching has to work with the NGB, the schools and community agencies".

Thorpe also noted the importance of the Youth Sport Manager in this co-ordination, furthermore, that it was essential to have the flexibility to suit local needs. Quality assurance on personnel and content could only be achieved, he proposed, through using trained coaches. A further advance noted by Campbell (1995b) was the growing recognition of career pathways for coaches.

However, she noted that the tensions and issues at local level were features of “partnerships in action”, as opposed to on paper. Local schemes were able to mediate policy at the implementation level – interpreting, shaping and putting into practice according to local needs, priorities and individual interpretations. This local implementation of a national scheme had implications for the evaluation of results due to the diversity of local solutions and locally determined outcomes.

Collins and Buller (2000) reported on a major piece of independent research into Champion Coaching implemented countywide in Nottinghamshire, as part of a larger sports development scheme, the NSTS. Some aspects were referred to earlier in Chapter Three, however, some results need to be reiterated here, as they provide a contrast the NCF reports. Based on the results from several smaller-scale research projects (e.g. Buller, 1998, Kohn 1998, Gray, 1998), the research addressed three main concerns:
1) the drop out from youth sport
2) overcoming barriers to participation
3) bridging the gap between school and adult participation

(Collins and Buller, 2000).

A similar approach to that used with the Active Lifestyles project in 1989 was used: a follow-up survey with participants on the sports programmes several years after completion. In the Active Lifestyles project, 71% of those surveyed were still playing sport three years after their course. Though some concern was expressed
over the sample, this gave an indication of potential for tracking over time sports participation in such programmes (Coventry City Council, 1989). However, only 16% of children actually took up a new activity, compared to the 64% indicating an interest in doing so three years earlier. This showed the problems faced by young people in converting interest to participation.

A lack of knowledge about opportunities was indicated as a potential cause of the gap between intention and actual activity, despite the cognitive and educational approaches taken in Active Lifestyles to introduce children to sports and develop their knowledge and decision-making. The Sport Council’s ill fated Ever Thought of Sport campaign had shown that knowing about opportunities can only go so far, when young people perceived that the opportunities available were not suitable to them (White and Coakley, 1986). Drawing upon the work of Bourdieu (1978), Collins and Buller perceived the lack of take up of opportunities for participation to be evidence that young people had a lack of necessary ‘personal and social capital’, as the activities were outside of their perceived habitus. Significantly, Collins and Buller chose to address the issue of take up of opportunity by analysing the post-code details of participants on the schemes against indicators of social need. Thus they were able to draw out comparisons in different areas of the county. Collins and Kennett (1999) had used a similar approach with the analysis of users of Leisure Card systems in Leicester and Oxford.

Through this method, Collins and Buller were able to identify large differences across the county between deprived areas and areas of lesser need, in take up of courses, they also showed the relationship between venues and catchments for courses. They found that the more deprived areas were less likely to host courses and children from areas of high social need were much less likely to take up the opportunities on offer.

Those who took part in Champion Coaching found their courses to be very beneficial. However, they noted potential participants may have been deterred by lack of transport or problems with the timing of courses. This may have skewed the results, as if people had been unable to get to courses, they would not have attended and thus been excluded from the sample. Collins and Buller (2000)
identified that lack of information on exit routes was a problem reported by participants. Despite this, only 12% of respondents gave up their sport entirely. However, as 58% did not go on to play at either club or county level, the effectiveness of Champion Coaching as a performance pathway was questioned. The destinations of Champion Coaching participants from this research provided some benchmarks against which to look at other schemes:

- 25% joined a club
- 10% went on to a county or development squad
- 46% continued with the sport for recreation
- 60% were currently member of a sports club (at the time of survey) (Collins and Buller, 2000:211).

Of those who joined a club, 97% felt it was friendly, which appeared to show that the programmes had good outcomes for those who had attended them.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this study was the use of Social Need analysis referred to above. CC had not overcome social disadvantage by attracting participants from areas of high social need, but this was not an explicit objective. However, CC should have been accessible to all young people. The research provided an indicator of how well or otherwise, opportunities for all young people can be demonstrated. There were methodological concerns regarding potential bias of the sample, so participant details for the analysis of need were taken from the registrations rather than the survey respondents.

Analysis of population and socio-economic need was by the smallest unit possible of the 1991 Census, enumeration districts (ED). Using official (Census and Nottinghamshire County Council) statistics, three categories of Social Need, provided by the County Council planning department, were used to group areas into below average, moderate or serious social need.

Champion Coaching showed a good geographical coverage, by registrations across the county, the majority of the population lived within 3km of a Champion Coaching venue. However, there was a clear gradient between parts of the county with few venues and few participants. Collins and Buller proposed this might have been due to a lack of an SDO in some areas of the lowest participation.
Their analysis showed 87% of Champion Coaching participants lived in areas of below average social need, although only 71% of the population lived in such areas. Only 9% of CC participants were from moderate or serious social need areas, whereas 17% of the population lived in them. Therefore Champion Coaching participants did not reflect their local populations and thus could not demonstrate "all young people" were able to take up the opportunities available. Very small numbers of children from areas of high social need participated in the Scheme, with some areas having put forward no children at all in four years. Questions were therefore raised about teachers' selection policies and parental support in these areas. Similar analysis of performance squads showed a similar imbalance, with only 9% in performance squads coming from areas of social need. Thus they concluded:

"the gradient of opportunity is clear, and shows itself up on the maps as a ring of opportunity in the suburbs and nearby villages and towns bordering the city, around deprived inner suburbs and coalfield towns"

(Collins and Buller, 2000:216).

Collins and Buller went on to suggest more research was needed, to examine the issues around referral by PE staff, perceptions of young people and attitudes towards referral routes. They proposed, "a closer analysis of the circumstances of successful participants from such areas and referral routes, possibly through focus group research" (Collins and Buller, 2000:216). Despite the obvious successes of the children, and the positive responses by parents, the fact that children from all sections of the local community did not enjoy these benefits was an issue of concern.

To conclude this section there are a number of issues, which are developed further in the chapters to follow. A focus on output measures and a lack of consistency in published data on the scheme makes it difficult to arrive at conclusions regarding the effectiveness of Champion Coaching as a sports development intervention. Overall CC appeared to show good rates of participation, with many thousands of participants and coaches. The Scheme clearly grew significantly over the course of its implementation into one of national prominence.
However, there are clear gaps in explaining why and how some sports and local schemes were successful in attracting young people, developing clubs or performance pathways, and developing coaches. There are also gaps in the evidence of advances made in co-ordinated community networks and raising the profile of coaching. It could be argued that Champion Coaching built on existing good practice, rather than reaching more challenging areas and children with fewer resources.

Further research could show whether successful outcomes can be achieved in relatively deprived areas. It can also examine the process of implementation, through a reflective approach, whereas the research conducted above reported within a more immediate and short-term time frame. Thus additional research could provide a holistic and realistic evaluation of processes and outcomes of Champion Coaching, in a more robust and independent assessment than previously achieved.

4.4 Conclusions and Research Aims and Objectives

In Chapter Three I examined theory at the micro level, which looked behind the interventions of policy for young people and coaching. This included socialisation in sport and the interactions of the factors concerned with participation and performance. The progression onto organised and developmental programmes is far from straightforward, it is a result of the complex interaction between various individual, social, cultural, structural or environmental factors, as shown by the model proposed by Welk (1999) and amended in Figure 3.1.

Key to this research, discussed in Chapter Four, are the interactions at the meso level, of the various policy ‘actors’ and agents in sport, including Physical Education, Coaching, Sports Development and other policy areas (health, employment and education). Despite extensive research into participation there is a dearth of evaluations of sport policy interventions or programmes, with sufficient time allowed for outcomes to be identified (Collins et al, 1999). Research which addresses the effectiveness of schemes or programmes needs to
account for the differences in expectation and perceptions of young people and other stakeholders, across different sites of implementation. These stakeholders each have a different perspective on the programmes, with a range of potential evaluation criteria.

The lack of a co-ordinated structure for young people has contributed to difficulties in advancing policy objectives in this area. Networks and partnerships are emphasised in this area of sport and this leads to the consideration of whether a policy community operates in youth sport. But youth sport overlaps with several other policy sectors, making the separation of a particular policy impacts particularly difficult. This points to the need to incorporate a range of methods for gathering evidence for evaluation and the need to seek out various perspectives on a complex and multi-layered issue.

What we can discern from the literature reviewed in the preceding chapters is summarised below.

**At the micro level:**

Background and personal characteristics can influence inclination and opportunity to participate in sport as well as the form this participation may take. Structural and environmental factors can influence participation through awareness and promotion of specific activities and the provision of programmes, particularly the access to performance-oriented opportunities. Coaches are one of the intervening influences on these performance pathways, and access to quality coaching has been proposed as being important for future progress, though problems remain in identifying how coaches are developed. Key to enduring involvement in sport appears to be the development of self-efficacy, personal and social capital, and coaches may influence this with effective coaching, as can teachers through physical education.

**At the meso level:**

Sport policy for youth has been clearly influenced by other policy sectors or communities. Though youth sport appears to represent an issue network, there may be some evidence of an emerging policy community and some different coalitions at work. Issues of power and resource relationships and the work of policy actors in ‘bottom up’ policy making are relatively neglected in the literature on youth sport.

What remains unclear or contentious is how far CC has been able to demonstrate outcomes in both widening performance pathways and of a legacy in coach development, and whether these objectives have been in conflict. The
mechanisms and contexts that produced CC outcomes, remain unclear, as more evidence is required from different settings of implementation. What impact and or legacy this Scheme has had on subsequent policy, is also unclear. For example, evidence of policy learning, particularly in the development of its successor scheme, Active Sport, is lacking.

The aims and objectives of the research

As indicated in Chapter One, the aims are to:

- Provide a realistic evaluation of the Champion Coaching Scheme in selected cases, in both the process of implementation and the outcomes achieved, and
- Consider the implications for ensuing schemes focusing on performance-oriented coaching for young people (namely Active Sport)

Research Objectives are to:

- Evaluate the implementation of Champion Coaching and examine the relationship between mechanisms used in different contexts
- Evaluate the impacts of CC and the outcomes achieved in the selected case studies, from the perspective of different stakeholders, and to
- Highlight the legacy of Champion Coaching and evidence of policy learning, for successor schemes and youth sport policy

These objectives were to be achieved through a range of methods, expanded on in the methodology chapter below. An examination of the programme theory for CC, implicit or explicit, is the starting point for such an evaluation. Essentially the research examines the theory behind CC to arrive at a realistic evaluation in a multi-method approach (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). At the micro or individual level this considers the impacts on coaches and participants, as shown in Table 4.8. The key outcome measures of the programme theory are highlighted as club membership and ongoing activity by coaches. For meso or organisation-level analysis, this research considers the impacts on organisations and systems, of the interactions of networks and relationships represented by CC. Meso level analysis examines how CC impacted on policy development in youth sport and the working of the ‘policy game’ in this particular context.
### Table 4.8: Micro level programme theory for Champion Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Theory (Programme Activities)</th>
<th>Programme Theory (Mechanisms of Change)</th>
<th>Sources of programme failure?</th>
<th>Evaluation Measures (Outcome Measures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority develops and publicises sports courses to schools, after consultation with teachers, clubs and governing bodies Coaches are recruited and profiled Programme registers young people onto the sport courses Coaching provided by qualified coaches Coaches receive ongoing CPD opportunities and scholarships Links to exit routes are provided New clubs or sections are developed and the information provided to young people Clubs are provided with support to attract young people Coaches have opportunities to offer courses and develop their skills Coaches remain active in coaching, take more CPD and develop their careers with more coaching, either paid or not</td>
<td>Teachers promote programme in schools and motivate young people to apply Young people are selected to attend (contribution to self esteem?) Young people attend the courses for 10 weeks Young people gain skills, and enjoyment from the courses, knowledge of opportunities and exit routes (self-efficacy) Young people will have skills and interest to seek exit routes, improved confidence and knowledge of new opportunities (personal and or social capital) Exit routes and opportunities are perceived to be appropriate and attractive – consistent with <em>habitus</em> Young people choose an exit route appropriate to them. Long term engagement with clubs or other opportunities tracks into early adulthood, due to increased self-efficacy and motivation Coaches perceive themselves to have more potential for coaching (increased personal and social capital)</td>
<td>Teachers don’t hear about the programme, or choose not to take part Not all those selected take part Problems in recording all the relevant data about performers including referral route Not all children complete the course Not all children will enjoy or gain skills, or get information Children may not find an exit route available No new clubs available Not all the exit routes may be supported or known about, or they may be deemed inaccessible Club or other opportunities not appropriate Some other factor prevents children from taking up opportunities</td>
<td>Teachers attitudes and perceptions of the scheme Proportion of schools involved in the scheme locally Referrals from schools Registrations across the district, proportions from each ward/ postcode sector Satisfactions with courses – intermediate measure only perspectives of parents and children, with different criteria Exit routes selected by children Take up of scholarships Attitudes of coaches to the scholarships and training available Proportion giving up sport Coaching activity levels after CC Clubs available after scheme Sporting profile of children – number of sports played in/out of school Structural factors – provision of opportunities in different parts of district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five Methodology

5.0 The nature of the research problem: “what works” in a youth sport programme?

This chapter considers the nature of the research and sets out the methods used. The central problem addressed is the evaluation of a specific policy intervention in sports development, namely Champion Coaching; what its impacts were; whether or not it ‘worked’, and how. The nature of this problem and the particular issues relating to methodology derived from the literature are discussed below.

The relative strengths and weaknesses of the selected approach, case studies, are identified, together with particular issues in application. The chapter analyses the specific tools and techniques selected, including their strengths and limitations. It goes on to examine briefly the cases chosen for the study, indicating particular methodological issues, in particular the arrangements for fieldwork and local variations in data collection. The intention is for this chapter to illustrate how the methods chosen satisfy the research objectives, and recognise and examine their limitations.

The research contributes to knowledge in the area of sports development interventions and policy in youth sport. In a broader sense, it examines some long-term outcomes of such interventions, and the interactions of policy networks or communities operating within youth sports. The research can contribute to policy learning, in that it provides evidence of how this policy operated through a ‘realistic’ evaluation of policy interventions.

5.1 Establishing the research paradigm

A detailed reprise of the longstanding and ongoing debate in the social sciences regarding research paradigms is outside the scope of this section. It is not the intention to reiterate these arguments, but to clarify the stance of this study. The underlying assumptions about knowledge (ontology) and epistemology must be
clarified, as these have shaped the methods taken. The ontology, that is, what is regarded as the nature of reality, is that ‘knowledge’, or what is known, is subject to interpretation and requires the acceptance of multiple realities. For the researcher, conceptualisation is one of a number of ways of knowing. Thus, the ontology is interpretive, subjective, or, according to Sparke (1992), internal/idealistic. This perspective recognises multiple realities exist and that the researcher plays a role in shaping and constructing them.

The underlying epistemology, or the relationship between knowledge and the ‘knower’, is not positivist, which would suggest phenomenon can be investigated as through the methods of natural sciences. People and complex social phenomena, such as sport, are not easily studied by the use of such approaches. Also, I take an ‘ideographic’ approach (Berg, 2001), in that the research involves a level of interaction with the subject matter. The epistemological assumptions of determinism, which sees people as products of their environment, or of voluntarism, which people are actively involved in creating their environment, are seen as two extremes, neither of which alone can reflect the spectrum of human experience (Sparkes, 1992).

The assumptions underpinning this research about people and knowledge tend to fall somewhere between these two extremes. Simply put, this recognises that for some, there may be a level of response to the environment, but that individuals do, to a greater or lesser extent, have some control over their own behaviour and environment. For this reason a positivist paradigm, based on ontological assumptions about meaning and reality, which are objective and capable of being defined and tested, has been replaced by a critical realist paradigm (Danermark et al, 2002; Archer et al, 1998).

This critical realist paradigm has a subjectivist/interactive epistemology and an interpretive ontology (Sparkes, 1992; Bryman, 2001; Danermark et al, 2002). This paradigm recognises the “contested meanings and multiple realities” found in the implementation of policy, for example, by Palumbo and Hallett (1993) and Rochefort and Cobb (1993).
Brante (2001: 178) suggested that the ultimate goal of sociology is to “identify social structures harbouring causal mechanisms that generate empirically observable effects”. This corresponds to Bhaskar’s view (1989) that the object of sociology is “social relations” and its task is to explain their reproductions and transformations. Key to the critical realist perspective is the “mechanics of causality” (Danermark, et al, 2002).

The implications of critical realism for methods is the application of what Danermark et al (2002) referred to as critical methodological pluralism, as they proposed that there is no such thing as ‘the critical realist method’. This is based on the acceptance that mechanisms have consequences, which may work differently in different contexts. Critical realism accepts there exists both an external world, independent of human consciousness and a dimension of socially determined knowledge and reality. Thus in research, methods must suit both the object and the purpose. Different views of the same issue result in different views of the ‘reality’ of it. In youth sport for example, different views of the purpose of CC, and of concepts such as performance pathways, result in different perspectives of its impacts and meanings. Each view is real, in that it exists and informs and motivates actions.

Brante further suggested “causality should not be defined as law-like universal regularities between observables ” (Brante, 2001:173). We need therefore to seek understanding and explanation of the regularities of social relationships and the “structurally dependent” mechanisms, which underpin them. Critical realism also recognises that ‘reality’ has an objective existence, but our experience of it is conceptually mediated, thus ‘facts’ are theory-dependent but not theory-determined (Danermark et al, 2002). Thus within this paradigm we are concerned with understanding and explanation, particularly of the mechanisms that underpin the events we observe. Our role is to find out what the mechanisms of CC are and attempt to explain how they work.

The problem of achieving a balance between realism and subjectivity is at the heart of ongoing debates around ‘rational’ or ‘evidence-based’ policy making (Davies et al,
The call for evidence of 'what works' in public policy is driven by a concern to demonstrate, both to public and policy makers, whether the policy is having the effect intended. However, what counts as evidence is becoming much more broadly interpreted, as complex social programmes produce evidence of growing diversity. The recognition of this trend has lead, within this research, to the adoption of a mixed methodology approach, including both quantitative and qualitative data, in the form of case studies. As pointed out by Sparkes (1992) and Radnor (1994), interpretive researchers see qualitative methods as being appropriate for the study of the social world, concerned as they are with the need to understand the world as it is, with a more subjective view of meaning (Sparkes, 1992: 26-27). A critical paradigm incorporates critiques of different views of policy and promotes change.

On the other hand, methods themselves are constrained by the resources available. For example, the resources available for this research have not allowed for an ethnographic approach to data collection, though this would have been a useful method from the interpretivist stance. Because of reservations about how a purely interpretative piece of research would be received by policy makers, quantitative or empirical approaches have been used, at appropriate levels, as explained in the relevant sections below. A concern for the application and acceptance of the research, or utility, in the contribution to evidence of 'what works' reinforced the need to balance interpretative and empirical techniques. This has strengthened triangulation in the research, both through the collection of different forms of data and in analysis from different perspectives (Bannen, 1992; Yin, 1994). The overarching approach to policy evaluation is thus a 'realist evaluation' as advocated by Pawson and Tilley (1997).

As pointed out by Pawson and Tilley (1997), the application of a realist approach in a sound evaluation depends on the careful enunciation of the programme theory. Sanderson (2002) also argued that from a realist position, the evaluation of policy should be theory-based and focused on understanding and explanation. He further pointed out that the complex problems posed by modern policy making mean that "the
quantitative agenda is seen as offering limited potential for improving the evidence base of policy making” (Sanderson, 2002:6).

While supporting mixed method approaches, Taylor et al (2000) were quite dismissive of paradigmatic debates. They highlighted the pragmatic concerns of realistic evaluation, operating in ‘real world’ problem areas. They pointed out the limitations of questionnaire-based surveys in dealing sensitively with outcome measures and particularly in measuring changes in individuals’ behaviour or attitudes. The poor response to questionnaires, possibly due to literacy problems, was referred to as a potential area for concern with programmes dealing with young offenders, for example, and there are similar problems in surveys of young people more generally.

Programme theory and Champion Coaching

Section 4.3 provided the background to Champion Coaching and its ‘theory’. At the micro level, that of the impacts of the programme on individuals, this research has been influenced by and developed from socialisation and behaviour change theories examined in Chapter Three, for example, Bourdieu’s (1988) concepts of habitus, socialisation and motivations to participate in sport. Theories which have illuminated the choices of young people when taking part in organised sport programmes, the impacts of such participation and the structures to support and facilitate were used to develop a more complete “theory of change” model for CC in that section.

In Chapter Three, it was pointed out that in order to understand the social and structural conditions affecting progression onto ‘performance pathways’, it was important to examine the social and economic circumstances of participants, their local environment and opportunities for sport. Some analysis of expectations and experiences of stakeholders (participants, parents, coaches, youth sport managers and physical education teachers) involved with the Scheme was important to be able to draw conclusions about process and outcomes in each location (Thayer and Fine, 2001). This is essential in order to draw conclusions about the policy at the meso level, across the cases of implementation, regarding the operation of communities and networks in youth sport, as discussed in Chapter Four. Within a realist framework,
however, it is important to ensure the right questions are asked of the right ‘stakeholders’, reflecting their particular perspective or expertise (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). The different levels of analysis shown in Figure 5.1 indicates the key methods and sources of data for these levels.

**Figure 5.1: Levels of analysis in the research**

**Evaluating the Champion Coaching Scheme**

The main aim of the research is to evaluate Champion Coaching, by looking at longer-term impacts and outcomes achieved. However, as the Scheme was delivered across Great Britain in over 140 local authorities, such extensive research was too onerous for a study to be completed part time, by a single researcher, with limited resources. Consequently, this research was developed to address specifically how far the Scheme achieved its stated objectives by analysing the impacts and achievements in selected cases in the North West of England and North Wales.

The objectives of this research sought to address the contexts or settings in which the Scheme was delivered, the processes of implementation across various local authority
Champion Coaching programmes and at different levels, for individuals and organisations. As pointed out by Burnett (2001) such multi-level research requires adaptability and flexibility on the part of the researcher, as a methodology was required which could address such complexity, yet retain the rigour demanded by academic analysis. A realistic framework, by which ‘what worked’ in the selected cases, for whom and in what circumstances could be judged, was therefore developed. Thus this research contributes to building a more complete understanding of the outcomes achieved and the processes involved in youth sport programmes across different settings, using Pawson and Tilley’s Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configuration.

Qualitative and contextually rich evidence has a contribution to make to the evidence base for sport policy. The lack of ‘outcome’ based evidence has been noted to be a major factor in whether projects and initiatives like as Champion Coaching continue to receive public funding, and for the relevant sporting interests (policy actors or coalitions) to develop their influence in other policy areas (Coalter, 2000). Arguably, policy makers and people not yet convinced of the messages being given out by sporting organisations like Sport England, are swayed more by empirical evidence from quantitative studies. This seems apparent in the Best Value approach to public funding and services, as shown by the publication of Sport England’s guide to performance measurement for local authorities (SE, 2001). In the current climate, all areas of public spending are coming under increasing pressure to provide empirical evidence to support their claims for the benefits they bring to the wider community and at the same time demonstrate that they are ‘inclusive’ and representative of these communities. Sport England suggested methods such as quantitative surveys, focus groups and interviews (SE, 2001), though the emphasis was on achieving an empirical (assumed to be quantitative) measure of performance, which may mask complex differences in provision or performance. This demonstrates the dilemma for researchers in that the choice of positivist approaches could be perceived as giving over-generalised views of complex phenomena. But the problem is that interpretative, qualitative approaches are often perceived to be weaker:

"in contrast to the numerical data produced by quantitative research,"
qualitative methods are characterised by ambiguity, subjectivity and place more emphasis on the localized context.”


Howe (1993) proposed that qualitative methods were highly appropriate for leisure-based research, due to the increased sensitivity to the effects of the experience on participants. She described methods such as interviews and content analysis as "naturalistic". These arguments therefore influenced the choice of a multi method case study approach for the evaluation of Champion Coaching.

As discussed earlier (NCF, 1992, 1993), the impacts and implementation of the Champion Coaching Scheme were both complex and varied. The original Blueprint determined centrally by the NCF, was delivered locally, through partnerships led by Local Authorities. The choice of the term Recipes for Action used in these initial reports on the scheme illustrated that the Blueprint could be used flexibly. The circumstances and eventual format of the programmes delivered locally was subject to variation, through choice of sports, venues and sporting infrastructures in each place. Each local programme involved different agencies, with varying levels of involvement, resources and different perspectives of the process and intended outcomes. Each local authority area had different circumstances, including demographics, economics and politics, which influenced both processes and outcomes. The level of individual interpretation of programme objectives and delivery processes lent itself to qualitative approaches in the form of interviews, in order to analyse the discourses and interactions.

When considering the concept of effectiveness for example, the ‘actors’ themselves can have different views of what this means. Views of power and resource dependencies that may link organisations together, as discussed by Rhodes (2000), can be gathered from the policy ‘actors’ and in different forms, including documents. As pointed out by Penney and Evans (1999), the delivery of policy can not be seen in isolation, too easily separated from interpretation and meanings imparted at various sites and layers of delivery. For this reason, therefore, evaluation of case studies of implementation at different sites is important. CC represented ‘clusters’ of
intervention as described by Okoumunne et al (1999). Such clusters have been widely used in health evaluations (Okoumunne et al, 1999) on the basis that as programmes are usually delivered to areas rather than to individuals, there is value in looking at impacts on the same basis. Individuals do not exist in isolation, and it is very difficult to identify separately individuals in different clusters to treat in experimental designs.

The issue of time was another factor in the selection of methods. The Champion Coaching Scheme operated in various forms from 1991 to 1999. This gave potential for variation over time and introduced problems related to a historical study: the accuracy of recall of participants, and access to appropriate archived data.

As with most programmes funded by the public sector, requirements were placed on authorities to report outputs achieved to the NCF. This provided a basis for some quantitative data centrally and locally, some of which was reported in Chapter Four. This included the number and gender of children participating in sports coaching courses, the number and status of coaches employed, and scholarships awarded. However, as data collection on the qualitative aspects of the Scheme, as suggested by de Knop and de Martelaer (2001) was not required to support funding, many authorities did not complete any, or relied on limited and often subjective or anecdotal reports to supplement the reports (Youth Sport Manager, Personal Communication, Flintshire, 17/10/1999).

As a result, there is limited data of qualitative measures of managers’, participants’ or coaches’ experience of the Scheme. For example, none of the YSMs contacted in the selected cases could provide any completed reports of surveys of participants’ satisfaction with Champion Coaching courses. This was despite the 1996 Guide to Champion Coaching advice regarding monitoring and evaluation. The main form of reporting to NCF related to outputs (numbers of children or courses) rather than outcomes (NCF 1996; 1997).

This then represents a gap in terms of explaining and understanding the success of the Scheme in the longer term, which this research can help to fill. Qualitative data can
explain and add depth to empirical data, based on measures of participation and exit routes. For example, the numbers of children referred from particular schools is better understood by analysing the views of the teachers and pupils. Describing the numbers of coaches involved in the scheme or scholarships for courses cannot explain what the impacts have been on coach development, hence the need to interview coaches.

A further factor determining the methodology is the range of actors in the process, and their different perspectives on it. Participants on the courses, their parents, the coaches, Youth Sport Managers and club officials, sport-specific Development Officers and NCF co-ordinators represent the clients, customers and ‘stakeholders’ in Champion Coaching. As indicated earlier they each have their own perspective and may have very different criteria for judging its’ success.

It was clear from early discussions with YSMs and NCF representatives that local programmes varied widely in both process and outcomes. The two important agencies, (the local authority and the NCF), described the Scheme in quite different ways. Early reports on the pilot Champion Coaching Schemes in 1992 emphasised the youth sport opportunities (NCF, 1992), though the NCF had clear priorities for Coach Education and Development (NCF Regional Coach Development Officer, Personal Communication, July 1999). There was potential, therefore, to explore the impact of different meanings and priorities on the Scheme’s outcomes, as highlighted by Palumbo and Hallett (1993). Utilising an entirely positivist approach would neglect very rich sources of data and context compared with the more inductive, qualitative and interpretative approaches outlined by Bryman (1988, 2001), Stake (1994) Berg (2001) and Silverman (2000).

There are thus strong arguments for an approach capable of embracing different paradigms, namely that of case studies. Firstly, there is the need to focus on evaluating the impacts of Champion Coaching as a policy intervention. Secondly, this is unlikely, given the political climate discussed above, to provide sufficient rigour to be recognised by policy makers as valid without an empirical basis. Thirdly, the effectiveness of the Scheme in terms of its impacts on individuals and organisations
cannot be fully evaluated without reference to the experiences of individuals and their perspectives, in the rich detail that case studies allow.

The literature reviewed earlier illustrated a range of methods in evaluating policy and of the impacts of projects and initiatives. Mason, for example, followed up the National Survey on children's participation in sport with interviews with children and teachers (Mason 1995a,b). Bannen et al (1992) also indicated the value of mixing methods in public sector policy research. Doig (1992:8) pointed out the need to balance quantitative approaches with their emphasis on empiricism and measurement, with the need to evaluate a phenomenon, seeking understanding of why or how things are as they are. MacPherson et al (2000) highlighted the value of case studies to educational research and education policy, particularly across different sites of implementation. Gummerson (1991) referred to the value of ‘grounded theory’ techniques to management research, in conjunction with case studies.

The ‘Grounded Theory’ approach of Strauss and Corbin (1998) was originally conceived by Glaser and Strauss (1967) for investigating complex social phenomena, incorporating the views of those who have experienced it. Though they later differed on how the method developed, this approach relies upon interaction between qualitative and quantitative data. Using qualitative methods therefore, helps to uncover some of the meanings behind quantitative data and develop understanding of the nature of the experience (Strauss and Corbin, 1998: 9).

Bryman (1988:108-9) suggested the distinction between qualitative and quantitative approaches was largely a technical matter. His more recent work (2001) reflected a growth in combined approaches. Combining previously competing sources and approaches has become much more acceptable and common. In this study, whilst the techniques commended by Strauss and Corbin were useful in analysing interviews and other qualitative data, a strictly ‘grounded theory’ approach was not used, as this implied a completely inductive approach to theory development.
Thus, each local authority Champion Coaching programme represents a 'case' of implementation. Within each case there is the opportunity to use a range of methods or techniques, which are set out below. By drawing conclusions within and between cases, a 'realistic' and holistic evaluation of Champion Coaching at national or macro level can be achieved. A single case of implementation would reduce the ability to draw conclusions regarding the scheme as a whole. However, a limited number of cases also enabled a more defined framework for CMO comparisons. To build on meso-level analysis of the policy impacts, a case study approach is necessary to allow conclusions to be drawn out with relevance to future policy development.

5.2 The case study within realist evaluations: the selected cases and study design

Some arguments for case studies and realist evaluations have been made earlier. Here we examine the implications of case studies within realist evaluations and how this study has applied the approach. Yin (1994) advocated the case study as a means of understanding complex social phenomena, particularly when examining contemporary events “when the boundaries between context and phenomenon are not clearly evident” (Yin, 1994:4). By combining analysis from within cases, the intention is to develop how and why the programme has worked (or not) with what has been achieved in empirical terms (outcomes). The advantage of using case studies in the Champion Coaching context is that they can deal with a range of evidence, including observations, interviews and documentary sources.

Case studies, however, need to be sharpened and focused through a thorough review of the relevant literature and theory, to clarify the concepts under review, establish the theoretical framework, and consider specific methodological issues. A single case study was felt to be too limited in its’ ability to contribute to conclusions about the Scheme mechanisms, due to variations in delivery and format. To provide a coherent framework for the analysis in the multiple site/case method, careful attention to study design, sequence and the selection of techniques within the cases was required. The case study design was tempered by logistical problems, of resources and access to
data, which meant amendments to Yin’s (1994) multiple case design shown in the diagram below. The initial phase of case study research was survey based, but there was considerable interaction between phases and cases as well as re-examination of relevant theory as the research progressed.

The theory referred to in the first part of Figure 5.2 is the programme theory established in the earlier Chapters, regarding the assumptions underlying CC and the measures proposed as appropriate for the evaluation. The context required an understanding of local characteristics, conditions and circumstances. The research also needed to take into account individuals concerned with providing access to data as well as those implementing the policy. As indicated by Alcock et al (1998), this can sometimes be problematical, due to resistance and conflicting interpretations of the purpose of the evaluation. Yin proposed that each case be analysed in a holistic way, but that an analysis of the conclusions across the cases can provide more potent arguments for policy evaluation. This also represents more robust “accumulation of evidence” (Davies et al, 2000), and better understanding of causal mechanisms (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). The study design is diagrammatically illustrated in Figure 5.2.

Yin (1994) proposed case study inquiry was an 'all encompassing' method. It can provide triangulation through convergence of multiple sources of evidence and allow theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis, facilitated by a ‘grounded theory’ approach, moving between observation and theory, as noted earlier. Yin (1994:15) also referred to the particular suitability of the case study method to evaluation research, including describing interventions and explaining causal links. Through accumulating evidence from different cases, it can also provide ‘meta-evaluation’.

Due to their flexibility, case studies can deal with the varying complexity and scale of sport programmes and are particularly apt when dealing with multi-site, multi-level interventions such as CC. The national framework for CC becomes therefore, the meta level case, as the research examines linked cases of implementation at local level.
Figure 5.2: Multiple case study method (after Yin, 1994)
Selection of case study programmes

The North West of England and North Wales was selected as the geographic region that could be covered by the researcher to travel to sites for meetings, visits and interviews. The CC programmes operating from 1996-1999 in the region were identified as potential cases, these were: St. Helens, Knowsley, Stockport, Tameside, Manchester and Flintshire (previously Clwyd). Initial contact was made with the local authority Sports Development Units in 1998/1999, with a brief proposal indicating the broad approach to be taken and the proposed methods.

However, only three organisations were both willing and able to assist in the research project at this stage (St Helens, Stockport and Flintshire). Later, Stockport found it was unable to supply the required data on participants, which was impossible to recreate. A replacement case study was sought, and Knowsley MBC, which had operated Champion Coaching jointly with St Helens, eventually agreed to co-operate. Unfortunately, again due to the loss of records of participants, the data collection in Knowsley was delayed and only a single cohort from 1999 was eventually available. This demonstrated one of the major problems of the research: the lack of data on participants and loss of data over time.

The selection of cases provided a limited range of contexts for CC. However, self-selection in this study has some obvious implications in terms of potential bias in the findings, addressed further below. Those organisations that perceived their programme to be successful might be more open to independent evaluations. However, the required research was impossible to conduct without the cooperation and assistance of the local authority Sports Development Units concerned. A series of vignettes, describing the key features and contexts of the selected cases concludes this chapter, and provides details of how methods and samples varied across cases.

There were some similarities between the organisations, as all were Unitary Authorities, but in practice, they represented different approaches to CC. They
were involved with CC for varying lengths of time, and included similar but not identical sports in their local programmes. Each had very different social and economic characteristics and conditions, not least the size and scale of resources devoted to sports development and the ability to assist with the study. One of the cases had a Welsh sport policy context, which meant a different set of NCF guidelines, with NGB templates for Wales rather than England.

Case study methodology had the flexibility to cope with the changing contemporary context. One method of dealing with this was for each part of the case study to be completed within a similar time frame, starting with the initial interviews with Youth Sport Managers, in 1998/1999 (later in Knowsley for reasons noted earlier). Participant/parent surveys started in late 2000 and continued into 2001 and 2002 with the coaches' survey. In-depth interviews with selected coaches and governing body/coaching representatives, teachers and other professionals took place from 2002 to 2003.

The time elapsed between phases of fieldwork also allowed for revisiting of theory and literature, to help refine and develop understanding of the concepts. Delays were not all planned, as some were due to problems with local authorities, where Departments had other priorities and concerns. For example, significant delay occurred in the Flintshire case study due to long-term absence of relevant staff and incomplete data.

Choice of subjects and samples within cases

In discussion with Youth Sport Managers it clear that a random sample of participants in all local authority programmes would not be possible, as not all records were intact or available. A practical issue was the lack of computerised records. This was particularly relevant in the Flintshire case study, so this was the last survey to be completed in 2002. Hockey and netball were the only sports included in all three cases, but at least four sports in each case allowed some aggregation of data by sport, and a limited analysis across sports in each case.
Replication of data, by selecting similar sports between case studies, was a deliberate approach. According to Yin (1994), replication provided sufficient data for a more potent argument and improved the reliability between cases in a multiple case method. We may find for example, similar results achieved with similar methods in the different case study organisations, or differences for predictable reasons. The questionnaires were the same for all cases, to allow for within-case conclusions and some cross-case conclusions for the final stage of the study (Yin, 1994:49). Coding and questionnaire design took into account the potential for pooling samples across cases. However, the intention was to consider each case as a holistic study where possible, due to variations in the samples.

The samples in each case, though modest, were representative of the overall population from which they were drawn and represent a reasonable proportion of participants given the time elapsed since CC ended (Table 5.1). In the first cohort, St Helens, some children received more than one questionnaire as they completed more than one sport or year. Only after all duplications were removed, were reminders sent to any who had not responded in each of the cases.

Table 5.1: Sample characteristics in selected cases – participant survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>St Helens</th>
<th>Knowsley</th>
<th>Flintshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All registrations*</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Girls football, hockey, netball, cricket, basketball, girls rugby</td>
<td>Girls football, netball, hockey, cricket, water polo, badminton, basketball,</td>
<td>Athletics, hockey, netball, rugby tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*estimated from returns to NCF and reports of SDOs

The measures within cases therefore took the problem of low sample size into account. The potential for generalisation from the cases is weaker than if the samples were much larger, however, Gummerson (1991) identified the advantages of using case studies holistically, in the embedded multiple case method, when using the same techniques across different cases. To consider each case
separately is thus consistent with the approach advocated by Pawson and Tilley (1997) as it enables patterns of regularity to emerge from the data.

In this critical realist research, comparison of different cases provided a basis for retroduction, as a method of inference, "or a foundation to sort out contingent differences in order to arrive at the common and the more universal" (Danermark et al., 2002:105). Through 'transfactual argument' and systematic comparisons in developing CMO configurations of cases, the thought processes of induction, retroduction and inference moved from surface to deep understanding of structures and mechanisms. Such comparisons are not always directly observable (Danermark et al., 2002).

Mainly due to time and resource considerations, this research involved frequent short visits to the case study organisations, with informal meetings or contacts to check on progress and to follow up ideas raised by ongoing data collection, rather than the ethnographic approach of Stake (1995). Ongoing co-operation of the case study organisations was an essential prerequisite for such research. Therefore, satisfaction with the process of key informants was monitored in such contacts, so any concerns could be responded to. More formally, findings were reported in summary to each LA and to SCUK as the research progressed, though little response, either formal or informal, was received.

As there was little descriptive data on the experiences of coaches on CC, the survey of coaches was included in the design to provide background and exploratory data, on which the more qualitative methods could build greater understanding. However, sample selection for the coach survey was restricted due to lack of access to the original mailing database. It was clear that a postal survey, with such a small group (<50), could yield such a small response as to provide little usable data. SCUK agreed a limited sample from their national database, across sports and regions, and selected a 'representative' sample (though this was not possible to check). The case study coaches were all contacted directly by the researcher in the mail survey, using details provided by the LAs. This data was not all up-to-date or complete, and so response numbers were small as predicted. Interviews were conducted with those respondents who responded positively to
the initial survey. Further interviews were conducted by telephone to ensure coaches from all sports were included in the qualitative phase. A breakdown of the characteristics of coaches involved is provided in Appendix 1.

Selection of schools and groups for interviews
Schools were selected for inclusion in the visits and interviews based on an analysis of referrals to CC, where this data had been collected. A ‘high’ and ‘low’ referral school was selected in each Borough (a ratio of approximately 1 in 6 schools). This resulted in seven school visits in total, from March to June 2003, and October to December 2003, involving teachers (often the Head of PE), and groups of pupils in years 10 or 11. Due to delays in school visits, only year 11 pupils in schools visited before Easter 2003 were included.

The choice of children for interviews was left to schools to determine, as access to pupil records was not possible under the data protection legislation for random selection, and schools were unwilling to engage in more complex or onerous selection procedures. Group interviews with Year 10 or 11 pupils were requested, as far as possible to reflect ‘typical’ year groups, for example, selected from the curriculum PE classes, rather than the GCSE PE groups, assumed to be of higher interest or ability in PE. This was not always possible, as for some schools (Sport Colleges) either all year 10/11 pupils did GCSE PE, or the teacher felt that it would be more difficult to get students to contribute to discussions. This had some obvious implications for potential bias, but the benefits of gaining more useful material with co-operative groups was felt to be important. Due to the limits imposed by schools on access to pupils it was not possible to build longer term trust and organise a focus group. Visits were arranged to coincide with regular PE lessons for these groups though there was some variation in how they were conducted.

Group size was aimed to be between eight and twelve where possible, to be manageable, and depending on how PE classes were organised, were both single sex and mixed groups. Due to logistical problems for teachers, smaller groups, of three, four or fewer were arranged to allow them to be conducted alongside a PE lesson.
School heads received written notification of the research purposes and methods, and gave their approval to the study, which was sometimes only obtained via direct communication with the PE department. Not all schools responded to initial communications and several schools in each area declined the opportunity to contribute. Contact letters and proposals are included as Appendix 2. Children were asked by their PE teachers if they would be prepared to co-operate and the school was asked to obtain the necessary parental consents. Most schools sent a note home with pupils, as a form of ‘passive consent’. Children were also given the opportunity to opt out if they wished. No individual children were identified in the study, and groups remained technically in their classes, under the supervision of teachers.

Given the constraints in access to the schools, it was also not possible to fully pilot the questions used in the group interviews, but some questions were partially tested with groups of young people at the author’s college and were discussed with PE teachers and SDOs. After the first visit to one of the St Helens schools that used individual and group approaches, the remaining interviews were conducted with groups only. Some amendment of language and terminology was also found to be necessary, to clarify the meanings of phrases like ‘exit routes’ or ‘performance opportunities’ for the young people. These interviews also highlighted the problems of acoustics in recording interviews in the ‘natural setting’ of the PE class, which meant that where possible, thereafter interviews were conducted in a separate room.

Key features of the Case study schemes, their socio-economic characteristics and how CC implementation varied are summarised in the vignettes below.
Case Study CC Schemes

St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council

Population
* 177,000 people, having reduced from 189,000 in 1981; with aging population (ONS, 2003; St. Helens MBC, 2002)
* Only 1% ethnic minority

Environment and Economics
* Decline in glass and mining left legacy of derelict sites, buildings, above-average unemployment at 6.8%, low vocational skills in employment market
* 3 wards in top 3% most deprived in England
* Large contrasts between inner Parr, Hardshaw and Marshalls Cross (Sport England Priority Areas) and green, affluent western suburb of Rainford
* EU Objective 1 status; 42nd most deprived local authority (DETR, 2000)

Champion Coaching
* SD Unit committed to youth sport - through BT Tops, Merseyside Youth Games, and particular emphasis on coach education and training and preparing joint scheme with Knowsley MBC
* CC covered hockey, cricket, girls football and rugby, basketball, and netball, and registered 336 players from 1996 to 1999, accredited by NCF in latter year; monitoring reports available (1996/97 and 1998/99)
* Venues chosen to suit clubs and use MBC facilities as 'exit routes', with new and existing junior sections, though often only 1 or 2 clubs per sport identified (personal communication Oct, 99)
* 20 coaches recruited and trained, not all continued or were retained, 7 provided interviews in person or by telephone
* Celebration evening took place annually, with awards to coaches and participants
* 13 schools involved were contacted and after strenuous efforts, three co-operated with teacher interviews and group interviews with years 10/11, in which 57 young people took part. Interview with LEA Advisory Teacher for P.E. for overview
* After eliminating repeats, 230 children registered 1996-99 were mailed a questionnaire, and 78 (33%) replied.
* SDO responsible for the Scheme had moved to new post by 1999, but interviewed later, as was current SDO responsible for Youth Sport
Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council

**Population**
- 153,000 people in large district of 34 square miles
- Some growth in 1970-90 and relatively young, with 1 in 4 under 16 compared to 1 in 9 nationally (Audit Commission, 2002)
- Several population centres- Kirkby, Huyton, Prescot, Halewood, included areas of very high deprivation

**Environment/Economics**
- Significant industry but 2/3 is green belt (Audit Commission, 2002)
- 6th most deprived authority in England and high levels of areas of poor health, child poverty, 39% of household on Housing Benefit, and 50% without a car
- 18 out of the 22 wards in the Borough fall in the 10% most deprived in the country.
- Beacon Council status for sport, culture, tourism (2001) and youth sport participation a priority in sports development

**Champion Coaching**
- YS Manager appointed before scheme began; CC integrated with MYG to fill perceived gaps in opportunities and coaching
- Head coaches mostly working in the Borough prior to CC
- Coaches also recruited from within other LA departments, some assistants new to regular coaching
- Differences to St Helens: Courses advertised as £1 per session rather than £10 a course; ran 2x10 week courses in N&S in all 8 sports concurrently; groups collected by minibus for some courses
- Sports as in St. H plus water polo and badminton; as in St Helens, regular celebratory evenings with disco
- Some 752 registered 1996-99 (estimated from monitoring reports)
- Venues chosen to fill gaps but often in one of leisure centres or 5 dual use schools, notably Halewood, Prescot or Kirkby
- Of 20 coaches, few had access to scholarships, eventually 5 coaches interviewed and 3 contacted by telephone
- All 12 secondary school involved plus some primary for cricket, 1 high-referral and 1 low-referral co-operated, through interviews with teachers and meeting with PE Curriculum Co-ordinators, and group interviews with 74 children from 2 schools in yr10/11.
- Current Youth Sport SDO, responsible for CC Scheme interviewed.
- 54 pupils (25% of those listed for 1999) responded to survey, from 220 contacted.
Flintshire County Council

Population
* 147,000 - large single tier authority, formed by combining Clwyd County, Alyn & Deeside and Delyn districts, some problems in demographic analysis due to changing ward boundaries and codes
* Main population centres Holywell, Flint, Mold, Queensferry/Connah’s Quay

Environment/Economics
* Relatively well–provided for sport, with 10 leisure centres and 5 dual use schools (Audit Commission, 2002), unemployment only 3.3%
* Wide range of deprivation - Flint ward 75th most deprived in Wales, Ewloe 847th (DETR, 2000)
* Extensive rural areas, despite being classed as a metropolitan authority

Champion Coaching
* 3 SDOs in 1999, now 8 staff and significant growth in responsibility and scope
* SD newly part of Education & Leisure, with priority for increasing participation and performance in youth sport (FCC, 2003), focus on Primary Schools Sports Development since CC ended, Dragon Sport.
* SDO responsible for Champion Coaching, no longer with Authority, unable to contact, current SDO with management responsibility for Youth Sport interviewed.
* Athletics, tennis, hockey, netball, rugby in CC, now Sports specific programmes for soccer for boys and girls and rugby, but run extensive Dragon sport Scheme in primary schools, and good range of schemes for supporting clubs and coach education
* Range of facilities used for CC, including clubs for tennis, rugby, but emphasis on central area around Mold/Hawarden/Buckley, with access problems for Deeside, Flint or the northern parts
* Some 15 coaches used on CC but addresses only available for 10 and 8 did personal or telephone interviews
* Not all of 12 secondary schools involved in CC, but no details kept of referrals. Two schools in areas with differing participation rates agreed to co-operate with interviews and visits, in which two teachers and 25 children participated.
* Small sample of addresses provided; of 78 children/parents mailed, 32 responded, plus 10 from second list, by telephone: a total of 42, or 36% (from total of 116 contacted).
* 73 postcodes eventually reconstructed from contact details for geographical analysis from survey and lists of registrations.
5.3 Surveys: methods and designs in case studies

For the Champion Coaching evaluation, surveys fulfilled two main aims. Firstly, to provide some descriptive/empirical data about the experiences and opinions of participants, parents and coaches about Champion Coaching, and any subsequent impacts on sporting or coaching careers. Secondly, to enable analysis and understanding of opinions, attitudes and perceptions of the process they were engaged in, related to individual characteristics, other variables or circumstances.

The potential weakness of the survey in this context is illustrated by some of the studies previously conducted into Champion Coaching. For example, using postcode analysis of survey respondents, Buller (1998) found that over a 4-5 year period, areas of higher deprivation had lower levels of participation in the Nottinghamshire Champion Coaching scheme. He had only limited ability to explain why this occurred, because of a lack of control groups and the limitations of his questionnaire design.

In this study the combination of the survey-derived data with other techniques was intended to improve explanation and subsequent analysis in a holistic way. To illustrate this, the issue of progression onto ‘performance pathways’ was measured through the participant survey, identifying the exit routes taken by participants after they had completed the Scheme, with information about the range of sports played. Thus, it is possible to compare the results with national or other studies as to the proportions of children who become club members. We would expect, given the nature of children taking part in CC and the impact of good quality coaching, that more CC participants would join and stay in a club than typical youngsters. As this membership could be recorded from two to six years after CC, this would comprise evidence of longer-term outcomes, and behaviours more likely to continue into adulthood.

As in many similar studies, however, the balance between coverage and detail on individual subjects in the surveys was difficult to resolve. Detailed and specific information about the nature and type, frequency and level of sports engagement was felt to be too onerous for a postal survey, and resources were not available for
an interview-based study as completed by Kremer et al (1997) or Mason (1995b). Postal surveys provided some opportunity to test the impacts of CC on club membership, out-of-school participation, and knowledge about progression opportunities, indicated as important by the literature in Chapter Three. They also provided some detail about children's attitudes and opinions about the courses. For example, as enjoyment was identified as an indicator of the likelihood of "enduring involvement" in sport (Green and Chalip, 1997), this was one of the attitudinal variables included, but was kept as simple as possible.

As CC also intended to provide important opportunities for coach development, the survey of coaches involved in the Scheme provided useful descriptive data to evaluate the impacts on coaches' careers, as there was no other information available from SCUK. The survey measured the impacts of CC on recruitment, training, CPD and the nature of activity of coaches. This was analysed overall, rather than by local programmes, because of the small numbers of coaches involved in each case and an anticipated low response rate. Further depth and triangulation was provided by corroboration with other interviews, for example, with the Coach Development Officers, or officers involved in the Active Sport Partnerships. So, the use of interviews was not a response to perceived limits of the surveys, but reflected the different nature of the information being gathered in this realist approach.

**Questionnaire design and conducting of the surveys**

**Participants' Questionnaire**

Questionnaire design was based on that used in similar studies by Buller (1998), Gray (1998) and Kohn (1998) as reported in Collins and Buller (2000). After some amendments, drafts were discussed with SDOs from the selected cases and the NCF Scheme manager. Customised versions of each questionnaire, using logo and venue details provided by the Sports Development Units were then developed (the Knowlsey example forms Appendix 3).

Questions were designed to allow analysis by SPSS (v.11), though coding details were not included on the forms to maintain clarity and simplicity for the
respondents. Questionnaires were mailed to a named participant, together with a
questionnaire for their parent or guardian, a covering letter and reply paid return
envelope. The local authorities provided either labels (St Helens), registration
forms (Knowsley) or lists of names and addresses or telephone numbers
(Flintshire) to complete the mailing.

In an attempt to increase the return rate, all respondents were included in a prize
draw, for sportswear vouchers. A reminder with a copy of the questionnaire was
sent to all those who had not replied after four weeks, after duplications were
removed. No further reminders were sent, and telephone calls were not made to
complete survey questionnaires, except to maximise responses to the limited
sample in Flintshire. This was due to limits of resources for such efforts, and in
case completing questionnaires over the telephone influenced youngsters or their
parents to reply differently from than those completing the form by post.

The first question identified the precise course and venue the participant took part
in. This was a necessary check on repeat registrations, which all case managers
had indicated would feature. Questions 2 and 3, therefore, asked for details
regarding their most recent course. Question 4 regarding the venue and ease of
getting to it was intended to demonstrate whether the criteria of accessibility had
been met, and could be linked to postcode addresses and to parents' views about
transporting their children. Questions 6 to 9 sought to examine the enjoyment or
otherwise of the participants and the benefits they felt they obtained from their
coaching, as enjoyment was felt by the NCF (1992) to provide a basis for future
participation and progression in sport, a view supported by the literature (eg,
Mason 1995b; Roberts, 1992, 1996a; Green and Chalip, 1997). Some scope for
open comment in these questions allowed for post hoc coding and gave potential
for other issues to emerge.

The ongoing participation in sport identified by the respondents in Question 10
included the exit route options felt by Youth Sport Managers (and NCF, 1992) to
demonstrate the effectiveness of the Scheme, and it's appropriateness to
individuals. This included joining a club, development squad, representative
squad, extra-curricular school clubs or involvement in Youth Games. Youth
Games was added after consultation with the YSMs, as they felt it would demonstrate how well their established strategy of coaching opportunities linked to their Youth Games plans. Both Knowsley and St Helens had been involved with Youth Games for more than ten years. This was seen as evidence of integration of sport performance opportunities, and had not been covered by previous Champion Coaching studies.

In Question 11, children could also indicate whether they had given up the sport and reasons for doing so; this was important, as their reason(s) may have nothing to do directly with their experience of Champion Coaching. This reflected a concern to consider the 'habitus' of young people and their perceptions of whether or not their sport participation was affected by other issues of choice or taste. Questions 12 to 15, regarding club membership and involvement, were based on the characteristics of a 'youth friendly' club, as outlined by de Knop et al. (1994) reiterated by Campbell (1995a).

How a child found out about a club was important, because of Champion Coaching's objectives in developing performance pathways. Children may have joined clubs regardless of their Champion Coaching experiences, and so evidence of a clear link was essential to demonstrate effectiveness in this area.

In question 17 the range of sports participated in, whether in PE lessons or outside, was based on those indicated as the most popular by Mason (1995a), inside and outside lessons in each group. This could demonstrate local variations in preferences and interests and could be related to the potential for different sports to provide suitable external opportunities. As indicated by Roberts and Brodie (1992), the number of sports played in adolescence could also be a useful indicator of increased likelihood of adult participation. The only distinction drawn was between sport in lessons and those outside; this was thought to be sufficient for identifying appropriate links. The success of CC in terms of longer-term progression or establishing more stable patterns of participation did not solely rely on membership of a local club (National Scheme Manager, Personal communication, 17/4/00).
Information about current membership of a club in question 21 gave an indication of the ‘tracking’ of participation following the Champion Coaching courses; this could then be linked to the length of time since the course and current club membership. For the Flintshire group, the potential lapse of time was longest, from 3 to 7 years. Measuring the extent of current club membership after such a gap was essential for illustrating longer term sporting habits, or stable impacts.

Open comments about progression in question 22 were used to draw out additional meanings and were useful in illuminating responses to earlier questions. Comments were valuable in putting experiences after Champion Coaching into context. They also illustrated how far clubs were able to take up where the CC Scheme left off.

Some limited personal data was collected, namely age, gender and postcode. The postcode was used as a ‘proxy’ measure of Socio-Economic Status (SES), as direct questions regarding income or other occupational details of parents could limit responses. Postcodes as an indicator of SES of participant have been used in measuring the penetration of sports services in different geographical areas (Collins and Buller 2001, Kennett, 2002). The problem with such ‘proxy’ measures are examined in Section 5.4., however, they have also been used in examining access to Higher Education (Tonks and Farr, 2000) and socio-economic characteristics of school populations (Gibson, 1998).

**Parents’ questionnaire**

As people involved in the Scheme as surrogate customers, or those most likely to pay for the coaching courses, the opinions and perceptions of parents were particularly important (Green and Chalip, 1998). However, in this questionnaire, it was felt to be important to limit questions to those most relevant to perceptions of accessibility, value for money, appropriateness of the courses and information about progression. It also allowed for some validation regarding genders and ages of children. Parents are often expected, indeed in many cases required, to transport their children to courses, and may facilitate or hinder progress in sport performance, as identified in Chapter Three (Mason, 1995b; Kremer et al, 1997;
Their responses provided an indicator of their approval of the programmes their children had experienced.

The initial questions established the relevant year, sport and venue, as in the children's questionnaire. Questions one to five on coaching programmes were based on a Likert Scale from 1 to 5 (poor to excellent), with 0 for no comment. The criteria suggested by the literature to be most relevant to parents were: effectiveness in coaching, enjoyment of the child, value for money and organisational efficiency. It was also important to establish whether information about future progression opportunities and the communications with the coach had been satisfactory, as CC may have been their first organised coaching experience outside school. If it was perceived as positive by parents, it could be beneficial for future involvement with the chosen sport or sport in general. Conversely, a negative perception by parents may have had a deleterious impact on subsequent involvement with a club or squad. Cost and accessibility were also assumed to be key variables for the parents, rather than the children.

However, it could be argued that people who were unable to get their children to a venue, or who found the costs prohibitive were excluded from this survey, as their children did not take part in the programme. Information to parents, or the lack of it, was noted as a quality related problem by de Knop and De Martelear (2001) and Collins and Buller (2000). The views of parents involved in the Scheme could shed further light on this issue, and a space for additional comments was therefore included. The parents were also not asked for details pertaining to SES, as this may have been considered intrusive and reduced the response rate.

Coaches' questionnaire

The questionnaire was checked for content and construct validity by the NCF (now rebranded as SportscoachUK (SCUK). The Coaches' questionnaire sought to establish firstly, the level of involvement with CC and the coaches' role in the programme; and secondly, the impacts of the involvement with Champion Coaching programmes on the coaches' subsequent level of coaching activity, personal coaching practice and involvement with CPD opportunities provided by
SCUK. The questionnaire was designed to establish some descriptive data about coach development, on issues to be explored more fully with a limited number of interviews.

The questionnaire design was amended to take into account the advice of SCUK on terminology and to incorporate some questions on the use of SCUK services. Through the approval of SCUK, as indicated in the covering letter, it was hoped to increase the response rate, together with a reply paid envelope. No reminders were sent to the nationally selected sample, but they were sent to all Case study coaches after four weeks. The coaches who indicated they were willing to be involved were contacted for interview, but as they were so few, additional coaches were contacted directly by telephone for additional face-to-face and telephone interviews (A copy of the questionnaire and letter is in Appendix 4).

Questions 1 to 4 established their level of involvement with Champion Coaching Scheme and the benefits received by the coach, in the form of coaching scholarships, access to enhancing NGB qualifications and training courses. Question 5 to 7 identified any previous work with young people and the qualification for work on CC and question 8 identified if coaches were teachers, and whether they had been involved in coaching at schools since the scheme ended. The opinion of the coach of the impacts upon personal coaching activity was established in question 9, with simple categorical responses. A follow-up question (10) required the coach to reflect on the impact of CC on his/her coaching practices, to identify whether Champion Coaching was perceived by them to be linked to any increase in the extent of active coaching and coaching practices.

Question 11 was concerned with their perceptions of CC in terms of organisation, the responses of the children, parents and teachers, local authorities and clubs to the coaching. The issues raised here were to be explored later through interviews. A question about any impact on their own performance was felt to have little validity, since coaches could be expected to indicate that their coaching had been beneficial to the participants. The coach: athlete ratio was noted by question 12 to see if their courses complied with Champion Coaching guidance. Coaches were
asked in question 13 to indicate if they felt more effective as a result of the development received through the Scheme.

Coaches' perceptions of the administration of the programmes was deemed important, as this role, largely undertaken by the YSMs/SDOs, was arguably one of the major advantages to youth coaches of being employed by the local authorities. In question 14, coaches were asked to rate the administration of the courses, with a series of Likert scales from 1 to 7, where 1 was poor and 7 excellent. Linked to this, it was important to see whether the coach was still involved with the local authority, and the reason(s) if not. Q17 identified the coaches recruited onto Active Sport who had taken part in CC. There was also a space to identify current coaching involvement and whether 'active' in some other way. Other questions (18 to 19), following discussion with SCUK, identified whether development opportunities provided by SCUK were accessed after CC had finished. This was consistent the programme theory outlined earlier, indicating commitment to CPD and a career or development orientation, taken as a measure of the importance of the development of personal or human capital to the coaches.

Coaches were asked in question 20 to state what they thought was the most important aspect of CC, again to be explored further with limited numbers of coaches in interviews. Open comments were important for allowing the coaches to express their own views about CC. The coaches' views could be compared to the emphasis placed by the SDOs and SCUK officials on the respective objectives of youth sport and coach development.

The NCF provided a sampling frame of all coaches used within the Champion Coaching Scheme, from which 103 were selected, as noted earlier. The questionnaires and covering letters to this group were mailed by SCUK with the responses returned direct to SCUK for collation and returned as one batch to the author for analysis. The remaining questionnaires, to case study coaches, were distributed directly by the author.
This was an attempt to avoid bias associated with surveying only the most ‘active’ or ‘positive’ coaches. However, as is often the case with postal surveys, address details were missing, incomplete or out-of-date for several of the local coaches and the overall response rate reflected this. The 50 responses were added to by telephone, to increase the sample size eventually to 67. This represented a response rate of approximately 45%.

Interviews with coaches in the case study areas addressed issues raised by the postal questionnaires and developed them more fully. Interviews with coaches representing different sports were conducted in each case study, starting from those who had responded to the survey. At least one from each sport was identified, though this depended on the ability to contact coaches and their co-operation.

5.4 Qualitative data collection: interviews and other methods

The purpose of interviews in critical/scientific realist model of research is to “confirm, falsify and above all refine” the theory of the researcher (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). This ‘theory’ is how the programme has been assumed to work. Interviews were usually conducted as semi-structured, face-to-face meetings with PE staff from schools invited to nominate children, with coaches, coach development officers, SDOs, and other relevant stakeholders. A number of structured telephone interviews were conducted with coaches or small groups of participants. Other less formal telephone interviews were conducted with officials from the CTF or the NCF/SCUK. Interview schedules are found in Appendix 5.

Interviewees were sampled across different schools, sports and stakeholder groups, in order to gain at least a representative ‘voice’, and if possible more than one from each as a check on consistency. However, lack of co-operation prevented all the potential interviewees from being included and incomplete data may have prevented some potential interviewees from being contacted.

Interviews were not completely free flowing, but rather focused by the researcher, on content oriented around the main research themes already identified (Radnor,
Thus in each interview, while there was scope to examine some specific or individual aspects of the case study, there were central and common themes, but the questions varied between individuals, as did how themes were raised or explored. In keeping with the ‘realist’ approach to interviewing, key concepts or terms were also discussed and explained, to clarify the researchers view and to test out respondents’ views of the theory and their real world experience of it. Pawson and Tilley (1997) referred to a ‘teacher-learner’ relationship between interviewer and subject. Transcript extracts in Appendix 6 demonstrate how this was attempted. Though the interviews were semi-structured, with advance preparation of schedules and potential questions, there was the flexibility to explore other areas or aspects not covered, or anticipated. The main themes explored at different levels with interviewees are summarised in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Themes for Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Level: Overarching themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy of CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual level: Coaches and SDOs/CDOs/Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal perceptions of CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils in Schools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of ‘pathways’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the coaches’ interviews, the sub-themes were to a certain extent influenced by or dependant on the results of the initial survey. However, they also explored perceptions and opinions of the impact of CC on personal coaching careers, how young people progressed into clubs or other performance sport and of the youth sport networks in which they coached. That organisational workloads for coaches were reduced by the involvement of professional SDOs, for example, was cited by the NCF as leading to a positive experience for CC coaches (NCF, 1992).
Coaches could therefore give their perspective of the effectiveness of this support and how and why it worked or not.

YSMs/SDOs clearly had another perspective on the organisation of the Scheme, and so questions to them looked at implementation and process. They focused on the impacts of CC on SD practice and how far current practice had been influenced by Champion Coaching experience.

An important set of interviews, as indicated by the literature reviewed in Chapter Three, was with Physical Education staff, both those directly involved in CC and those who did not put refer any children. Though it was possible to identify the relevant schools, due to the time elapsed there were problems in contacting staff directly involved. It was only possible to contact a few relevant staff and so the opportunity to meet with a group of teachers was taken in Knowlsey. Unfortunately an appropriate forum was not available in the other case studies. An additional interview was undertaken with the LEA PE Advisor for St Helens who had previously taught in a local secondary school.

Group interviews with young people focused on their perceptions of external opportunities for sport in its broadest sense. This included both formal and informal sport, but particular attention was paid to their experience of formal sport, including clubs. Their views on their school PE experiences and environments were also explored. These interviews were less structured and formalised than in focus groups or Nominal Group Technique methods (Bryman, 2001), partly due to the problems of gaining co-operation from schools and of identifying sufficiently informed and interested young people. However, using of more typical young people, who might or might not have an interest in sport, was felt to provide an appropriate contrast to those selected who enjoyed CC, and so they acted as a form of control group. They were all children of a similar age to the survey cohorts, who had lived in similar areas, and had been exposed to similar school and other environmental influences. Group interviews with children also provided the opportunity to explore some of the issues identified by CC participants. Their main purpose was to explore the real world experiences of young people in these areas, compared to the CC participants.
The interview process has many potential areas of bias; therefore, a standard approach to conducting interviews was adopted. All face-to-face interviews, subject to the permission of the interviewee, were tape recorded, then transcribed for later analysis. Only one teacher declined to be taped, and no coaches. However, it was impractical to tape three teacher interviews as they had to be conducted during lessons, at one side of the class, or while moving between classes. One recording of a coach interview and one of the school groups was faulty, which prevented full verbatim transcription. When taping was not possible, full notes were taken during the interview and observations and memos were noted immediately afterward. Notes were also important in the group interviews, which were sometimes rather hectic at times and difficult to hear and fully transcribe. These group interviews lasted from 15 to 30 minutes, with four or six different groups in some schools, but a minimum of one group (of 12) in all schools. Some of the groups were less co-operative or productive, despite the efforts of the researcher to engage them in a dialogue. As time for visits was limited by the school timetable, it was not always easy to build as much rapport with young people as desirable in such a short time.

Interviews with SDOs and coaches were longer and tended to be more conversational in nature. These lasted from 25 to 60 minutes, conducted in the offices of staff, coaches' homes, places of study or work, a 'neutral venue', or the office of the researcher, dependant on individual preferences. The respondents were often very co-operative, and efforts were made to keep the meeting as relaxed as possible.

When interviews had been transcribed, subsequent content analysis was first through a manual, then later computer-aided coding process, to draw out the categories and themes, through identifying topics, either through key words, explicit terms or reasons or situations described, or implied through the expressed responses. Tapes were reviewed and notes supplemented this process. These notes and memos were added during the transcription phase and/or during the interviews, immediately after completion, or during later examination of the tapes. QSR NUD*IST (v4)(developed by Richards, in Bryman and Burgess, 1994) was
identified as appropriate software available to the researcher for the analysis and
development of concepts for a thematic analysis. However, despite the
advantages of such tools for textual analysis of documents, and other sources, this
was only partly successful in adding to the initial manual categorisation, partly
due to limited time for mastering the software and the duplication involved in
transferring manual coding to project files.

There were also practical issues related to this approach, including the need to
transcribe and input all the relevant coding information. However, the use of such
programmes has been found to be beneficial in similar projects, particularly when
completing a range of interviews with different groups at different locations
(Bryman, 2001; Gahan and Hannibal, 1998; Waring et al, 1996). The benefits of
systematic analysis were initially felt to outweigh these difficulties, though in
practice, a manual analysis of the interviews and transcripts was conducted, due to
the relatively small number of interviews and their semi-structured nature. Both
manual and computerised approaches required extensive interaction with the data,
informed by reference to theory previously reviewed and seeking out more
theoretical material to support analysis.

Other data collection and analysis

Documentary evidence, reports, archives and other secondary data was collected
in each case study organisation and from the NCF or other relevant bodies like
Sport England, or the Sports Council for Wales. Where relevant, they were also
subject to content analysis, for reference to the relevant concepts, such as
performance pathways.

Geographical analysis of the participants and outcomes achieved relied on reports
from local authorities on the socio-economic characteristics and local sports
provision, and was complemented by data from the Office of National Statistics
(ONS), for example, Census reports and ward summaries and Audit Commission
reports for Best Value reviews. The DETR index of local deprivation was used to
develop a picture of the social and economic conditions and analysis used the data
released by DETR, based on 1998 population estimates (DETR, 2000). Each
ward had a score and a national rank for deprivation. Different methods and separate rankings were available for Wales, but wards used for these ranks in 2000 were changed for the 2001 census, making the analysis of populations and deprivation more difficult for Flintshire. The data for wards in the 2001 Census was only made available in 2003.

The MIMAS service (Manchester University) provided mappable census information for each case study area, obtained via CASWEB (Manchester) and UK Borders (Edinburgh University). Digital data was then mapped using the Arcview software programme (Ormsby et al, 2002). A pilot mapping of the St Helens survey respondents showed the potential of this approach, when the relative take up of the CC across the local area was mapped with the DETR ward deprivation ranking (Map is Appendix 7, ©St Helens Education Statistical support). The PC2ED software from University of Manchester Census dissemination services, converted the postcode information for participants, using the All Fields Postcode Directory, firstly to Enumeration District (ED) then Wards. In a geographical analysis, the locations of nominating schools and the wards they served enabled better understanding of the environmental influences on young people’s participation and opportunity.

A qualitative approach incorporated public transport and other factors thought to influence take up from certain wards. An important source of this information was the local authority, but websites and ONS data was also used. This secondary data collection involved travel and interviews with officers in relevant authorities or organisations. The geographical analysis was based on all available registration addresses, and was therefore not subject to the bias associated with a sample of respondents. Ward-level distribution of CC participants was compared to the proportion of all the Under 16s in each ward as a participation ratio. This demonstrated how far CC participation reflected the local populations of children in each ward. An initial analysis completed using 1998 census estimates was repeated when the 2001 Census data was released in 2003.

Though a direct comparison with Collins and Buller was not possible due to the classification of need used by Nottinghamshire County Council, the analysis
showing the relative penetration of the programme in the potential population was augmented by interviews and visits to schools.

Sports strategies, local development priorities and notes of decisions regarding the selection of sports and venues were also important to develop an understanding of the local contexts of the Schemes. As noted by Yin (1994), however, the value of such documents was not solely based on their accuracy or lack of bias. They were important for corroborating and augmenting other evidence. They were also used to highlight variations, or identify potential questions to explore with interviewees and aided subsequent analysis. They were an important part of the convergence of evidence within case studies.

*Validity and reliability: Implications of methods in the study*

Arguably, the concerns of validity and reliability appertain particularly to the empirical techniques used in the case studies. However, as pointed out by Berg (2001:7) "qualitative methods can (and should) be extremely systematic and have the ability to be reproduced by subsequent researchers." In his analysis of methods for surveys De Vaus (1991) referred to various aspects of validity. These are mainly the concern of the empirical methods and reflect what may be considered positivistic assumptions about evidence in case studies. From a critical or scientific realist perspective, these are almost irrelevant, as each method has within it concerns of validity and reliability of methods and measures.

Criterion Validity is how far the criteria used matched existing, accepted measures. In this study, criterion validity was based on using measures already tested for participants and their parents, for example, those used by Collins and Buller (2000). The measure of performance orientation used here, club membership, was based on the literature reviewed in earlier chapters, strengthened by its’ selection as an outcome measure for school sport by current Government policy (DCMS, 2003). Further criterion validity was based on the national surveys of sport participation of young people (Mason, 1995a; MORI/Sport England, 2000, 2002). However, there is no clear and valid set of criteria accepted for all youth sports participation for the effectiveness of performance pathways. Multiple sources of data, for example club memberships and details of clubs available for a sport in an area, can improve criterion validity. The level of
club membership may not be a problem for example, if other performance pathways can be identified as more appropriate for a given target group. However, no local comparisons were available, only national averages.

Content validity, on the other hand, is how far the indicators measure the different aspects of the concepts under examination, which clearly depend on the nominal definitions used. This is one of the difficulties of positivist approaches that critical realism attempts to address – the potential influence of the researcher in determining what is an appropriate measure. For example, progression from Champion Coaching can be measured by responses to indicate which exit routes were used, but is this an appropriate measure of the performance pathway? The assumed content validity was based on consultations with YSMs’ definitions of progression and that of the NCF Scheme manager (Senior SDO, St Helens, personal communication, October 1998; NCF Scheme Manager, personal communication, April 2000). This is how Pawson and Tilley suggest such measures are developed, but it is also difficult to establish cause and effect with a measure of exit routes only.

Construct validity is how well the measure conforms to expected findings or hypotheses. Questionnaires were adapted from those already extensively tested in Nottinghamshire (Buller, 1998; Collins and Buller, 2000) to improve construct validity. Other methods of data collection i.e., interviews, documentary information and the responses of key informants complemented this, as Yin (1994) advised. Yin also referred to internal and external validity. Internal validity was improved by pattern matching and explanation building taking place within the data analysis phase from each case. Replication within and between multiple case studies improved external validity.

The findings and methods within this study can also be compared to other studies using the evaluation of the impacts of sport or other similar policy programmes. Studies using longitudinal approaches, for example, Vanreusel et al (1997), or large-scale interview-based studies, e.g., Kremer et al (1997) looked at progression and performance orientation. However, they were much larger and
better resourced. The most valid comparisons would appear to be with the studies completed on Champion Coaching by Kohn (1998), Gray (1998) and Buller (1998) in Kent and Nottinghamshire respectively, reported by Collins and Buller (2000). However, these did not deal with coaches or coach development to the same extent.

In order to develop reliability in the cases, protocols for data collection were consistent, as were the use of databases or spreadsheets for the empirical and quantitative data generated within the cases. As far as possible, objective and clearly defined concepts and measures were used in questionnaires and interview schedules. Reliability was improved by using proven good practice relating to the conduct of surveys in social research, as outlined by De Vaus (1991), Bouma and Atkinson (1995) and Veal (1997). This included providing a covering letter, reply paid envelope and careful attention to the questionnaire design as outlined above.

A potential source of reliability problems was the passage of time between completing the Champion Coaching course and the questionnaires or interviews, due to a loss of accuracy in recall, but this was unavoidable given the nature of the study. Again, triangulation between different data sources was an attempt to improve and provide a check on reliability. Regularity in the outcomes of mechanisms across the cases helps demonstrate whether measures and approaches are relatively stable, despite the passage of time.

Interviews were recorded, transcribed and analysed with a manual system described above, for coding and analysis, as outlined by Radnor (1994) and Potter (1994). This involved systematic coding and ordering responses into categories. The main problem with software for such data analysis was the length of time needed to establish expertise with the programme (Barry, 1998). With a relatively small number of interviews, and a single researcher, there was consistency in interpretations and coding between interviews. There was some cross-checking of interview transcripts, which ensured that themes were applied consistently to interview data.
Sound methodological principles to reduce bias, improve validity and reliability applied as far as possible to all the techniques and data collection methods used in the cases. However, resource issues and more pragmatic concerns, for example, access to addresses, timing of questionnaire surveys or the format of questionnaires had to be balanced against an ideal methodology. As noted by Pawson and Tilley, these problems are entirely consistent with a realistic evaluation, which adopts the most appropriate methods to the circumstances and the type of theory being investigated. Subjects and what is asked of them are based on their relative position to contribute to understanding the context, the mechanisms or the outcomes concerned. Furthermore, some limits on implementing a chosen method was beyond the control of the researcher, for example, the loss of data by organisations.

**Responses, bias and limitations to the study**

Described by Rossi *et al* (1999: 254) as a “delivery system contaminant”, the ‘Hawthorne effect’ is the name given to changes brought about due to the attention given to the group under study. Named after the famous studies by Mayo, in the 1930’s investigating changes in working conditions on productivity in factories, this has been the subject of much debate in any social science study attempting to replicate a scientific approach (Roethlingsberger and Dickson, 1939, cited in Rossi *et al*, 1999). This is noted here as an issue of methodological concern. The effect must be considered when evaluating sporting schemes due to the nature of the selection process they involved. Children selected for Champion Coaching courses by their teachers, may have gone on to performance-oriented opportunities simply because they felt that some interest was been shown in their progress and development, rather than any impact due to the CC ‘mechanism’. This implies that simply by being selected, their perception of their own potential had been altered and their continuing participation in sport was much more likely. It was not clear how far a ‘Hawthorne effect’ was found with participants in CC, and this may be an unavoidable contaminant in sport programmes based on selection or referral. This makes the achievement of experimental: control designs favoured by Coalter (2003) almost impossible and certainly ethically doubtful. The randomised control design, favoured in medical research has its limitations.
where complex social programmes are concerned (Okoumunne et al, 1999). This is a further reason to use a critical realist stance, as this focuses attention on the causes of outcomes, and how mechanisms worked to achieve them.

Some attempt to balance a potential ‘Hawthorne effect’ was made by examining the experience of contemporary groups of young people who had not experienced CC, though from comparable cohorts. This was part of a triangulation of evidence from key informants, including some participants’ views. As findings from these programmes can be accumulated with others, the reliability of conclusions based on the mix of intensive and extensive methods used can help contribute to what Pawson (2002) termed a ‘realist synthesis’ for sport development.

As with most studies of this nature, the methods and approaches were designed to minimise, but could not entirely eradicate, bias. Inherent in the acceptance of the epistemology of ‘realism’ is the acceptance of multiple realities and a degree of reflexivity in researcher – subject relationships.

Thus there is an inevitable bias built into the study design, through selecting cases, concepts and mechanisms to be investigated and in the techniques chosen to do so. The selection of samples for questionnaires and interviews may also have influenced the eventual findings. Particular techniques are themselves quite subject to bias, for example interviews and their analysis. Interviewer bias may be introduced through the manner in which the interview is conducted and the format, content, or language of the questions, the coding and analysis of responses. Pawson and Tilley (1997) warned against the imposition of the evaluator’s preconceived ideas on the interview subjects, and within a ‘realist’ framework, the need to clarify meanings with subjects was attempted by the interviewer in this study.

Non-response was anticipated as a particular area of concern for potential bias in the surveys (De Vaus, 1991:73-74). However, postcode information and other data from the course registers complemented the responses achieved and illustrated the representativeness of the sample of the populations of participants.
However, by recognising the potential sources of bias and anticipating the impacts they could have on the results, the discussion and analysis of the case studies that follows illustrates how these were dealt with. The ability to draw meaningful conclusions from the data depended upon using clear and unambiguous questions, gathering data from a range of valid and appropriate sources, and by being informed by ongoing reference to the relevant literature and appropriate theories.

For example, as noted above, the potential of survey respondents to represent a particular bias needs to be recognised. Did these young people follow certain routes because they were selected for CC or because of what happened to them on the programme, or for some other reason, unrelated to their CC experience? The results chapters attempt to unravel the impacts in each case to arrive at overall conclusions for the Scheme.

The more positive their experiences, the more likely we might expect young people to respond to a survey. Those without full registration details could not be included in the sampling framework. Response rates may have been depressed due to natural movements in or out of areas, a lack of interest in sport or in the research. Inherent in CC was the selection of sports by the Local Authorities, which influenced the female: male balance and provided different contexts of sporting capital and infrastructures. However, these limitations are acknowledged and discussed in the chapters that follow. The strength of conclusions are enhanced by the use of multiple sources and the recognition that a balance needs to be struck between empirical and qualitative methods, which can offer a depth of meaning and explanations beyond ‘mere statistics’.

**Concluding remarks**

To identify and examine the long-term outcomes of Champion Coaching, a case study approach was selected as the most appropriate, given the limits to resources and the time frame available for the study. This is consistent with a critical realist perspective of research, which has an interpretive, subjective/interactive epistemology and an ontology that recognises that reality exists independent of our knowledge of it. Thus such an approach can strengthen the case for evidence
in what works in public policy, when investigating complex social phenomenon, where not all of the mechanisms can be directly observed.

Within the identified Champion Coaching case studies a variety of techniques were used, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative approaches and data. Participant and parent postal surveys were complemented by interviews, documentary and secondary data analysis to build up an evaluation of each CC programme into a Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configuration (Pawson and Tilley, 1997). This then enabled a cross-case analysis of the Champion Coaching Scheme in the North West/North Wales, from which a matrix of CMOs achieved by these cases was developed. The evaluation should therefore contribute to understanding both the processes and outcomes of sports development interventions and enable improvements to be identified in developing and evaluating successor and future schemes.
Chapter Six  Participants and Pathways: Champion Coaching’s impacts on performers, and the pathways experienced by young participants from school to clubs

6.0 Introduction

This chapter sets out the results of the participant and parent surveys, school-based and other interviews, and analysis of secondary data, concentrating on the outcomes achieved for participants and the sports participation pathways developed in each area. The area vignettes in Chapter Five provided the context to the results. The key themes are the enjoyment and accessibility of the courses, as indicated by children and parents, exit routes and the experiences of clubs, the sporting profiles of participants, and the views of parents on the quality and organisation of courses. Geographical analysis of postcode registrations and ward level multiple deprivation is presented to examine the relative success of these schemes in attracting children from different parts of the authorities, an indicator of the ‘width’ of pathways. The relationships between the mechanisms and processes involved are examined and the links to previous literature highlighted. The next sections give the perspectives from the different stakeholders (teachers and pupils, LEA and SDOs) on the impacts CC had on opportunities for children in each case study.

As the size, scope, choice of sports, organisational process and some aspects of data collection differed in each case, attempts at direct comparisons are more difficult and less convincing for a positivist analysis, with smaller samples, subject to greater sampling errors. However, within a critical realist analysis, the outcomes achieved are related to the contexts, processes and mechanisms of each configuration, by examining the regularity and patterns emerging from both quantitative and qualitative data. Conclusions on pathways and participation are provided, and further developed after Chapter Seven on coaches and coaching development.

One of the key differences is the varying choices and numbers of sports courses offered to different age groups. The reasons for these choices were examined in the interviews with the relevant Sports Development officers, noted below.
However they reflect the notion, identified earlier, of a ‘recipe’ approach to Champion Coaching, where the Local Authorities were expected to develop sports according to local priorities and circumstances, based on an audit of needs (NCF, 1992). Sport Programmes in Table 6.1 represent 10-week sport courses, the figures for which are taken from available reports from Sports Development Units to the NCF, for incomplete reports there are some estimates.

### Table 6.1: Champion Coaching Scheme in selected case studies – 1996-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St Helens</th>
<th>Knowsley</th>
<th>Flintshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls football, Hockey, Netball, Cricket, Basketball, Girls Rugby</td>
<td>Girls Football, Netball, Hockey, Cricket, Water Polo, Badminton, Basketball</td>
<td>Athletics, Hockey, Netball, Rugby Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Programmes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Approx 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrations*</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures based on reports from Sports Development Units (incomplete data)*

As only hockey and netball were available in all three areas, conclusions across the schemes were limited. The characteristics and circumstances for the development of each sport, were different, particularly in terms of the exit routes, including to clubs. Furthermore, only netball had reasonable numbers for analysis in all cases, due the samples provided by the SDUs.

### 6.1 Results From Participant and Parent Surveys

As Table 6.2 shows, each sample comprised a unique combination of gender, age and sports. In each group, some 6% of respondents had taken part in more than one sport course. In St Helens, duplicate registrations represented almost 30% of all registrations supplied, across the three years of the programme.
Table 6.2: Sample Characteristics in each Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>St Helens N= 78</th>
<th>Knowsley N= 54</th>
<th>Flintshire N= 42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys (%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (%)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (years):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At survey</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the courses</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Played by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respondents (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approx 6% played more than one sport

Enjoyment and Accessibility

The results show that overwhelmingly, the children felt the venues were easy to get to, perhaps not surprisingly: Collins and Buller (2000) found the likelihood of going to the courses was small if they were not accessible. Of more interest was whether the children were aware of any particular problems in getting to the venue. However, as Table 6.3 shows, few children noted any problems, and they showed a distribution across the boroughs, which meant that these were problems concerning home:venue relations, rather than the location per se.

Table 6.3: Was the venue easy to get to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>% Indicating yes</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each area, several children noted they needed a car to participate, particularly in Flintshire. In St Helens, small numbers indicated the venue was difficult to find, or off bus routes. Participants in the sport programmes clearly felt they had enjoyed their courses and had benefited from them, as shown in Figure 6.1, reinforced by positive comments in questionnaires, shown in Appendix 8.
In St Helens, 90% of participants said they had enjoyed the courses. Similar figures were experienced by the other schemes (94% in Knowsley and 98% in Flintshire). This response was consistent by gender, sport or time elapsed since the course, which could have been from one to six years. Those who did not enjoy their course were too few for statistical tests. Similar results were achieved when children were asked if they felt they had benefited from the course (Table 6.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme (%)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Flintshire, where 10% were uncertain that they had benefited, it is important to appreciate against the fact that time elapsed from participation was up to six or seven years, though results were similar to St Helens. When groups were asked to identify what they had enjoyed about the course, a similar pattern emerged in all three cases (Figure 6.2). Key to these respondents' enjoyment was the development of skill and improvement of their performance in the sport. This is consistent with what sports psychologists (Zahariadis and Biddle, 2001; Wang and Biddle, 2001) might suggest as being 'task orientation'. Again, this did not appear
to relate to gender, sport, or length of time since the course: in the St Helens group, 78% of girls and 74% of boys had said they had enjoyed learning a new skill and 91% of boys and 82% of girls had enjoyed improving their performance. Chi square tests indicated no statistical difference between girls and boys.

![Bar chart showing reasons identified for enjoyment of the CC course](image)

**Figure 6.2: What respondents enjoyed about the CC course**

The courses therefore appeared to be achieving a satisfactory blend of skill development and enjoyment as set out by the NCF guidelines and the sports development objectives for each sport. It could be concluded that children had received good quality coaching, by the criteria of improving both standards and enjoyment for participants, as also indicated by the unsolicited comments. Only one or two per scheme indicated a reason for not enjoying the course; some noted that the coach had favourites, they got bored, or had some problem with other participants. Much more typical was this response:

“Very useful coaching course for individuals who want to improve their skills whilst making new friends and enjoying participation in sport – Excellent!” (Boy, aged 17, St Helens Basketball course).

**Exit routes and club experiences**

Children in each case study experienced a range of exit routes after completing their Champion Coaching courses, because of the different contexts and potential routes in each Local Authority, these profiles are shown separately in Figure 6.3.
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The exit routes enjoyed by participants in all three schemes were very similar, though in Flintshire the Youth Games option was not relevant (despite being selected by a few respondents). 47% of participants in Flintshire joined a local club and another 3% joined a new junior club, similar rates to those in St Helens. This meant that the majority of young people engaged in organised sport after taking part in CC. In Knowsley 36% went immediately into a local club, though four in five said they carried on playing the sport for fun, and 22% joined the Youth Games squad.

This is therefore a reflection on the diversity of local options available. For example, a greater proportion of the Flintshire group went on to join the county squad (26% compared with 15% and 11% in St Helens and Knowsley), as this was the next stage for development in their area. On Merseyside, the Youth Games was a stepping-stone to County selection for youngsters not already involved with the sport. The 42% going on to Youth Games squads in St Helens is evidence that this pathway was better established in these sports than in Knowsley. Across all three schemes, the numbers joining clubs was very positive, though this was not the only indicator of ongoing participation, as 68% to 80% indicted they continued to play the sport for fun. From 65% to 90% carried on playing the sport for their school (outside lessons) that indicated at least they were motivated and able to continue playing in an organised setting.

For those who went on to join a club, the experiences were similarly positive in each case study, though the factor ‘lower fees and charges’ had lower responses than others (Table 6.5) perhaps because young people had difficulty in defining what ‘low fees and charges’ meant. In Knowsley 78% indicated their clubs had organised matches and friendly coaches, only slightly fewer than the other two schemes, but only 30% indicated their club had a junior section, compared to 50% in St Helens and 75 % in Flintshire. However this may be due to the higher ages of the Flintshire respondents, (mean age 17.4 years) and that they were in adult clubs. The younger groups may be in junior clubs, so the distinction in the question may have been ambiguous to them.
The results show that experiences of the participants’ initial contact with clubs was generally positive, and consistent with what de Knop et al (1994) called ‘youth friendly’. But smaller proportions found about their club through Champion Coaching course than from teachers or friends. This is somewhat of a concern, when the objectives of the courses included encouragement to join local clubs, but is consistent with what Collins and Buller (2000) found in Nottinghamshire (Table 6.6). Table 6.6 also points to the relatively poor promotion of clubs through advertising flyers or leaflets. Open comments about joining a club varied across the groups: in St Helens, it was said that there were no clubs or none for the relevant age group (3 people) and in Knowsley, the lack of clubs was again commented on. However, in Flintshire only one such comment

![Exit Routes](image)

Figure 6.3: Exit routes of Champion Coaching respondents

Table 6.5: Comparison of club characteristics in the schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>St Helens</th>
<th>Knowsley</th>
<th>Flintshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have organised matches competitions</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome you into the club</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have low fees</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have friendly coaches and leaders</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a junior section</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n=26</th>
<th>n=27</th>
<th>n=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Shows percentage of respondents indicating ‘yes’
was made, but several were positive, about how important it was to join a club for competition, improving fitness and standards.

Table 6.6: How Children found out about the club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St Helens</th>
<th>Knowsley</th>
<th>Flintshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion Coaching Course</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=55</td>
<td>n=34</td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all figures are percentages

Teachers were more important than other sources in Knowsley. Champion Coaching had less impact on participants knowledge of clubs than might have been expected. Despite parents having been identified in Finland as influential on club membership (Seppanen, 1992), in these groups, they were clearly less influential. This perhaps indicates that joining a club, was not typical or traditional, particularly in these sports. The findings however, are consistent with what Hendry et al (1993) suggested, that peers become more influential to leisure choices through adolescence.

Current club membership and sporting status

In each case a large proportion of young people were still members of clubs when they responded to the survey, as indicated in Table 6.7. Given that the time elapsed in each group was different, this is an important measure of sustained sports involvement in a performance or committed context. Also, given the participants were predominantly female, this is higher than might be expected compared to the national average for girls or both sexes (Sport England/MORI, 2003). Table 6.7 shows this initial comparison of club membership, ages and time since the course was completed. The results show that in this group of selected participants, club membership was sustained after the course. As 41% currently belonged to a club in the Flintshire case, this may again be due to their older age profile, and therefore more likely to have left school, and so the English national survey is not directly comparable.
Table 6.7: Current membership of a club

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St Helens</th>
<th>Knowsley</th>
<th>Flintshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age at survey (years)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean time since course (years)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with GHS data for 1996 (Sport England, 1999; Sports Council for Wales, 2001), which indicated that only 17% of 16-19 year olds were sport club members, in this selected group at least, a higher rate of club membership was seen up to six years after the CC course.

Table 6.8: Club Membership by Gender of participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme (%)</th>
<th>Girls club member</th>
<th>Boys club member</th>
<th>club overall membership</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey**</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pearson Chi-Sq .291signif at 0.05
**National average for all age's boys and girls under 16, 1999 (Sport England/MORI, 2000).

As shown by Table 6.8, the issue of gender and club membership was statistically tested using Chi-square. This compared the percentages across cases with the results of the Sport England Survey in 2000. In Knowsley, but not in St Helens or Flintshire this was found to be statistically significant. A Pearson Chi Square value of .291 was significant at the 95% level. The crosstabulation of gender to joining a club after the course, shown in Table 6.9, also indicated Knowsley had statistically significant gender difference in this exit route, with a Chi square value of 5.902.

Table 6.9: Joined club after course and gender - Knowsley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joined Club (frequency)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi square: 5.902. D.f. 1, Sig (one sided) .017, significant at 0.05 level

Despite almost half of the girls joining a club (47%), boys were more likely to join one after their course in Knowsley and more likely to be a club member when
surveyed, some years later. The issue of gender differences is examined further in the views of teachers and pupils in section 6.3, to see how girls perceive their opportunities.

*Current participation in sport*

Another key question was whether participants *currently* (at the time of survey) took part in sport on a regular basis (defined as more than once a month). The figure show that this group is on the whole at least as active as national surveys have indicated, and in some groups more so.

**Table 6.10: Regular current sport participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the lapse of time and age of the Flintshire group, their result is not surprising but they remained active for their age group compared with the relevant national comparisons (SCfW, 2001). There was no significant gender difference in any of the groups.

*Sporting Profiles*

This section considers the profile of the participants in terms of their sporting involvement in school, the range of sports experienced in the curriculum and their choices of sport outside school. Through comparing sports for each gender in each case study, a better picture emerges of how their experiences in and out of school help explain the club membership and sustained involvement outside school. As Roberts and Brodie (1992) pointed out, the range of sports played in adolescence is likely to be a good indicator of whether or not participation would continue into adulthood. For girls in particular, as noted by Koivula (1999) Brennan and Bleakley (1997) and others, the adolescent stage is particularly important for girls in overcoming traditional stereotypes that often portray girls as not interested in sport. The mean number of sports experienced in the PE lessons at school, was 7.8 for St Helens, 8.07 for Knowsley and 9.71 for Flintshire. There were however, differences in the numbers of sports played according to gender as shown in the box plots, Figures 6.4 to 6.6.
Figure 6.4: Sports played in Lessons, St Helens

Figure 6.5: Sports Played in Lessons, Knowsley
These show the median (50th percentile score) as the line, and the box indicates the upper and lower quartile score for each group as well as the range (highest and lowest values) as lines (whiskers). These box plots show even when girls experienced a wide range of sports in their PE lessons the range was wider for boys, even if the averages were similar. Outlier scores are shown as cases that fall outside these boxes.

The range seen in Knowsley in Figure 6.5, is narrower for boys and girls, though girls had a higher median score. This implied that girls had more diverse PE experiences than their male peers. In the St Helens group, the girls had a greater range, but the median was slightly less than boys, and there was more consistency in the boy’s scores. In all areas, the children had experienced a fairly wide range of sports in their PE lessons and the sports played were similar in the different schemes, as shown in Tables 6.11 to 6.13.

In contrast, the sports played outside school on a regular basis (and therefore assumed to be the result of both the interest and opportunity to play), were fewer in number, as shown in Table 6.10. They varied in the three areas, and included several which were clearly not experienced in the PE curriculum, for example, golf, horse-riding and martial arts. The mean number of sports played regularly was 5.5 in Flintshire, 4.1 in St Helens and 4.0 in Knowsley. There were only
slight differences in the means for boys and girls and across case studies, but girls in Knowsley played fewer sports (mean of 3.6) compared to girls in Flintshire (mean of 5.6 sport) and St Helens (mean of 4).

Tables 6.11 – 6.13 show the top five sports in each group played regularly, in and out of school. Interesting points to highlight here are the percentages of children playing non-curricular sports outside school, such as golf, snooker, horse riding. The municipal provision of activities like golf in Knowsley and Flintshire could have contributed to the high proportion of boys (32% and 30% respectively) experiencing such sports, traditionally associated with private clubs, but despite similar municipal provision this was enjoyed by only 4% of boys in St Helens.

Table 6.11: Sports played on a regular basis outside of lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 sports in each case study group</th>
<th>Boys(%)</th>
<th>Girls (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Helens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Netball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snooker</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rounders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>N= 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowsley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Netball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Rounders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snooker</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flintshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Netball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Dance/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Rounders/Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are rounded and based on respondents

Table 6.11 shows that in each area, preferences for sports played have some variations and similarities. Football was less popular in this group of boys in St Helens, which may reflect the range of sports played by the boys on CC. Hockey, netball and rounders appear in the top five for all three areas for girls; football and
basketball in each area for the boys. These preferences could also be influenced by the availability of local facilities, for example, golf, athletics, or swimming.

As girls football was included in both Merseyside cases and not in Flintshire, the differences in preferences by girls may be a result of the influence of their involvement with CC and MYG in this sport, which does not feature at all in the Flintshire girls list of favourites.

Table 6.12: Favourite sports for boys and girls in each group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Favourite Sports in each group</th>
<th>Boys %</th>
<th>Girls %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Helens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Netball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rugby League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>golf/RL/hockey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Skiing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowsley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Netball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Swim/Basket/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flintshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Netball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all others &lt;5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are rounded and based on respondents

The small group of Flintshire boys, despite their exposure to different sports in CC, remained fairly constant to the choice of football as their favourite sport. This was a pattern similar to Knowsley, but St Helens had quite a different profile, with more diverse favourites. In all groups of girls, the favourite sport was netball. But though netball is played by the overwhelming majority of girls in school, it was selected as the favourite by only 22% of girls in St Helens, compared to 41% in Flintshire and 51% in Knowsley. This confirms the complex nature of allegiances to different sports.
Table 6.13: Sports Played in Lessons by group and gender

Top 5 Sports Played in Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys %</th>
<th>Girls %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>St Helens</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowsley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket/Baseball</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Gym/Swimming 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flintshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*this group had missing values, figures are percents, rounded and based on respondents

The sports on offer to boys and girls in their PE curricula is clearly very different, and in these groups, reflects a traditional split between team sports and games for boys and aesthetic/individual activities predominantly for girls. Football and basketball tend to dominate in boys PE, and netball and badminton for girls.

A series of correlations of the number of sports played in and out of lessons provided inconclusive results. Based on the findings of Roberts and Brodie (1992) the assumption was that the two should be correlated; Table 6.14 shows that in St Helens, the value of Kendall’s tau, a non-parametric correlation, of .188 was significant at the 95% level; likewise, the value of .455 was significant in Flintshire, at the 99% level, but no significant correlation was found in Knowsley.

Thus it is not possible to say conclusively that those who experienced greater numbers of sports in their curriculum went on to play more sports outside. The figures for the sports played outside school may have been influenced by time
elapsed since the course, but no significant correlation was found when the number of sports played outside lessons was correlated with time since the course, or gender of participant.

Table 6.14: Correlation of Sports in and out of lessons in each area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation: Number of Sports in Lessons to number of sports outside</th>
<th>Kendall's Tau b</th>
<th>Significance (2 tailed)</th>
<th>N=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>0.048*</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at 0.05 level  
**significant at 0.01 level

Parents' views on programmes

Parents' views about the programmes were collected via a separate, short questionnaire. The measures for parents were based on factors or criteria assumed to be relevant to their approval and satisfaction, namely those relating to organisation of the course, its accessibility, perceived enjoyment of their child, information they may have been given on their child's progression and contact with the coach. The assumption was that the more positive the view of the parent as indicated on a scale of 1 to 5, the more likely that (s)he would support the child if they were to follow up on the course. As noted by de Knop et al (1995); de Knop and de Martealar (2001) and Buckley et al (1996) the involvement and perceptions of quality by parents are important factors in youth involvement with organised sport, particularly where this involves regular material support in the form of transport or equipment. The Cronbach's alpha score, a measure of variance in the scores of the different items, of the responses for the St Helens parents on all the organisational factors was .76, as 0.70 indicated a reliable scale (Bryman and Cramer, 1999; Ntoumanis, 1999) this was considered reliable.

Parental ratings by sport are shown in Figures 6.7 to 6.9 with parental rating by factor in Figure 6.10. Scales on these charts are slightly different due to the different sizes of groups.
The best rated sport in St Helens was girls football with over 60% of the ratings as excellent. Hockey was rated as excellent in over 40% of the parents’ responses but also received the highest proportion of poor or below average ratings. In Knowsley, the most positively rated sport was cricket, where very few parents rated it as below average. In Flintshire, the proportions of excellent and good responses were lower than for Knowsley or St Helens. Hockey was rated highest in these factors by parents, followed by netball.

The analysis of parental responses demonstrates that the area of least satisfaction was the same in all three schemes, that is the information about progression opportunities and contact with the coaches. This is similar to the findings of Collins and Buller (2000) in Nottinghamshire. Most highly rated by parents was the enjoyment of their child and accessibility of the venues. However, the courses were favourably rated overall by parents (Figure 6.10).

Relationships of age, gender and background with parents’ views, club membership, and choice of sport were tested and also parent rating with current sports participation and club membership, but no statistically significant relationships were found. So, parental approval of the courses did not appear to influence whether a child joined a club; even if parents gave a low score, children still went on to join a club or were members when surveyed.
Figure 6.7: Parental responses by sport – St Helens

Figure 6.8: Parental Responses by sport – Knowsley

Figure 6.9: Parental Responses by sport – Flintshire
Figure 6.10: Parental Rating of Factors in each case study
6.2 Geographical analysis of participation

As described in Chapter Five, each registration for which a postal address and postcode was available was eventually converted to enumeration district and ward using the PC2ED and the AFPD services of the Census Registration service (available from MIMAS). Then, the share of registrations in each ward from the total was plotted against the ward score for the Index of Multiple Deprivation (DETR, 2000). This was also tabulated against the populations of under 16’s in the 2001 Census (ONS, 2003).

All St Helens wards provided at least two participants over the three years. Figure 6.11 shows that the least deprived ward in the Borough, Rainford, had one of the largest groups of participants. The highest percentage came from an area of relatively low deprivation, Rainhill. The lowest percentage of participants came from the most deprived wards, Parr and Hardshaw, and Marshalls Cross. These are identified by Sport England as Priority Areas for Lottery funding, as are Broad Oak and West Sutton (see Appendix 10).

This pattern however, was not repeated when a similar analysis was completed in Knowsley, where the more deprived wards still had sizeable groups of participants. (Low numbers of full postal details meant a similar analysis in Flintshire was less useful, as there were more wards with no participants and smaller numbers of participants) In the Knowsley analysis, the least deprived ward had a very low percentage of participants, and one of the most deprived, Kirkby Central, had one of the highest. Once again, all wards provided some participants. In order to see if the participation reflected the population in the area of children aged from 5 to under 16, a further analysis was undertaken, relating IOMD scores to the ratio of participants under 16. The age breakdown from the 2001 Census was used to build an analysis from ONS. Due to boundary changes, 2001 wards from the Census did match IOMD scores (results for Flintshire are in Appendix 9 in tabular form and graphs). IOMD scores for England and Wales are also not directly comparable.
Figure 6.11: Percentage Participants and Index of Ward Score in St Helens
Figure 6.12: Percentage Participants and Index of Ward Score - Knowsley
Using this data a participation ratio was derived, and compared to IOMD score in Knowsley and St Helens. For a population of 900 aged from 5 to under 16 in the ward, with one participant on the scheme, the ratio would be 900. The ratios for each ward were then plotted against the IOMD score. If the concerns about equity of Collins and Buller (2000) were repeated in Knowsley, there would be few, if any, CC participants from the most deprived wards, as they were among the most deprived in England, not just Merseyside. However, the ratios from St Helens showed only a moderate correlation between ward score and participant ratio, and for Knowsley almost none, as shown by Figures 6.13 and 6.14. This suggests that the constraints assumed to operate for those living in more deprived parts of Merseyside did not prevent them accessing CC. Appendix 10 gives more details of the tables and ratios achieved in each ward.

An attempt was made to conduct a similar analysis with Flintshire postcodes, but because so few had been recovered from the survey and mailing lists, this was less reliable and due to boundary changes noted earlier, it was not possible to complete a full analysis.

Therefore, the relationship between the level of deprivation in the local area and the likelihood of the target population taking part in Champion Coaching had almost no relationship in Knowsley and only a very moderate one in St Helens. Even allowing for the overall deprivation of the two areas, this is a good, if unintentional result for the Scheme in terms of demonstrating access to local children. Apparently CC was more successful in this respect in Knowsley, as identified in Chapter Five (5.2), it operated slightly differently, in order to target children in more deprived wards.

Knowsley's ratios ranged from 54, to 711 and St Helens from 54 to 719. However, to put this in context, the equal lowest ratio in all wards was achieved in the 18th most deprived ward in England. The situation in the two boroughs was almost exactly reversed: as the highest ratio in St Helens (719) was in the most deprived ward. The measures, however, even one additional participant could make a considerable difference to the ratio and the IOMD score for wards can mask pockets of deprivation within them. Tables for the calculations of these ratios and ward scores can be found in Appendix 10.
Figure 6.13: Index of Multiple Deprivation and CC participation ratio, St Helens

Figure 6.14: Index of Multiple Deprivation and CC participation ratio, Knowsley
A further comparison of scores for the most and least deprived wards showed that in St Helens a smaller percentage of participants came from the five most deprived wards compared with their resident population under 16 (Table 6.14). In Knowsley 21% of participants lived in the 5 most deprived wards (all of which were in the 100 most deprived in the country) compared with almost 21% of the Under 16 population. However, these ratios were more favourable than in the Nottinghamshire study, where the differences were much more stark (Collins and Buller, 2000).

Table 6.15: Percentages of Participants and Populations in Deprived Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants by Scheme</th>
<th>St Helens</th>
<th>Knowsley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% U16 living in most deprived wards</td>
<td>26.49</td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CC participants in most deprived wards</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To illustrate this distribution, digital maps showing wards and participants were produced using GIS software (Arcview). Appendix 7 shows the map of postcodes for the survey of St Helens participants and the ward deprivation, conducted as a pilot in 2002. This map was completed with only 64 complete postcodes from the original survey in 2001. A further analysis with all registration postcodes was needed to check whether this distribution was consistent. The maps from this analysis are shown as Figures 6.15 to 6.17, using UK Borders digital mapping data, for ward boundary data. The maps show participant distribution in wards and the venues used for courses. The map for Knowsley has the ward rank taken from the table in Appendix 10, to illustrate how participants were distributed across wards of relatively high deprivation. The highest 20 wards in Knowsley were recognised by Sport England as Priority Areas for Lottery Funding, as were the top 18 in St Helens. This geographical analysis reinforced the need to consider the ‘real world’ of the children and their parents, when considering the relative take up of sport programmes and was thus part of the discussions with children in schools in the later phases of the research. Additional maps of IOMD score and participant ratio are shown in Appendix 13. As there are problems with wards and populations in Wales, ratio maps as produced for Knowsley and St Helens were not possible in Flintshire.
Figure 6.15: Champion Coaching in St Helens
Figure 6.16: Champion Coaching Participants in Knowsley
Figure 6.17: Champion Coaching Participants in Flintshire
6.3 Results from Schools: referrals and experiences of Champion Coaching

The analysis completed for Figures 6.15 to 6.17 also identified the clustering of participants around schools. Information about the schools which referred children showed that the response varied from no children at all, to over 20% of all referrals in that area. In St Helens, school referral information was identified in their files, but not linked to individual registrations. Flintshire captured no data on school referrals. In Knowsley this data was recorded on registration forms and could therefore be analysed by sport, school year and postcode. Knowsley had fewer schools that referred larger numbers, with the main concentrations in two schools, one in the northern part of the Borough and the other in the south, both near to or used as a venue for some courses. This was reflected in the ward and postcode data of participants. St Helens had a similar concentration of registrations in two schools at opposite ends of the Borough, but they were not used as venues, and many of the courses took place more centrally. Flintshire registrations were clearly concentrated in and around Mold, where many of the venues were located, including a major joint use leisure facility/school campus.

A ‘high referring’ and a ‘low referring’ school in each area was identified, for undertaking additional research into the perceptions, attitudes, curricular and extracurricular experiences of their pupils and teachers. Here details of the schools are kept to a minimum to reduce the potential for identifying individuals or schools. Schools are identified as:

A Knowsley (Low referral) – some deprivation, in the south of the Borough
B Knowsley (High Referral) – deprived ward in the north of the Borough,
C St Helens (Low referral), deprived ward in central St Helens
D St Helens (High referral) one of the least deprived wards, north of the Borough
E St Helens (Moderate referral) high deprivation, south of Borough
F Flintshire (level of referral not known – assumed to be high/moderate, based on discussion with SDO) in centre of county, (Mold)
G Flintshire (assumed as above to be low referral) north east (Flint area)
Schools' involvement with Champion Coaching and teachers' views of opportunities for young people

Not all identified teachers or schools were able to supply much information about their involvement with Champion Coaching, though they were prepared to discuss this and other sports development issues. The focus of meetings with teachers was on the impacts of Champion Coaching in terms of opportunities for after-school sport, the relationships with the local Sports Development Unit, and what teachers thought about local sports opportunities.

CC was something that the teachers were clearly aware of, but given the plethora of subsequent initiatives they had been involved in, their recollections of its particular features were often limited. They had no records of which children that registered on CC and had kept no details of who they had identified as appropriate to take part. A typical response was a male teacher who had completed an undergraduate project on Champion Coaching, making it clear he did not feel the Scheme had had a big impact:

“I've never had anything come to me in this school that said 'Champion Coaching'”

(Teacher, school B).

So, even though forms, letters and posters were circulated to all schools, they had not had a big impact on teachers, even those with some knowledge and awareness of CC. Similar results were found in St Helens, where the involvement of teachers in CC was apparently very limited, once they had informed children of sports courses available via bulletins or notice-boards. This was found in both high and low referring schools. Schools did not monitor the impact of Champion Coaching on individuals as they did not identify which children had taken part; parents had been responsible for getting the children to the courses. For School B, courses were held at the school or in the local leisure centre less than a mile away. But School A (low referring) was a car or bus journey from several venues and the teacher felt that many children would have struggled to get to after-school courses, particularly if they took place in the early evening where parents were expected to chauffeur their children from school and across the borough. Low car ownership was a real issue in Knowsley, and transport was a recurring issue, identified by the Curriculum co-ordinators group, also picked up by teachers in St Helens. In Flintshire teachers highlighted this as a problem for
children who had to use school buses from outlying areas, as staying at school for courses meant missing a bus home.

Though teachers acknowledged perhaps they should have known which children had registered, they viewed the opportunities presented by Champion Coaching as very positive, indicating that children were given coaching opportunities that could not be offered by the school, even when it had a club for that activity. If the sport was not offered in the curriculum (cricket for example) the coaching was more specialised and of a higher standard than could be offered in an extra-curricular club.

A teacher in School A noted the problems faced by schools like his, which could not offer payment to coaches in after-school clubs, compared to schools that could, because of different policies in schools. Therefore, he was in favour of being able to encourage the more interested and able youngsters to take up other appropriate opportunities. There was no evidence of any philosophical objection to Champion Coaching as 'elitist' from the school teachers spoken to or in the curriculum leaders group, despite concerns voiced by Welsh (1992) and Thomas (1993). Flintshire teachers also indicated a keenness to encourage such external links, despite any difficulties this caused them. Teachers clearly perceived encouragement and facilitation of external opportunities to be a part of their role as Physical Educators, even if they varied in how this was translated into practice, as evidenced by the referral rates.

Reasons for low referral or participation were not clear-cut. For example, the low referral from school A, according to a teacher positive about school-club links, could be due to lack of communication or the lack of time to organise a response when CC courses were promoted to schools, and to teachers' perceptions of being distant from central venues. As with other teachers, he did not appear to act as a filter or gatekeeper, as he was keen to point to the volume of information and advice he offered to children. However, his school was very close to the Borough’s boundary with St Helens, and he felt this location contributed to poor consultation for planning activities. The school was in a large council housing estate, and its PE facilities meagre and in need of substantial refurbishment, compared to the brand new community IT facility on the site. Though it was designated as a 'community
recreation centre’ and was open in the evenings and weekends, the impression was of a low priority given to sport by the school, in contrast to the teachers comments and enthusiasm.

With only two full time members of staff, keeping his after school clubs and extra-curricular activities going was a constant struggle. He had attempted to develop new initiatives, for example, piloting the Sports Search programme of Sport England with the GCSE PE group, which involved children measuring their characteristics and matching them to appropriate sports. His was one of very few schools not a Specialist Sport Colleges to do so. He had also been successful in obtaining Lottery funds from Awards for All to develop basketball at the school. Low referral or participation from this school was clearly not due to a lack of staff interest in promoting after-school opportunities.

In contrast, School B, the high referral school in Knowsley, had a very large and successful Physical Education department, with Sportsmark Gold awards in 1997 and 2000 in recognition of their excellence. The teacher interviewed had been the Head of PE for several years and recently appointed as Director of Sport when the school became a Specialist Sports College. This meant a large proportion of her time was now concerned with after-school sport and extra-curricular clubs and external links. She had not been directly responsible for Champion Coaching but had some recollection of the school’s involvement. This however, seemed to be limited as in school A; to giving children information about the courses and leaving the responsibility of following this up to the parents. In terms of CC’s impacts on the relationship with the Sports Development Unit, this teacher was no more convinced than her counterpart in School A, of much impact. Though they were clearly involved in all the current major schemes and initiatives, staff were not part of the early planning process for programmes offered by the Sports Development Unit. Often at quite a late stage they were asked to recruit children, find venues or promote courses. The school also had its own very extensive extra-curricular programme and saw some of the CC courses as potentially ‘competing’ for children. Yet she acknowledged, evidence of exit routes from the school-based activities is something that they had struggled with, despite taking a lead on new initiatives, like Girls in Sport or Junior Athlete Development and Education, being developed by the Youth Sport Trust:
"we’ve been asked to pilot that for the whole Borough, so we’re now in the process of going and finding all our elite sports pupils in all our schools in the borough, to put workshops for them, lifestyle, counselling, …those types of initiatives tend to work particularly well, its some of the exit route measured initiatives we tend to really struggle with”

(Director of Sport, Teacher, school B).

The problem appeared to be maintaining a sustained interest in sport when this relied on external clubs, which had not been impacted on by CC. A positive factor for this school was the development of new facilities on site (a ‘ball hall’ and astroturf pitch), used by various clubs, but to which their pupils had ready access. This was how she envisaged future developments, with the school facilities hosting clubs, rather than simply holding taster events or courses, when children had to negotiate their own way into clubs outside.

Though she had only been in post for two years, the Head of PE in School C (low referral) had been aware of Champion Coaching at her previous post in Liverpool, but had no direct experience of it. Therefore her interview and the visits to this St Helens school focused on the current working arrangements and how the school viewed external links and opportunities for its pupils. In general, she was not very positive about links with external sports development, and indicated that this was due to lack of communication and understanding, and of contact from clubs and other agencies, including the Sports Development Unit. The school had received no visit from any of these bodies during the two years she had been at the school:

“they just send us letters and expect us to all the running…”

Head of PE, school C.

In many ways, she noted, she preferred to accompany pupils herself, as a way of making sure they took part:

“I would rather take them to the club myself… they (the clubs)should come to the school and talk to the kids and show their faces…”

Head of PE, school C

Again, this was to do with making sure the children could overcome any concerns about starting in a new club, which she recognised as being quite difficult if parents or friends were not already involved. This apparent lack of engagement with community recreation or SDU activities was despite the sports hall being designated a ‘community recreation facility’ by the Borough Council, open for activities in the
evenings and weekends. There was a distinct lack of information or publicity about these activities in the foyer or changing rooms of the PE Department, though there was a long list of regulations for hirers and a notice about the Leisure Key Card system for people on benefits. The sports facilities (which included a fitness space on the hall balcony) were in poor repair, and the changing rooms were similarly unappealing. However, despite such shortcomings, the teacher noted an increased number of pupils taking PE for GCSE and improved results. They ran a range of after-school activities for both girls and boys. There were some external links with athletics and rugby league clubs, with some football for the boys (but not the girls). However, she felt local opportunities were not easy for these children to access. Added to this, as she did not live locally, her local knowledge was not strong, so she found advising the children difficult. If information failed to come to her, it was unlikely she could generate it. Though the school was involved in some external events and competitions, the children seemed to rely on the teachers to ‘run them around’, which implied the parents were either unwilling or unable to do so.

She was aware of a drop in interest in traditional games, notably among the older girls, who, she said, wanted a change from their staple diet in the lower years, netball, saying, “oh no, not netball again”. More popular was dance and trampoline (the lesson going on during the visit), which she was keen to offer and encourage through school clubs.

For this school the children seemed to have had little on offer outside school, other than what they and the teacher generated. Though the teacher expressed an interest in getting children to take up outside opportunities, there was little evidence of this being successful, particularly with the girls.

In contrast, the Head of PE at School D in St Helens had positive observations about Champion Coaching and current links with Sport Development. She was also able to observe some differences between her school and others in the Borough, when it came to taking up such opportunities. On the positive side, she felt, Champion Coaching and similar schemes offered something extra to the children, in standards of coaching, better than they might have had at school, if they were not already in a club. However, she felt that some courses ran at inconvenient times (early evening) for
working parents to get their children to the venues on time. As a teacher with her own extensive after-school provision to manage, she had to rely on parents to transport the small numbers of children booked on courses like Champion Coaching, because she had enough problems with transport for her own events. This teacher was very positive about the opportunity Champion Coaching represented and had no problems in recommending and encouraging children to take such opportunities. This helped to explain why the referral rate was high for this school, even though the children may have had some distances to travel to get to the venues for their sports.

She thought the more recent work with Sports Development was more effective as it linked better with what the school was doing and she could co-ordinate it with school clubs and practices for teams. This she put down to better communication between the Sports Development Unit and teaching staff. She felt hers was a ‘middle-class’ school, with plenty of parents willing and able to support their children’s involvement in sport. She particularly wished her views noted on the factors she felt impacted on whether children got involved with Champion Coaching: parental support, transport and timing of courses. Also important was the communication of information to children and parents, and the children’s own motivations. She thought that most children in her school were well motivated to take part and the sports offered interested them. Much of their success in referral was due to the children’s initiative, since staff concentrated on making sure the children knew about the opportunities and did little other than encourage them to take them up. This she compared to other schools in more deprived parts of the Borough, where she felt that the parental support might be lacking as well as the children’s motivation, particularly when courses involved any amount of travelling.

Even in her own school, recognised with a Sport England Sportsmark award, she was aware of problems of sustaining interest in sport in years 10 and 11 and above, because of pressures arising from examination-based PE at GCSE and A Level. Pressure on staff time had recently reduced extra-curricular activity from five to three nights a week. Gaining cover from other teachers for after-school programmes was more difficult for girls’ activities, as fewer staff could support netball or hockey than football, cricket or rugby. Despite this, they still continued to offer a range of activities for both girls and boys.
The teacher interviewed in school E, a school with only moderate referrals, had been involved in Champion Coaching to the extent she had referred children to it, and as she had been at the school for over 15 years and always based in St Helens, she had a good understanding of both the Scheme and the sporting opportunities in the Borough. Her views largely echoed those of the teacher in School D, despite being in a very different environment.

Again, this teacher clearly perceived Champion Coaching as a positive experience for those who took part, as it gave them 'specialised coaching' and extra opportunities to those offered in school. The problems or issues that she was aware of were to do with transporting children and a lack of 'back up' from parents in getting their children to the courses. This may have been due, she thought, to them not being able to get there in the evening or letters not being passed by children when they were given them. She found a similar lack of support with some extra-curricular activities, which was partly due to cost and partly to timing. Early evening was difficult for many working parents.

In terms of whether Champion Coaching had any impacts on the school's external links, she could think only of the summer holiday 'camps' for young people at the community recreation centre on site. This facility was much more extensive, of better quality and more heavily promoted and developed than the service at School C or School A in Knowsley. There were many recent physical and organisational improvements arising from the recently achieved status of Specialist Sport College. Teacher E noted the much closer working with Sport Development Unit staff than they had at the time of Champion Coaching, reinforced by the Director of Sport's comments on the same visit.

The issue of selection or assessment for access to Champion Coaching courses was not a problem at this school, as at the others. They had not seen 'selection' as important at the time. This school had similar programmes, where courses were offered to all those with an interest in sport, as a means to keep them involved and to improve their attitude in school; they were not always offered to the 'best' or most able pupils, who were likely to be involved in clubs already. She felt these schemes
were all about getting the disaffected youngsters involved, so she didn’t see a problem with offering programmes like Champion Coaching to selected or targeted groups.

In her view, children locally did see routes and ‘pathways’ open to them, however, there were more opportunities for boys and family support was again highlighted as significant. She felt parents with girls seemed less inclined to support their daughters’ sporting aspirations than their sons’. She said it was a case of: “sorry love, we’re off to watch our Jack play, so we can’t come to your game…..”. For some sports the routes were more established and obvious, but for others, less easy to find, as “for squash or something, they would have a hard time” (Teacher, School E).

Similar to School’s A, B and C and F, at School E, the availability on site of community recreation meant there was a local means of ‘closing the gap’ between school and after-school sport, but home and family environment was an issue in the deprived parts of the Borough, from which many of their pupils came. Teacher E noted that this difference could be seen in the physical condition of children from the school when they competed against children from more affluent areas. She reported hearing a colleague, not a PE teacher, at a tournament, express surprise at the difference in stature of their pupils compared to the opposition, saying, “what do they feed them on?” Environmental improvements and community sport venues therefore, appeared to go only so far, when home and family exercised more pressing constraints.

The Director of Sport at School E reported good, close and effective working with the Sports Development Unit, which supported the school in achieving its objectives as a Specialist Sport College. He pointed to the large proportion (70% of year 8) of children taking part in some form of out-of-school sport, and he had extensive data (not made available for analysis) on the levels and types of activity children were now involved in. He acknowledged that this percentage dropped as the children went into the later school years, despite the strong links and the excellent community provision. It ran an extensive after-school club programme, every lunchtime and evening. Sport College status had brought the extra support staff and ICT that enabled monitoring of this participation to take place. It also enabled the production of a weekly bulletin and other resources to support the promotion of opportunities for
pupils. The school is actively involved in the Merseyside Active Sport programmes and Active School programmes, as was its counterpart in Knowsley. It also had initiatives in place to promote sport in each year group, through the use of form ‘captains’, for example. Coaches were also regularly employed to offer specialised coaching for school clubs, as were other teachers with a particular interest or expertise to offer.

However, the Director of Sport recognised that the success of these initiatives was due to the resources that Sport College status had brought. Without such support, so-called ‘ordinary’ schools would find such work with external agencies and clubs more challenging. He acknowledged since it was not in place at the time of Champion Coaching, it may have contributed to lower involvement in external schemes. Again, he raised the issue of transport, for events or activities across the Borough or further afield and the level of support that could be expected of parents for this to be problematical. This was something over which schemes like CC had very little influence, and needed to be appreciated in programme planning.

Though teachers in schools F and G in Flintshire provided more limited access to pupils, they supported the views expressed by the Merseyside teachers. The teachers had positive approaches to out-of-school sport and described their active encouragement of pupils in schemes like CC whenever possible. This was, until fairly recently, without much contact from the SD Unit. They had both welcomed recent research conducted by Flintshire and were developing action plans to deal with the results for their school. Again, access to venues for clubs or coaching opportunities were problematical due to the lack of good clubs and transport problems for outlying areas. Both teachers were also keen to encourage a range of sports, not just those traditional sports offered by CC, for example, ice skating and curling. The teacher in school F, though involved in county netball herself, recognised that the girls at her school were less keen on ‘competitive’ sports, but for those with a genuine interest, like those she encouraged to go to CC, she was “prepared to push them a bit harder”. even if in her own school, this had led to some criticism for being ‘elitist’.

The PE Curriculum Co-ordinators meeting reinforced the messages from individual schools about how CC worked and the current modes of operation in Knowsley. The SD Officer usually attended their monthly meetings, and this helped improve
communication. CC was seen as a good scheme for participants, but of often marginal interest to teachers, under substantial pressures themselves in responsibilities for after-school clubs, organised competitions and examination-based PE. The teachers, did not perceive CC to be about developing coaches, but about youth sport opportunities. No similar group existed in St Helens, but the views of its LEA advisory teacher gives another perspective on the Scheme. From the teachers’ perspective, there was little direct legacy they could report from CC, but for some, it had resulted in improved relations and working with SD Unit.

*Views of the children on their pathways and opportunities*

Children in most groups often were not very vocal in the meetings, and consequently groups often took time to develop more than one-word responses to questions or prompts. This was not surprising, given that for most children there was very little understanding of what they had been asked to get involved with, and little choice, other than not to contribute to discussions. Discussions with smaller groups of one or two children, enabled them to be more open. As they were comparable to the CC groups surveyed, interviews helped demonstrate that the experiences of exit routes and clubs for the CC children was much more varied and positive than those experienced typically in local schools.

One of the most striking things from all the group sessions was that there were similar responses in schools of very different types and sizes. Children negative about sport were found in most schools, even those that had referred large numbers of children to CC. There were also children with very positive experiences and attitudes in schools with very little involvement in CC. The only major differences were from children in school D in St Helens, a high referral school in a relatively affluent neighbourhood, where the active group of young people were both aware of and articulate about opportunities.

In both Knowsley schools, the children clearly varied in their attitudes and perceptions of sporting opportunities. School A most children seemed to be less involved in out-of-school opportunities, even though they were aware of them and had opinions (often unfavourable) of local facilities. But the sorts of activities they
were interested in were not those offered by Champion Coaching or Active Sport; they were dance (mentioned by most girls), going to the gym, sports like football and boxing (boys). Though they took part in sports like hockey and netball in their PE lessons, few girls mentioned ‘games’ as their chosen outside activity. Various local facilities (including commercial sports clubs) were identified but there appeared to be little interest in what they offered, or they were perceived as being too expensive. A more positive group of year II pupils in school A thought that if children were really interested in sport, that there were plenty of local opportunities for them, and teachers that were helpful in keeping them informed and encouraging them to try. They said if children claimed they didn’t know or there wasn’t anything for them, this was “an easy way out” or “an excuse”, and identified no other significant barrier to children wishing to take part in sport outside school.

Similar responses came from year 10 children in the Sport College, School B, which had seemingly excellent facilities and extensive extra curricular opportunities, but where except for curricular PE, few children in the groups were active outside, or even inside school. The active engaged in very varied activities, but only a few were part of the Active Sport or CC schemes – badminton, exercise and dance (girls), football (boys), boxing, climbing. Only a few children had taken part outside school in athletics or swimming, girls’ football or netball. The groups noted that even if they belonged to a club in lower school years, they no longer had time, or interest, or found fewer activities were open to their age group, in or out of school. Being classed as ‘adult’ at age 16 meant clubs and courses were often too expensive, even at public leisure centres.

The children in school B had mixed views about being a Sports College. A significant number indicated this status was a mixed blessing for them – on the one hand, they referred to extra money for the school and more choices that friends in other schools didn’t have, but on the other hand, the standard of school facilities was compared unfavourably with those outside, like the David Lloyd Centre. They were also critical of the PE programme, when it included choices cancelled due to teacher absences or facilities problems (like swimming pool closures). Their lack of input on the choice of activities was also criticised:
they don’t give you a chance, they say like, this is a sports college... loads of opportunities, some of them listen more, some of them don’t,. It’s their view, not yours, it doesn’t matter what you think”

(girl, year 10, School B)

So, even in Sport Colleges, young people in this age group recognised the limits to do the sport of their choice. They expressed their choices in attending or not after school clubs or the voluntary Thursday afternoon activities. So, children as well as teachers recognised that being motivated to take part was essential, regardless of whether pathways available. This demonstrated the limited ability of CC to impact on views and pathways of children who had not been part of it. There seemed to be little legacy of take up from this school or others like it.

Being able to travel along pathways was not just an abstract concept to these children, but a real challenge for some. Those living less centrally without a car (in one of the outlying estates in Kirkby) indicated they felt more isolated from many things. This group, as many others, noted how important it was to be able to get to places by bus.

Children in School E were a mixed group of Year 10 children, selected as a cross-section of the year group in the largest school visited, a newly designated Sports College. The children interviewed were involved in a broad range of sports in and out of school. In terms specifically of access to coaching, the boys involved in the major games (rugby and football) had experienced coaching, but the girls were less forthcoming – they were more likely to be involved in recreational clubs or activities not involving ‘coaching’, like dance. Though they were able to discuss how youngsters with talent might progress in St Helens, this was usually explained in terms of rugby (St Helens being described as “a sporting type of town”).

Similar to many other groups, this one seemed to think that facilities and programmes were available for those with the interest “there are places everywhere” - but it was the only one to go on to discuss problems of those with a disability, who might find it hard to join regular clubs. The issue of transport was raised, but again, this group didn’t think it was an issue. The quality of facilities, rather than coaching, seemed as important to this group, in keeping children involved in sport.

Echoing the comments of children in the Knowsley Sports College, they were not all convinced that the status had brought much benefit to them, as one pointed out:
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“what have we got for the government money .... new varnish” (Boy, Year 10). He was inferring that many changes were cosmetic, but other students noted how much better their facilities were, compared to those in other schools. One girl (who wasn't very keen on using them) said they had: “the best facilities in any school in St Helens”.

The Merseyside Youth Games were not brought up, and when the group was pressed they were clearly not very aware of them (despite a prominent display on the main PE notice board). None the less, they were very positive about the communications from the PE Department and the encouragement by staff. The ‘captains’ approach described by the Director of Sport meant that those taking part in sport for the school were recognised, though some (mainly boys) felt this singled out captains to the exclusion of others. Others noted the positive encouragement given to those who got ‘badges’ and ‘colours’ for representing the school. Clearly this approach had both positive and negative impacts.

**Opportunities and Constraints**

All groups, except for School D in St Helens, noted that girls’ opportunities were more limited than boys’. In the Knowsley groups, a few children had experienced coaching outside school and were very positive about it. Only one or two (from 26 children) in school A and a similar proportion (four or five in 41) in school B had taken part in the Merseyside Youth Games, no children recalled anything about Champion Coaching when younger.

The picture in St Helens was similar, in the low referral school C, girls in Year 10 talked about opportunities which they took part in outside school clubs, but, like the girls in Knowsley, they felt their opportunities were more limited than for boys. Some of the courses or clubs they were involved with were not easy to get to, and not all of them provided coaching, in fact few girls, except in school D, seemed to have received coaching other than that offered by schools. In the low referral school in St Helens, girls gave the impression that typically, girls didn’t push to get involved with sport. The boys, however, were quite positive about sport opportunities and clubs.
outside school, which were focused on rugby (league), with some limited involved in football, as “St Helens is a rugby town” (Boy, Year 10, School C).

When they had a sporting interest, children found out about opportunities from various sources – friends (mates), PE staff and family – one girl even mentioned going to the Yellow Pages to find her kick boxing club. The boys in School C thought that friends or ‘mates’ were more important, but there seemed no lack of knowledge about local facilities and clubs.

Despite this, among both boys and girls as in Knowsley, fewer took part in sport now than earlier, which they attributed to a lack of interest more than a lack of opportunity or help. The keen should be able to take part as:

“there were loads of places to go” (Boy Year 10, School C).

However, girls seemed less convinced:

“there’s not much for girls unless you go to (School E.) and you do running” (Girl Year 10, School C)

“its allright for the lads isn’t it?” (Girl, Year 10, School C).

However, if they wanted to do something, they travelled some distance and appeared not to consider themselves at any particular disadvantage.

In the ‘high referring’ school on the edge of the Borough (D), a semi-rural location, the mixed group of year 10 pupils made similar observations about opportunities. They were positive about opportunities outside school and had used a variety of sources to discover them. Compared to School C pupils, they listed a greater variety of sports and were all involved to some extent in a club. They were all positive about their clubs and the coaching they had experienced, including almost all of the girls. Several girls were actively involved in more than one sport and were members of various clubs and development squads. Their teachers had clearly been supportive and influential. However, like the children in most schools they were unaware of the role of the Sports Development Officers in promoting courses or activities. Some were aware of the Youth Games and had taken part when younger, though none had any knowledge of Champion Coaching.
They clearly felt opportunities in St Helens were good, and that it was largely up to them whether they took part outside school. This was a lively and confident group, aware of the pathways in their sports. They were conscious that for children without transport, getting access to some opportunities might be difficult, but they did not see this as a big problem. They observed that some facilities in St Helens were poor (noting problems with the track at school E, for example), but there was a good enough choice not to prevent those interested from taking part.

None of the Flintshire children recalled anything about CC, which reinforced the impression that it had not had a strong identity in schools. Few were involved in any organised sport outside school though several in both schools were in sports clubs. Therefore, despite very different circumstances, the results were very similar. For children living in rural areas, transport to sports facilities and clubs may have been more problematical but for those in the central areas it was relatively easy; facilities were plentiful and schools encouraging. Getting involved with organised, coaching based programmes was the activity of a minority. If they did anything outside of school, children were more likely to be involved in recreation, often involving sports or activities not included on CC, such as swimming, ice-skating or golf. As in Merseyside schools, there was no real evidence that CC had taken place. Though teachers seemed knowledgeable about clubs, it wasn’t clear that children perceived ‘pathways’, except for the very able.

Issues of motivation and transport appeared to be the most important to the children across the schools; they did not bring up the problems of lack of parental support that appeared to be so important in teachers’ views. They were often very aware of a range of opportunities, but in general, the involvement with coaching programmes or organised clubs was not very high, yet in the more affluent areas, children seemed more active and pro-active. Children from all schools often participated in less formal and non-competitive environments or non-traditional sports, those not part of their curriculum. Children attributed a lack of involvement with clubs to a lack of interest more than a lack of opportunity, but many girls recognised that their choice of clubs was more limited.
The LEA view on Champion Coaching

The advisory teacher in St Helens, representing the LEA, gave some insight into CC’s operation, and its impact on current policies and practices. As a former secondary school teacher and a parent of an active child, she had a multi-faceted view of the Scheme and during her interview, wore several ‘hats’. Though initially her responses focused on the youth sport opportunity aspects of the CC, her later responses indicated she was well aware of the issues regarding developing coaches. She observed that “in theory, Champion Coaching was a good scheme”, but she had experienced deficiencies, which showed it had not really achieved its potential. For example, the level and quality of coaching in one sport, hockey, was not high so there was no real legacy from what she termed “poor practice”. She conceded this was not necessarily true for all sports.

Because, in the choosing venues and sports, not all children could access CC from all parts of the Borough, she thought the Scheme had been quite “divisive”. She explained that this was due to “variable family support” in getting children to courses, even when held in excellent facilities. Courses often took place at difficult or inappropriate times, or used facilities rather difficult to reach from some parts of the Borough:

“depending on what part of St Helens you came from, parents’ support was very mixed”

St Helens, Advisory Teacher).

This meant that even when courses were well publicised in schools and children were encouraged to go, attendance relied on parent’s ability to get them there. However, both SD and PE staff had been able to learn from their experiences of Champion Coaching, and this definitely had improved practice and how subsequent schemes were implemented. The LEA in St Helens was aware of a fall in participation in clubs in secondary schools, though it had little data to confirm this. To an extent, she felt this drop was inevitable, as “children have other choices that they are making and sport is not one of them” (Advisory Teacher).

In St Helens sport in and out of schools had an increasing profile and status as attempts were being made to improve standards of pupil behaviour in schools across the Borough. In addition, sport was seen as a vehicle for tackling the problems of
social inclusion in schools, with a greater emphasis on targeting children at specific risk or in particular need. Programmes were in use that combined the efforts of schools, youth services, community safety teams, drug action teams, the professional rugby club and others. Monitoring and evaluation of these programmes was being focused on changes for individuals and schools, in self-esteem measures, behaviour in schools and attendance, which, she felt, was related to experiences of involvement in delivering schemes like Champion Coaching. The Community Recreation and Education departments were now more acutely aware of the problems of the disadvantaged areas in the Borough that were now the subject of efforts to raise participation. The influx of six new School Sport Co-ordinators was noted as important in this regard, though their role in linking with primary schools. Particular targeting work was going on within the Education Action Zone (which included School C, though it had no Co-ordinator post).

Conclusions of schools, teachers and children about pathways and opportunities

Across all groups common themes and issues arose and there were some key differences between schools in the two boroughs of Merseyside. Teachers brought up similar problems and issues about the process of Champion Coaching and its impacts. These included:

- Communication from SDUs was frequently at too short notice and teachers were not able to integrate these into planning the school year
- Lack of involving PE Departments in choosing venues and sports could result in courses not tying in with the schools’ programmes or conflicts with existing evening practices
- Variations in parental support necessary to convert interest/awareness into attendance meant that not all children could take up the opportunities available
- Schools lacked the resources to monitor and track children’s participation in external programmes and links with clubs

As noted in the literature (Penney and Evans, 1999), the role of teachers in initiatives like Champion Coaching needs to be carefully considered, and their commitment secured for successful implementation. Where such commitment was evident, schools were more successful in referring children onto pathways.
Teachers preferred to be involved at the outset in programme planning, and not merely informed later, by letter or promotional leaflet. Many schools need help to implement coaching programmes, as they lack resources while already under pressure to provide inclusive after-school clubs, catering for all abilities and interests. Time and resource demands on schools to go beyond an ‘information service’ about clubs and community sport can be quite substantial, and this has relied on the goodwill and enthusiasm of staff in the past, and for Champion Coaching, this clearly was not always enough. This was found to be particularly acute in ‘ordinary schools’, i.e. without specialist status.

Where schools were successful in referring children, it was where well-resourced departments were committed to providing out-of-school activities, and possibly even more importantly, motivated children had the support of parents. Even in Sports Colleges, with additional resources available, it is still important to consider parental support, if children are expected to travel across a District independently. With more extensive sport programmes available on site, external opportunities need to be carefully matched to the existing school clubs, to establish successful pathways. This is where lessons appear to have been learned by SDOs and teachers.

Low rates of referral to CC occurred in schools with poor facilities and a generally low profile of PE and after-school provision. Based on the group interviews, motivation levels and interest of young people in these schools do not appear to be very different from their peers in high referral schools. Despite low referral rates to CC, these children exhibit a similar range of positive and negative approaches to sport, and take part in various activities. The low referring schools visited were not always within easy reach of venues, though in itself, this didn’t seem to be an important issue to the children. It seemed that if the children didn’t feel interested or motivated to take part in the specific sport being promoted, they would not be inclined to make the special effort needed.

Though children made few references to parent support, they recognised that some help with transport was needed to access many of the opportunities available. This would be in answer to the self-efficacy questions suggested by Welk’s (1999) model: ‘am I able?’ ‘have I got the resources’ and the personal and economic capital
identified by Bourdieu (1978) necessary for them to consider participating in a particular sport. In low referral schools, teachers seemed to have either less inclination or less information or both, to promote external opportunities to their pupils, so had less influence. Children tended to refer to opportunities in terms of facilities and places, rather than coaching or performance enhancement. In any school, coaching, or performance-oriented programmes, involved only a small minority.

Clearly Champion Coaching was a positive experience for most of those who had taken part in it; it gave enjoyment and developed skills, confidence and competence. What is less clear, is how any future club membership or participation depended on these factors. Arguably the children involved were well-motivated and encouraged, and may have gone on to access clubs eventually. Clearly a good proportion went on to join a club and the vast majority stayed involved with regular sport. The rates of club membership in CC participants was higher than that of similar groups in the national survey, especially for girls (Sport England/MORI, 2003), but no local comparisons were available to determine whether these outcomes would have been achieved without the intervention of Champion Coaching. The school visits have strongly suggested that club membership rates were higher in CC participants than similar groups of local youngsters in school years 10/11.

Even though CC may have been successful in generating interests and motivation, the children may not have had a suitable club available locally. The level of regular sports participation for several years after the course was however, a strong indicator that the courses contributed to developing more involvement in organised sport than was found with older teenagers in local schools.

6.4 Views of the SDOs on pathways and participant Development

This section is based on interviews with the SDO’s responsible for Youth Sport in each case study area, and the former SDO for St Helens, who was the acting Manager for the Merseysport Partnership. These interviews were in addition to meetings with the Regional CDO for SCUK and the CDO for Merseysport. This provided the professional SD perspective of CC’s impacts on pathways and participants. Interviews
with the current SDOs focused on the legacies of Champion Coaching and the lessons learned, for individuals and organisations.

At the outset, the St Helens staff made it clear their focus was on coaches, rather than player development or pathways (Boocock, personal communication, 1999). The main way the Merseyside schemes contributed to pathways was through the Youth Games, seen as the major ‘exit route’ for players from Champion Coaching courses. Other opportunities were established in sports with existing clubs that needed junior clubs or sections. CC was perceived to fill a gap where existing resources had been lacking. The SDOs all found the guidelines of NCF to be sufficiently flexible to allow local priorities to be addressed. Based on their interviews, the officers had sufficient autonomy, to apply their judgement on how the Scheme was to be managed within the parameters set by the NCF. In St Helens and Knowsley, both SDOs, were presented with the outline of how the scheme was to be offered, but largely left to deal with all the practical aspects of implementation, venue arrangements, participant recruitment, promotion, coach recruitment and profiling.

“I used the programme to meet any of the needs of St Helens, whether it was player development, whether it was developing coaching, or whether it was setting up clubs” Former SDO St Helens.

This was key to how this experience contributed to developing practice in the Departments and for individual SDOs, as it was the first major national scheme they had been involved in delivering, reporting to an external funding agency. This prompted the Knowsley SDO to remark that as they had only come on board once the decision to go ahead had been taken (more senior officers having prepared the original bid), one of the key lessons she had learned, was to get involved in such programmes “from the word go in future”. Several of the problems they had experienced were attributed to the original choices of sports and age groups, with lack of clubs or exit routes and/or coaches causing delays in starting. The SDOs acknowledged they needed to be involved in planning from the outset, to ensure that schools, clubs and governing body perspectives could all be taken on board, to develop the appropriate links for the partnership to be effective in establishing effective pathways. This was a lesson they drew on heavily when implementing the new Active Sport partnership on Merseyside, Merseysport.
Also very important to developing appropriate pathways and exit routes was working across traditional geographical and departmental boundaries. Champion Coaching enhanced this practice in the Merseyside area and consequently, opportunities developed more effectively for both performers and coaches:

"we say boundaries are not an issue, it's all player focused"

Former SDO St Helens.

Departmental collaboration, facility management and sports development were also enhanced, through the pricing and timing of venues for CC courses. In Knowsley, for example, time (4-6 p.m.) was identified for development purposes to facilitate after school courses at public facilities. CC courses were offered at different times and dates to enable children to access courses across Borough boundaries.

Working with the Education Departments was also improved, as SD Staff had to communicate very closely to inform schools and plan courses. At first, this relationship was problematical, as acknowledged by both St Helens and Knowlsey SDOs, but over time, it improved, and schools were eventually much more involved with after-school activity and better links to clubs have emerged. The Knowsley SDO referred to some schools seeing SD programmes as a potential threats to existing school clubs, which may have reduced their interest in getting children involved.

However, Champion Coaching alone could not account for all the changes in relationships with schools, as many other sports initiatives with schools overlapped with CC or became more important over time. For example, Active Schools and NOF funding (SportsMark Challenge Funding, School Sports Co-ordinators, Sport Colleges), became very influential once Champion Coaching had ended. Knowsley came to rely heavily on the PE Curriculum Leaders group that was not in place when CC was in operation.

In all the case studies, the authorities were single tier and Education and Leisure were in the same departments or directorates with shared corporate aims, a point reiterated by the LEA advisor. Better working across Departments, according to the SDOs, helped to get clubs and schools together, to provide more opportunities linked to the curriculum and by not overloading schools with different demands at inappropriate
times. Essentially, mutual understanding improved, influenced by experience of the CC’s cross-departmental co-operation.

A similar trend emerged in Flintshire, with the SD Unit focusing on more close liaison with secondary schools, after a period where it had prioritised primary school development with Dragon Sport. This new approach was based on the findings of its 2003 survey of school participation which provided for the first time, baseline data on the extent and nature of participation in out-of-school and extracurricular sport (UCW/PCC, 2003). SDOs were able to identify with each school, an action plan based on its needs and its pupils, taking into account local clubs and opportunities:

“for us, its great because we’ve never had that level of detail before....instead of going into schools and being prescriptive and trying this and that initiative, we’re trying to reverse it and saying well this is what the pupils are actually saying they want to do and we can work with you to access money to do it”

SDO Flintshire.

This in turn allowed the SDOs to work with clubs to ensure they could offer junior sections and access other funding streams (Awards for All or Community Chest in Wales) to pay for coaches or other support needed. Champion Coaching required more direct involvement and support from the SD Unit, though subsequently the role was more “facilitative” and enabling. One of the consequences of the ending of Champion Coaching funding after three years, was that clubs and exit routes which had not had time to become self-sufficient were discontinued once funding for the coaches was withdrawn: “as soon as the funding went, most of it collapsed” (Former SDO, St Helens).

It took the new scheme on Merseyside some time to re-establish these links, and even then, in fewer sports. In St Helens, following the discontinuation of Champion Coaching, the development of pathways in basketball, hockey, netball and cricket with structured coaching and clubs provision in different parts of the district for primary and secondary age children was only possible due to Merseysport funding. Other sports did not benefit, as the Youth Games reduced the number of sports included, or they were not included in Active Sport. SDOs described this as a better ‘focus’, rather than a reduction of opportunities.
The MYG remained a key focus on Merseyside for developing pathways from schools to competitive, club-based and representative sport. The Merseysport planning time frame was set at five years, to allow for the development of more self-sustaining clubs, a major improvement on Champion Coaching, and of great help to the SDOs, as they said, "its much clearer now, when writing action plans out, working to five year plans" (SDO, St Helens).

With no equivalent in Flintshire, the gap remained there, with governing bodies taking responsibility for representative sports and development squads, and clubs operating their own junior sections and coaching programmes with some support from the SD unit. As a result, the SDO could not identify specific youth opportunities that were sustained outcomes of CC. The results of the school survey (UWS/ PCC, 2003) showed low levels of club-based activity, but could not identify specific club membership rate, so provided only limited relevant data for this study.

According to the SDOs, Merseysport focused more on the systems and processes for coaching and player development in general to underpin their pathways in all sports, not just those selected for Active Sport. The use of sports-specific development groups had emerged through Champion Coaching, which the Merseyside SDOs highlighted as important for building networks and pathways. These groups identified gaps in provision and the focus for any development activity, as well as coaching needs. Most importantly, according to the St Helens SDO, they involved all the "right people" to move the process forward – coaches, sports-specific development officers, teachers and key officers in each sport.

Champion Coaching clearly acted as both a catalyst and a learning experience for the SD officers and their Departments. The funding represented an important mechanism for providing opportunities for structured coaching programmes not available previously. This enabled MYG and sports-specific development programmes to be linked and made accessible to more children, as well as opening up the potential for local clubs to offer youth sport opportunities. Funding enabled the payment of coaches and the costs of their development courses and training.
The longer-term continuity of staff on Merseyside and to a certain extent in Flintshire also emerged from the interviews with SDOs. Though there had been some turnover, key individuals remained involved in what was referred to as the “friendly Merseyside mafia” SD network. This facilitated the transfer of knowledge and sharing of good practice across departments and spread lessons learned across different Boroughs. This sharing of good practice was also noted as important by the regional CDO for SCUK, where ideas from Merseyside were spread to other partnerships, like Greater Manchester, and where SDOs across the region had been coaches, participants or even parents. Individual SDOs identified that their own skills and knowledge had gained from the Champion Coaching experience, and this had impacted on other aspects of their work, including planning, working with other agencies, communication, finance, and negotiation skills. Therefore this represented another important legacy of the Scheme, the development of personal and social capital of SDOs, which underpinned future work.

The sports development mechanisms and processes of Champion Coaching worked in slightly different ways in the three case study programmes – resulting in similar, though different outcomes for pathways and participants. In St Helens, the focus on coach development meant a lower priority for recruiting new participants for each sport programme, and so the numbers of new participants was more limited and there were greater numbers of repeat registrations. The higher rates for club membership may be explained by the longer engagement with the Scheme that these children had, resulting in higher competence and confidence to join clubs. Knowsley focused on venues accessible for schools and children in different parts of the Borough. It also offered a ‘pay as you play’ payment for the courses. As a result, its registrations included larger proportions of children from more deprived areas. The lack of local clubs for some sports meant that, even if the children had been motivated to join a club, they were not always able to do so, and the MYG could only continue their involvement with a sport for a limited time. In Flintshire, venues and sports were selected to match existing youth sport routes, as a result, fewer new opportunities were created and registrations appear to have concentrated on the Mold/Buckley area. Changing priorities once CC ended meant a gap in continuity in secondary school based SD work in Flintshire.
In both Merseyside programmes and in Flintshire, schools’ involvement with the scheme was seen by the SDOs as dependent on the motivation and enthusiasm of the teachers to promote out-of-school activity and the interest of the children in taking it up. In St Helens, the problems of children from more deprived areas was increasingly addressed through targeting, though this approach had not been used in Champion Coaching. Knowsley was more aware of these issues, due to the more deprived status of much of the Borough, and the SDU had considered this in its pricing policy and marketing. Accordingly, they had achieved good results in registrations from many parts of the Borough.

6.5 Participants and pathways – the achievements and issues

This final section of the chapter focuses on the achievements, impacts and outcomes against the participation and club development objectives of the Scheme. As reiterated in the 1996 Guide, CC’s purpose was to help create and develop links between the NCF, sports councils, Local Authorities, Local Education Authorities, Governing Bodies, Schools and Clubs to:

- recruit and develop coaches to work with junior performers
- create quality coaching opportunities which enable keen and interested 11-16 year olds to become more confident and competent in sport
- support the development of junior clubs and their coaches
- raise the national and local profile of coaching and youth sport development”

(NCF, 1996:3).

This section examines how far the second and third of these objectives were met in these cases, with the coaching-related outcomes examined in the following chapter. Impacts of Champion Coaching on opportunities were seen in different ways across each case study, as the local context and implementation was different, even if consistent with NCF guidelines. A key difference was the inclusion of specific sports in the sports programmes, and the local environment or sporting infrastructure – each case had a unique local blend of conditions and circumstances, which makes complete comparisons difficult. Within a ‘realist’ approach, it is more appropriate to consider how the mechanisms worked, and for whom, or in what contexts, to result in these different outcomes, to assist in developing understanding of the impact of the policy and its implementation. Some of the impacts, identified in these chapters, were
consistent with the programme theory discussed in Chapter Four, though others were clearly unforeseen or unintended.

The results clearly show that the children and their parents perceived the courses to be successful in developing both competence and confidence in sport. Measures of this success were the percentage of children who had gone on to join clubs or taken other exit routes after their courses, and the opinions of participants of the benefits they had gained, in skill development and improved performance, as a result of the coaching they had received. Compared to similar groups of local children, or the national survey, the Champion Coaching cohorts seemed to be more active and engaged in regular and organised sport outside school.

The engagement of young people on the CC courses was not confined to groups who would otherwise go on to become involved with these sports, as reported by coaches and teachers. The distribution across the Boroughs in Merseyside, with participants in some very deprived districts, meant that the findings of Collins and Buller (2000), that the barriers to development were structural, was not replicated. By providing opportunities perceived as accessible to young people, in sports they had interest in, Knowsley was able to show that the more deprived wards could produce participation rates equivalent to less deprived areas. However, without particular attention to this issue, the results of St Helens can be seen as a benchmark, in a comparable area, within the same region.

The use of club membership as a measure of sustained participation, however, was found to be insufficiently sensitive to allow for the range of exit routes accessed by participants. It did not take into account the problems of finding clubs in the selected sports in different areas, particularly when not connected to a school. Current regular sport participation (regardless of context) may be more appropriate as a measure of outcome of long-term regular participation, but should be clarified to be leisure time sport(s) or activities more likely to be continued outside school. This would also capture the less formal, but nevertheless important, participation, which contributes to physical activity targets introduced after 2002. In all three cases this rate was higher than suggested by national figures for the age group (GHS, 1999; MORI/SE, 2003).
As large proportions of young people continued to play sport regularly, those living in more deprived wards were not apparently disadvantaged. But the development of limited sustained new opportunities for clubs showed that the time span of the Scheme in St Helens and Knowsley was insufficient for the considerable growth in opportunities seen from 1996 to 1999 to be consolidated, once the NCF funding was discontinued. The Merseysport Partnership funding has been successful in maintaining some self-sustaining clubs and development squads, but some sports were more successful in this than others (Enoch, forthcoming). It is too early to say if these can continue once this funding is withdrawn.

On Merseyside, sports involved in MYG and Active programmes have clearly gained more opportunities. As pointed out by the coaches and teachers, however, in some sports and parts of the county, the situation is no better than before Champion Coaching was implemented. In Flintshire, with no continuation after CC, this lack of sustained impacts on clubs was clear, with the results of the schools survey showing low levels of club-based sport, particularly in older age groups.

Merseyside SDOs admitted a narrowing of their focus since 1999, but saw this as a positive, rather than a negative impact of Champion Coaching. Again, the employment of sports-specific Development Officers since 1999 have built on the gains made by Champion Coaching, and taken them further than they would otherwise have reached.

The assumption that the Scheme directly linked children to clubs must be questioned, as so few of the respondents identified that they found out about the club they joined through their CC course. Peers and teachers were more important in providing this information in each of the case studies, consistent with Collins' and Buller's (2000) findings in Nottinghamshire, which infers a weakness of design, or 'theory failure' rather than of implementation. Indirectly however, through increased competence and confidence, children went on to join clubs in greater numbers later.

As so few children found out about their club through their parents, it is reasonable to conclude that these children would not necessarily be socialised into sport club membership in these sports, without the influence of teachers selection and CC
courses. However, it is difficult to draw conclusions for specific sports, as again, different contexts of sporting infrastructure were in place, to facilitate the school-club link.

The impact of CC on sporting networks and pathways

The impact of the experience of implementing Champion Coaching was quite significant in all three cases to the development of the function and practice of the SD Units concerned. The SD units all grew in terms of personnel and responsibility, despite the services within which they worked being under continuous review (Best Value) and in the throes of reorganisation. Practices required by Champion Coaching have to a certain extent become the template or norm for current practice in school-club work, even though some aspects were not resourced to the same extent. Sports-Specific development groups, cross-boundary working, consultations with teachers and LEA advisors have all been developed and enhanced through the experience of implementing such practices within the Champion Coaching framework. Champion Coaching highlighted the need to develop better quality club-based opportunities, due to the problems in exit routes, and so led to local authorities giving more priority to supporting clubs to gain Clubmark accreditation or its equivalent. Thus they could now access alternative funding through Awards for All (via Sport England), or the Community Chest (ScfWales), to help them provide coaches and other support to youth sections.

The support of volunteers has also been increasingly recognised with the introduction of the SE Volunteer Investment Programme and the new funding for coaching, indicative of the new impetus for coaching in communities. Those responsible for implementing the CTF at the government level (DCMS) may not be aware of the contribution of CC to this process (Conway, personal communication, 5th December 2003) but the SDOs and CDOs on the ground certainly are, as made clear in the interviews:

"Without CC, I cannot see how we would have had Active Sport in its current form"  
SDO, St Helens.

And this learning will influence the CTF implementation of 3000 new community coaches:
"I think we need to be quite sensitive if you like, to how we manage that 3000, and how it may impact on the volunteer workforce we’ve got at the moment” Regional CDO, SCUK.

Therefore the local networks for youth sport in the three case studies have all benefited to some extent from Champion Coaching and consequently the local policy network in which these organisations operate has also been influenced. However, monitoring and evaluation remains on an output rather than outcome basis, based on the numbers involved, or courses completed. Though there are AS targets for proportions of participants from different groups, including those from more deprived areas, these are again output-oriented (numbers recruited onto programmes).

The quality of the CC programmes was monitored in *ad hoc* ways by individual SDOs, and not reported to NCF or recorded in its files, or made available for independent review. Some children completed questionnaires for coaches, about their views of the courses, but these were not recorded centrally, as coaches used them to help with planning and reflection on the sessions and programmes they were delivering. A lack of emphasis on the quality of the experience and outcomes achieved was a result of not having specific quality-oriented objectives for the sessions or the programme overall. Qualitative outcomes were not specified or nor required to be reported to the monitoring agency, the NCF. As this was not required, the SDOs were under no pressure to produce it, as they had many more pressing calls on their time. Though SDOs referred to some evaluations completed with children, they were not reported or made available for this study. Any such conclusions have thus relied on the reports produced for the NCF, or recollections of the relevant officers, with obvious limitations.

It is difficult to identify what constitutes evidence of a ‘co-ordinated community structure’, and difficult to assess whether this has been achieved in each case. What are the characteristics of a quality coaching experience and how can we be sure this is what was delivered? Previously this has been assumed on the basis of the qualification or experience of the coach and the completion of the courses by children. This sort of approach, unfortunately is the norm, rather than the exception in many policy areas, including sport (Pawson, 2004).
In the views of participants and parents, for the most part, the course were perceived to be of good quality and appropriate, thus facilitating progress along performance pathways, for those with the interest to do so. But SDOs were still not in a position to track and monitor the progress of individual children, and there were still gaps and difficulties even for keen and interested children.

This research has shown the potential for CC mechanisms to achieve positive outcomes across different and challenging contexts. But in Knowsley, for example, despite the fact that the course outputs were heavily weighted towards girls, the outcomes achieved (in club membership specifically) were not as good as for boys, due to the lack of clubs. In St Helens the girls achieved only slightly lower club membership rates than boys. A cohort tracking system, to follow up participants as they enrolled on different exit routes, would enable more accurate reporting of outcomes, if funding could resource this level of follow-up. This could also enable better monitoring of outcomes against other measures, for example, of social deprivation, disability or ethnicity. The only measure of equity considered by these cases was recruitment by gender, though small numbers of children had learning or other disability, as indicated by survey responses. However, there were no courses specifically aimed at young people with a disability, and no particular arrangements were made to integrate them into the courses or the clubs. No data was collected on ethnicity by any of the SDUs, or indeed in this research, though in mitigation, all three cases had low ethnic minority populations, of 3% or less, so this would not have been a high priority in these areas.

**Impacts on Participation in Out of School Sport**

As CC worked as a nationally regulated, centrally devised Scheme, there was an inevitable ‘top down’ approach to the implementation guidelines. The revised templates for sports were developed through consultation with the National Governing Bodies, and according to the NCF, by building on their experience on the ground, so this should have provided the best potential for linking to sport performance plans. However, as indicated by the results from SDOs, these guidelines were subject to significant interpretation and flexibility of application in each local authority. Implementation was therefore ‘bottom-up’, with significant autonomy of
individual SDOs, and coaches responsible for the scheme locally. Despite Knowsley and St Helens entering a joint bid to the NCF, they managed their programmes quite separately, after initial planning to ensure a distribution and co-ordination of opportunities and resources. There were differences in how the Scheme operated which resulted in differing emphases on the mechanisms for selecting children and promoting courses.

It was not just NCF guidance that SDOs had to respond to. As CC did not operate in a policy vacuum; and before, during and since the Scheme ended, outcomes, particularly those for pathways to clubs have been impacted on by other policies. The policy for school sport and Physical Education has been most important, culminating in the Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links Strategy (PESSCL) (DFES, 2003; 2004), which brought together various initiatives by DCMS (SE) and DFES together. Campbell has indicated that this strategy shares much of its philosophy with CC (Campbell, personal communication, 28th May, 2004) in linking schools to their wider communities. At the same time, National Curriculum developments and the growth of examination-based PE and sports studies/science has increased pressure on the staff involved, impacting negatively on out of school activity, as seen in some of the schools visited.

National Lottery funding for Active Schools programmes, including Challenge Funding which helped schools develop links with clubs, and the award of Sportsmark for excellence in PE (which requires a certain percentage of children to be involved in extra-curricular activity) have all provided impetus to after-school sport over and above what was happening with CC. Since CC ended new funds for SSCOs and Sport Colleges have provided resources and motivation for schools to provide quality after-school clubs, better links to external clubs, and specialised coaching. These were potential contaminants to the longer-term outcomes of CC, which makes it more difficult to separate out its effects.

These changes illustrate a changing power and resource dynamic within the school sport network, which has implication for future policy. There are now two sets of partnerships operating in Merseyside: schools partnerships and the AS partnership. Schools are now much better resourced on Merseyside, through NOF funding, than
was the case in CC, which has arguably changed the relationship with the SDU, as they no longer rely on them for help in funding after-school provision, and facilities have also had some considerable investment. This was not found in Flintshire, where teachers were much more reliant on the support of the SDU and community sport provision.

Other policy initiatives have also impacted on the sustainability of the outcomes of CC, most importantly was the Youth Games. Established for over ten years on Merseyside, this was closely linked to the success of CC, and had driven choices of sports and age groups for CC in both St Helens and Knowsley. As the Games expanded, the age groups and sports were increased, to fill the perceived gaps in the Boroughs, for team coaches as well as participants. The integration of MYG and CC was one of the key successes of the Merseyside schemes, as they provided a competitive structure and training programme for those children who had fallen through the net of the existing talent ID systems and club structures, or were at a lower standard of performance. As the results have shown, CC and the MYG provided a stepping-stone into continuing participation and competitive highlight for many of the participants and coaches. This demonstrated a co-ordinated structure for sport, which contributed to developing players, junior clubs and youth sport coaching, of which CC was a major part. Unfortunately this concept had not operated in Flintshire and may have reduced the impact of CC on pathways into club sport there.

One of the problems of having both player and coaching development objectives was that the achievement of both may have been compromised by conflicting mechanisms - arguably the results found in the different Boroughs support this view. As the NCF was the lead agency, it was perhaps not surprising that coach development objectives seemed to be more important in reporting outputs (in coach scholarships and qualifications for example). As reported by one of the SDOs, the NCF seemed to be happy enough “if programmes ran with 10 children or 30” and they didn’t have to justify exit routes or performance outcomes achieved, as long as they were reported. A major change with the new AS scheme was the development of player competence and the selection of the more able into development squads whilst at the same time offering more children the chance to continue their sport. However, CC was continually promoted for example, to schools and parents, on the basis of youth sport
opportunities, rather than developing coaches. It was very unlikely to have received the support it did, if it was perceived to be about coaches alone.

In developing social capital through clubs, and the personal capital of coaches and SDOs, CC was developing a legacy of expertise and competence of both participants and professionals, particularly in the delivery of multi-sport programmes, and multi-agency working, to underpin the local networks for sport. This was perhaps the most lasting and yet most difficult to quantify outcome.

Pathway and network enhancements may not have been sustained in part because of the lack of emphasis on them by the NCF. Judging by the growth of SD Units, departments and their increased roles, CC can be seen to have contributed to the raised profile of youth sport, but it was not unique in this regard. The NJSP, incorporating BT TOPS was also responsible for an influx of large amounts of funding into youth sport, but CC was major part of an increasing youth orientation in Sports Development where it operated, and the NCF (later SportscoachUK) undoubtedly had significant influence through the funding of CC.

The explicit performance orientation of CC could be seen as being at odds with the current drive to increase or widen participation. However, in recognising the need to establish out-of-school activity as the basis for leisure choices in adulthood, developing sporting infrastructures, through clubs and coaching opportunities, was firmly established by CC, even if experience later showed that clubs needed much more specific and longer term support.

As AS was implemented however, and NCF no longer drove this area of policy, the profile of coaching was apparently relegated to a support role in player pathways and performance structures for AS. As was clear in the interviews, though the SD professionals clearly had a heightened awareness of the need to develop more coaches, this was not always translated into more resources or more coaches. This aspect is examined more fully in the next chapter, which focuses on the impacts of the Scheme on coaches and coaching.
Chapter Seven  Developing Champion Coaches?

7.0  Introduction

The review of literature on coaching policy in Chapter Four indicated the importance of the discourse on coach and coaching development and the importance of coaches in underpinning both participation and performance in sport. It further highlighted the issues this research has attempted to address, namely the impact of programmes designed to develop coaches and the relative paucity of knowledge and understanding of how such programmes work, or not (Lyle et al, 1997; Jones et al, 2002). Moreover, in coach education in particular, there has been a focus on outputs, such as training courses attended but a lack of appropriate outcome-based measures of their effectiveness, for example, improved knowledge or coaching practice. As coaching remains largely a voluntary activity in British sport, understanding how coaches responded to the Scheme and what impact it had on their careers as coaches is of real benefit to those considering changes to coaching structures, like those announced in 2002 (Coaching Task Force, 2002). In contributing to this study, on the whole, coaches were very positive about the chance to give their views on the Scheme, in either telephone or face-to-face interviews. Essential descriptive data, through the postal and telephone survey, helped to clarify the issues to explore in interviews with coaches, in the selected case study areas.

Coaches indicated this follow up was quite welcome, an opportunity to express their feelings about CC, with several indicting that it should be an automatic part of any such scheme. The results of the survey are grouped under themes, which are then considered in the light of how CC operated in each case study area.

Likewise, the results of the interviews are again presented thematically, addressing the key questions, particularly how coaches’ experience was linked to the outcomes they reported in coaching development and providing pathways. Interviews with Sports Development and Coach Development officers, and discussion’s with CTF members and reports contribute to conclusions regarding the legacy of Champion Coaching for coaching and coaches.
Survey results were from 50 postal and a further 27 responses from the selected case study schemes, either by telephone or in person. The breakdown of the case study sample to each group is shown in Figure 7.1. The breakdown of the survey sample is made up of 67 responses in total, with just over half from small, randomly selected national sample and the remainder from the three case study programmes.

The qualitative analysis in Section 7.2 is based on responses from the coaches in selected schemes, in face-to-face or telephone interviews, and other interviews with SDOs and CDOs.

As Figure 7.2 shows, the sample of coaches was more heavily weighted towards the views of Head Coaches, though coaches from all levels were included. Figure 7.3 shows how many courses they were involved with, most commonly from one to four. The sample was predominantly of coaches who had been involved from 1 to 3 years, though coaches in the national group noted a longer involvement. Mean length of involvement was 3.2 years for Head Coaches, 2.9 years for Coaches and 1.5 years for Assistant coaches.
7.1 The results of the survey of coaches

*The CC process as experienced by coaches*

Questions about coaches' background and experience of CC began with their previous experience in youth sport, in order to see whether CC brought new people in to youth coaching, and secondly whether they had qualified in order to coach on the Scheme.
Figure 7.4 shows that overwhelmingly coaches were already involved in youth sport before coming onto CC. Therefore this throws into question how far coach recruitment was improved by the Scheme. A crosstabulation showed those new to coaching youth were mainly assistant coaches, as might be expected, given the level of qualification and expertise needed to be given the role of head coach. However, with such small numbers new to coaching no statistical significance was found. Perhaps surprising given the importance of development of coaches as an objective, only 58% had gained an additional qualification while working on CC, and 41% had received scholarship support to do so.

SportscoachUK was particularly interested to find out whether Champion Coaching recruited coaches from teaching and whether these teachers subsequently delivered coaching back in a school setting, in or out of the curriculum. As Figure 7.5 shows, only a small proportion, about 1 in 5, were teachers, which echoes the research of Lyle et al (1997).

Slightly more, 22%, responded that they had been involved with coaching in the curriculum, and 24% had delivered coaching ‘out of hours’. Not all of these coaches were teachers.
Out of hours coaching at school
Delivered coaching in curriculum
Teacher

Figure 7.5: Teachers and coaching in schools since Champion Coaching

This clearly demonstrated that overall there was only a limited benefit for coaching in schools as a result of CC. But of those who were teachers, about half had taken part in coaching sport both in and out of school lessons. This implies that teachers involved in CC made a significant contribution to coaching for their schools.

**Mechanisms and their impacts**

The key mechanisms of Champion Coaching for the developing coaches were the use of profiling and access to scholarships and training opportunities. Questions asked the coaches to comment on the impact of these following the Scheme. As noted above, though only 41% indicated they had had any scholarship support, this may be partly due to problems of recall or identifying what they had received in the form of free or reduced cost training. As many were already senior coaches, it is perhaps not surprising that almost half had not gained additional coaching awards. This raised an issue that was clearly worth pursuing in the interviews.

According to the coaches, the mechanisms used, profiling and mentoring for example, had different impacts. In the main, these were positive for only a third or less of the coaches, as many noted either they did not apply, or they had been neutral/had no impact. The most positive response came about coach profiling, noted as positive by 35% of the coaches. Table 7.1 shows how few coaches noted any negative aspects of these mechanisms.
Further analysis was undertaken to examine the links with coach level and the local scheme. Using a Pearson Chi-square, coach level was found not to be associated with scholarship support, since coaches at all levels received this support. However, the particular scheme where the coaches were employed was clearly linked to whether or not they had scholarship support, where a statistically significant difference was found. A Pearson Chi-square value of 20.919, significant at .01 level (1% level, with 3 d.f.). None of the Knowsley or St Helens coaches recalled they had a scholarship. However, as numbers were small, and they may have received this without being aware of it, we cannot draw too much from this. Again this indicated an aspect requiring exploration with coaches and SDOs in the qualitative phase.

Table 7.1: Impacts of Mechanisms in Champion Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism (%)</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral/No impact</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Not applicable (did not experience)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach Profiling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 63

When surveyed, relatively few coaches were spending less time coaching, but only approximately 47% were doing any more (Figure 7.6). Cross tabulating the time spent subsequently showed no significant difference across the case study schemes, but numbers were too small for a valid Chi-square test. Some coaches were not involved in either performance-oriented or paid coaching, so responded 'not applicable', when asked if they were doing more or less since CC ended (Table 7.2).
Figure 7.6: Impact on time spent coaching since the Scheme

Table 7.2: Impacts reported by coaches on amount and types of coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of coaching</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work With Young People</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Oriented coaching</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Involvement</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Work as a coach</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=67

Looking at type of work, the most significant drop was in the proportion of coaches involved in paid coaching, as this showed that since the Scheme ended, the potential for earning money from coaching reduced in the cases study areas, but also significantly for the group sampled nationally. This may show the impact of the Active Sport programme, as a later question indicated. Work with young people either increased or stayed the same for the majority. These results reinforced the need to understand why such difference occurred, and what led to coaches doing less coaching.

Reactions to coaching from others

Coaches were asked to indicate the reactions they had received from those who were either responsible for their employment (the local authorities), teachers from schools, the children, or their parents.
Table 7.3: Reactions to Coaching by Different Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% of coaches indicating positive reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across all groups only 8% indicated negative reactions, 18% were neutral and 80% were positive. The most positive reactions came from the participants, followed by the Local Authorities. This may reflect the fact that the coaches had little to do with parents and teachers. This also confirmed the findings of Collins and Buller (2000) in Nottinghamshire and suggested that lack of contact with parents is a consistent aspect of the Scheme. Coaches had very little feedback from teachers, which is perhaps not unexpected, but indicated the low involvement by teachers, in the implementation of the Scheme. The results showed that the coaches felt a high level of approval from the participants and local authorities, as indicated by such reactions.

Figure 7.7: Were coaches more effective as a result of CC?

When coaches were asked if they were more effective as a result of Champion Coaching, this produced ambiguous responses. Coaches may have felt they were more effective now than several years ago, but did not attribute this to Champion Coaching. Figure 7.7 shows over 55% of coaches thought they were more effective as a result of taking part in Champion Coaching, but there were also
around a fifth who said no and a similar proportion who were not sure, but this was an aspect which could be investigated in the interviewees.

**Organisation of courses**

As one of the key features of CC was that the organisational burden, often complained about by youth coaches, was taken on by the local authorities. Questions sought to explore the coaches' views of the effectiveness of different aspects, such as the venue and progression arrangements for the children. It could be assumed that the coach would have to deal with any problems that arose, if arrangements were unsatisfactory. Many of the coaches were able to rate the organisation of the courses as good or excellent as Figure 7.8 shows.

![Figure 7.8: Coaches' views of the organisation of the courses](image)

Coaches were asked to score each factor, on a scale of 1-7, where 1 was poor and 7 excellent, and with a Cronbach's Alpha score of 0.82, the scale was considered reliable for these six variables (as indicated by Ntoumanis (2001)).

Table 7.4 shows the means scores for course organisation on each factor. The factor with lowest mean score was the contact with parents (at 3.49). The highest was for venue for the sessions (at 5.3). 56% of the coaches rated the local
authority's administration at 6 or more, implying strong approval of the arrangements.

Table 7.4: Coaches rating of Organisational Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Factor</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>coaches rating at 6 or over (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for sessions</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.576</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue for session</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression arrangements</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.722</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority administration</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.891</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information to participants</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with parents</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.134</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*included only where all questions completed

Responses were recoded, thus coaches with scores above the median, were rated as high, those below the median were categorised as low/moderate. The coaches rating of the organisation of courses, based on the overall score from all six variables, was then crosstabulated with whether or not the coach was still involved with the authority to see if indicated some relationship, as high approval could lead to greater retention, low rating could contribute to lower retention. However, the correlation value was not significant at the 95% level.

As shown by Table 7.5, even if coaches rated the courses highly, they did not necessarily remain involved with the Local Authorities. This shows that the relationship is complex and worthy of further inquiry through qualitative methods.

Table 7.5: Crosstabulation of Coaches’ rating and involvement with L.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational rating by Coach (above median)</th>
<th>Still Involved with Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate/Low</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi Square 4.189, 1 d.f. Significance .41 – not Significant at 0.05 (95%) level, shows frequency
Involvement with coaching and development since the Scheme

Of those responding to the survey, 30% were still involved with the local authorities that employed them for Champion Coaching. Shown in Figure 7.9, 26% were involved with the Active Sport scheme, because of the number of coaches associated with areas or sports where Active Sport was not operating. For those in areas offering Active Sport, this increased to 50% (of 30). Given that many of the sports in both Schemes are similar, this is not a very conclusive result, and it is difficult to infer that involvement in CC led to any involvement with AS.

![Figure 7.9: Coach Level and Involvement with the Local Authority](image)

Figure 7.9: Coach Level and Involvement with the Local Authority

Figure 7.9 also shows that the coaches still involved with the Local Authorities were predominantly head coaches, though there was no significant difference statistically between the groups of coaches. Of some concern is the loss of coaching expertise if such well-qualified and experienced coaches no longer coached at all. However, earlier responses suggested very few had been lost completely or were doing less coaching.

As an indicator of whether Champion Coaching contributed to longer coaching careers, the results in Table 7.6 bring into question the outcomes achieved. Just less than half (46%) were members of SportscoachUK (SCUK), which was used as an indicator of a 'professional' approach to coaching. However, it should be
noted among reasons people gave for not being a member, several indicated that because their Governing Body arranged sufficient cover for insurance or professional development, SCUK membership was unnecessary. This inferred that coaches associated SCUK with insurance rather than professional development. This therefore is not a conclusive measure for an attitude of increased ‘professionalism’. However, given that over half the coaches were non-members, SportscoachUK gained some useful feedback on the need to promote awareness of its services to coaches, as all of these coaches had been involved in profiling and training opportunities funded by the NCF during CC.

Table 7.6: Coaches’ development since Champion Coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity since CC</th>
<th>% of coaches</th>
<th>N=65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of SCUK</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCUK/NCF workshop</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB update or training</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Profile Meeting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running Sport Workshop</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps of greater significance was that only 14% had taken part in a profile meeting, since CC ended, despite being involved in various forms of coaching since. This is an indicator that the good practice of Champion Coaching had not been sustained. Again, given that the group included some very active coaches, the proportion involved in development activity in general is somewhat disappointing. The fact that National Body updating or training had been accessed by only 35% of coaches in over 3 years gives rise to concern about the level of governing body support available or its promotion. Either coaches were not being presented with appropriate opportunities, or for whatever reason they were not unable to access them.

Responses from coaches shown on Table 7.7 also indicated that they perhaps did not receive NCFs message about the purpose and value of CC for coach development, as 37% indicated that the most valuable aspect of the Scheme was the development of coaching expertise, and only 9% the opportunity for coaching
scholarships. Scholarships were therefore unlikely to have been a motivating factor for the coaches.

Table 7.7: Most valuable aspect of the Champion Coaching for coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Identified as most valuable</th>
<th>Coaches (%)</th>
<th>N=67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Young People</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Opportunities for Juniors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of coaching expertise</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of national Programme</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for coaching scholarships</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the open comments on the questionnaires expanded on these comments:

"the Champion Coaching Scheme was an excellent concept for the development of potential (athletes) individuals. There was also the opportunity for me to teach and mentor junior coaches, but little or no opportunity to further develop my own skills, too many skill courses cancelled. (I'd been coaching 20 years before CC"

"I wrote the programme, introduced the skills, advanced the participants and mentored junior coaches, I enjoy coaching and promoting sport but got no development personally as a result (unpaid coach) working in schools but not a teacher"

Coach A, national group

This coach added:

"The scheme should not have been stopped. There is always a place for junior development without changing a proven system. The problem is coaches are used then abandoned, those controlling sport at LA level need to look more pro-actively at the coaching levels that are available"

Other coaches provided evidence as to the potential for CC to impact on individual coaches careers:

"I loved the programme and fully supported it. I wish I had been able to have done more of them. I have all my notes and info as memorabilia of a good time in my coaching career"

Coach B, national group
"CC was just as I'd qualified. It was a positive experience which gave me confidence to move onto bigger and more performance oriented based coaching"

Coach C, national group

7.2 Coaches Views on their experiences and the impacts of Champion Coaching

The following section summarises results from in depth and telephone interviews, with coaches in all schemes, and with Coach Development officers and Sports Development staff (A list of contacts interviewed in Appendix 11). Interviews lasted from thirty minutes to over an hour, and were conducted at the workplace or home of the coach, or at the office of the researcher, according to the coach's preference.

Recruitment onto CC and relationship to a career in coaching

Coaches for CC were recruited from various sources, but all of the head coaches, by virtue of needing to have certain qualifications and experience, were already known to or working for the Local Authorities. Their recruitment was through informal, personal contact, rather than any rigorous process of search and selection. Few coaches considered coaching was a 'career' for them, as they had had a main source of income from another occupation, often a very challenging one, which included officer in the RAF, social worker, manager and F.E. tutor. Two had become professional coaches after being involved with Champion Coaching: one professional, self-employed in cricket, the other employed by a major racquet sport group. The former had seen Champion Coaching as a catalyst to a career change, but not the cause, which was an unexpected redundancy. He remained very heavily committed to coaching as a career, as since going self-employed he had "loads of work". The second, subsequently had left coaching altogether, not having seen CC as being important to his career. Coaching young people was something he would have done anyway and CC was just another coaching job to him.

In the majority of cases, the head coaches, rather than the SDO, had recruited their assistants. This contact was made via their club, as a player, or through school. More often than not, the assistant coaches interviewed were not involved currently
in any formal coaching, and many had drifted away from coaching gradually since the end of the Scheme. They remained fairly interested however, in the possibility of doing more in future, and may have done more had they been asked. A recurring phrase in these interviews was, “no-one ever asked me…”, or “I’ve not heard from them”.

For some assistants, the demands of study or work (most were aged 17-19 at the time, so at the stage of leaving school or going off to University); for others the demands of family and home, or active children of their own, had halted, albeit temporarily, their coaching. CC had nevertheless been a positive experience for them.

Across the different local schemes, coaches showed similar patterns. Flintshire seemed to rely more heavily on younger assistant coaches, but this was found in the other two schemes. Therefore, we could consider this to be evidence of the recruitment policy working less effectively – younger coaches recruited into youth sport did not seem as likely to sustain a coaching career when they continued their studies, or gained employment. Those recruited as more mature ex-players would potentially continue, but they would have to be very well motivated and pro-active to do so, as they had to seek out their own opportunities to coach. These were usually as volunteers, at clubs or community venues rather than in opportunities offered by SD units. Nor did the Governing Bodies of their sport follow their progress, which may be considered a missed opportunity to capitalise on their increased experience, as few coaches had been contacted by their NGB since CC.

Though teachers were a small minority (echoing the survey), other coaches were also involved in education in a variety of roles; student, classroom assistant, learning mentor and others were intending to be teachers later. CC might have provided them a motive to get involved in coaching, to gain experience in working with young people. Recruitment from among council employees was a feature of the Knowsley scheme and to a lesser extent St Helens, where several coaches were working for the Borough in various capacities (social work, refuse collection, facility management, countryside ranger).
Few became involved with coaching as a result of their own child’s involvement in sport. Though many adult coaches were parents of children active in sport, CC had not involved their own children’s sport. If anything, parents were under pressure, due to demands on their time (for example, the netball and girls football coaches in St Helens), and coaching was actually quite difficult for them to balance with these responsibilities. For those with demanding ‘real jobs’, CC was a change or a contrast to their day-to-day role. There were those in what could be seen as complementary posts, for example, teaching assistant in a primary school, recreation supervisor or sports development officer. The relationship between CC and career was therefore very complex and clearly subject to significant influence by individual circumstances.

**Experiences of the scheme**

The experiences of the coaches were diverse across sports and case studies, as might be expected. Thoughts about their experiences were expressed as being filtered over time .... “it was a very long time ago…”, so answers had to be probed and developed – asking them to focus on what seemed important or lasting from their experience. What was clear for all the coaches was that though they found the experience of working with the children very positive, not all aspects of the Scheme were so successful, from their point of view. Many commented that the scheme was very helpful to them in their development as a coach:

“it made me more aware about beginners”

Hockey Coach, Knowsley.

“it gave me regular coaching… more confidence”

Cricket coach, Knowsley.

The scheme may have opened up new possibilities for them, or was seen as contributing to their overall personal development:

“it gave me more confidence, definitely”

Cricket Coach, St Helens

Confidence was certainly key to many coaches’ experiences. Though others were more neutral – they didn’t think that the Scheme made much difference, as they would have done these things anyway:

“I was already qualified and working towards a qualification, Champion Coaching didn’t push me any further”

Rugby Coach, Knowsley.
However, some had negative comments that did not match what NCF guidelines suggested should have been their experience. When asked about access to scholarships and training for example:

"no, it was never offered...... but anyway, I just didn’t have the time”

Hockey Coach, Knowsley.

“I had the basketball grade 2 from the start so I didn’t get offered any other staff development or training courses”

Basketball Coach, St Helens.

Some indicated they never had support from the governing body, either during or after the course, which echoed the comments in the survey. This suggested they represented a not insignificant minority and confirmed the concern that NGBs were unable to take over coach development when CC finished. These comments also confirmed that some coaches felt undervalued by their NGB.

Negative comments were in the minority, they tended to be about personal contact with the SD officer (or lack of it), or relationships with others in their sport – not inherently part of the Scheme, but how their interactions and relationships developed as part of coaching. When asked about their experience of the profiling meetings and scholarships for training, the interviews illuminated how coaches could not relate to this in their recollections of the Scheme. Some coaches indicated they could not remember any formal meeting for ‘profiling’, even if they knew that the SDO had taken information about their qualifications, and they had been “sent on loads of things” or “sent to some courses”. The impression given by these coaches is that the SD Officer made decisions about their development, rather than it being a joint process. Other coaches noted the help and guidance given by SD officers on their development, in identifying their choices, and the influence of Development Officers from their sport, or local coaching forums, in keeping them up to date with skills and knowledge.

Therefore guidance and support did not depend entirely on Champion Coaching, even if this was influential in this process, and the process was not as standardised as implied by the NCF guidance. The role of the SDO was clearly significant, as these quotes indicated:
“I mean, they’ve advised me and I’ve only got good things to say about Knowsley” Cricket Coach, Knowsley.

“Chris was very good on that” Girls Football Coach, Knowsley.

“Chris suggested I do this course” Water Polo Coach, Knowsley.

Similar comments were made by coaches in all three schemes. There were differences between sports. Cricket Coaches in St Helens and Knowsley made it clear meetings with the sport specific development officer influenced their development. Netball and athletics coaches in Flintshire were able to recall specific and positive interviews taking place, even if they didn’t remember their precise content. A key feature of the relationship was the encouragement offered by the SDOs to continue coaching and developing. This individual support indicated a growing level of trust and contributed to coaches’ expression of feeling they were valued by the SDOs.

However, as made clear by the SD Officers and the coaches themselves, this variation could as much an issue of recall and memory as of fact. The SDOs had recorded details of profile meetings, though they might have been conducted as informal ‘chats’ about development needs with coaches. In all three groups of coaches, the mechanism of profiling and access to scholarships seemed to be informal, and varied according to the style of the SD officer.

Though returns to NCF showed lists of courses and qualifications gained by the coaches, according to interviews, not many relied solely on the involvement with CC. The coaches did not always know that they had been ‘sent on’ a course that was part of a ‘scholarship’. Similarly they did not appreciate they would normally have been asked to pay to attend NCF workshops, and that this was part of their CC commitment.

There was little or no evidence that the SDOs had done any follow up with the coaches to see whether the courses had been helpful or influential in developing knowledge or practice. The SDOs may have conducted some observations or evaluations of the courses with the children, but these were not fed back to the
coaches, and not reported to NCF. One Flintshire netball coach referred to her own use of participant’s feedback on her coaching courses, but this wasn’t something she necessarily shared with the SDO.

Sometimes this could have negative consequences for coaches. One of the hockey coaches in St Helens for example, was never fully debriefed on the courses she had been responsible for, and from her point of view they had been run very well and were successful with the children. However, the new SDO was concerned that the quality of the courses was not as high as they should be, and consequently discontinued employing this coach when Active Sport appeared. Although she was appropriately qualified according to her governing body, he felt there were better qualified and more experienced coaches available. The lasting impression, however, was that she was badly treated and in some way undervalued for her contribution:

“he completely just dropped me, I did feel quite hurt, I suppose”
Hockey Coach, St Helens.

In his interview, the SDO who took over youth sport and coaching made clear his concerns about her ability as a coach, a view based on observations, his own coaching experience, and awareness of negative feedback from some participants. Because his own criteria for the quality of coaching: “would you be happy with them coaching your own children? ” was not met, he found a replacement for the Active Sport programme, even though he did not discuss this with the coach concerned, and she remained ignorant of any problems. As a high performance coach, his view of coaching ability may have been very different from his colleagues. Therefore, while on paper, the coach development process may have been followed, in practice, the experience varied greatly between sports and local schemes. In all three areas, the process had not worked as well once CC ended, despite positive impacts at the time.

**Impacts on coaching career – what coaches felt they got out of Champion Coaching**

In all three schemes, all coaches noted that the main thing they had gained was ‘experience’, and all noted their confidence had improved, even those for whom
as discussed above, the experience had been less positive. The ‘experience’ they gained was in working with young people in a sustained programme, working to a predetermined aim (for Merseyside coaches, working towards the MYG) and using the development template of each governing body. Not all templates were found to be suitable for the children they worked with, and these coaches saw the experience of designing and delivering a more appropriate model of course as positive and developmental for them.

The impact on subsequent careers or engagement with coaching was less clear and more varied. Experienced head coaches, working in sports involved with Active Sport/Merseysport, were still heavily committed to coaching and developing other coaches, but they were the minority of interviewees. They were involved in sport specific coaching forums, or as coach tutors or mentors. Only some of this involvement could be attributed to Champion Coaching, however, since some felt that this was a natural progression of their own involvement over time. It might be that the coaches concerned - in cricket, for example, were benefiting from the situation of their sport as part of Active Sport:

“I sit on both their (Knowsley and St Helens) development groups as a coach... I think it’s basically my duty to be there to find out what’s going on in the town”
Cricket Coach, St Helens.

“I sit on the Merseyside development committee because I mean, I’ve developed quite a bit since then. I’m now secretary of the Cricket Coaches Association, so I’m quite busy”
Cricket Coach, Knowsley.

Not all sports had their own coaching groups, and not all coaches were so active as the Cricket coaches in them, for example, the Netball coaches. But these forums were a positive factor in developing coaches since CC. As few participant courses were being run by the local authorities (outside Active Sport on Merseyside), paid appointments as coaches may have reduced, leading to less emphasis on continuing development activities and fewer coaching awards. In Flintshire, where there was no real replacement for Champion Coaching, the opportunities were much more limited, and dependant on clubs obtaining Lottery funding. Consequently there was less potential for coaches to continue with development courses or qualifications.
Another group emerged from the interviews who were now involved in what they called "helping out". They had no formal coaching role, but were "helping out" in clubs, schools, or colleges where they had personal contact, e.g. their children's school or their old club, or the club they were still playing for. These were the coaches who had not been followed up by the governing bodies or local authorities, but who, through their actions had shown that they had some interest and commitment to a 'helping' role in coaching. 'Helping out' could be seen as a precursor to getting more involved in coaching, but some necessary conditions would appear to be lacking to convert interest into active coaching: family circumstances, contacts with sports governing bodies, and proactive SDOs or clubs. These coaches said things like, "no-one ever asked me", or "I never heard from them". Of course, a minority of them had consciously chosen not to continue or to reduce their involvement. These were often, but not exclusively, assistant level coaches, who saw their involvement with the Scheme as much less relevant to their eventual careers, or they found that demands of these careers such that they dropped coaching.

Therefore three groups of coaches could be identified on the basis of this analysis: *Active and committed* (4 or 5 in the interview group); *Irregular/Helpers (3 or 4 interviewees, with some more in the telephone group); and *Not involved/Sporadic* (only one or two interviewed and several more over the telephone). The final group was likely to be underrepresented in the interviews as these were the group most difficult to make contact with, along with the coaches who were too busy, for whatever reason to respond to requests to get involved with the study. Apparently important to which group coaches belonged was their relationship with the SDO or the NGB. Those in closer contact were in the active/committed group. The Regional DO was relevant for several coaches in different sports, who recognised the role as important particularly for newly qualified coaches, even if they were critical in their comments:

"you know, they (development officers for the sport) should be monitoring them (newly qualified coaches)"

Netball Coach, Knowsley.

The current role and involvement of coaches was shown to be a function of diverse factors, operating at both individual and structural levels. At the
individual level these seemed to be influencing both the personal and social capital associated with coaching: that is, the perceived value of coaching to the individual and the social status and recognition afforded them in the community because of their skills and commitment. At the structural level, these factors were concerned with the role and influence of the agencies and organisations that created or supported coaching opportunities. The individual factors were:

- Family and home circumstances (e.g. role as carer, parent or wage earner was in conflict for some, but supportive for others)
- Job and alternative career (sometimes in conflict, sometimes complementary)
- Educational background, influencing the perception of coaching as a potential career or having professional status (e.g. whether educated to degree level or above - there were several examples where coaches had a degree in teaching, social or sports science, but others had no professional or academic qualifications).

These factors seem to influence motivations for coaching and coaches’ attitudes toward it as an interest, where they expected no financial reward, alternative occupation or potential career (as indicated by Lyle et al, 1997).

Some differences were found between men and women coaches in how these influences interacted, in that the women were more likely to discuss problems of balancing home and family commitments and their coaching, a situation highlighted in the work of West and Brackenridge (1991) and White et al (1989). The problem was exacerbated for women who had no other qualifications, but was also be seen with well-qualified women coaches:

“It’s OK for the men isn’t it? I now find its very, very hard to do everything and my health has suffered a little bit because I was never having a break”

Girls Football Coach, St Helens.

However, male coaches did identify the importance of having a supportive family “who put up with a lot”. It was clear that all coaches had to some extent, balance conflicting demands.
Champion Coaching involvement had little impact on motivation to coach, even though it was paid; payment seemed a relatively minor concern, to both men and women: "it was a few extra bob, but the money wasn’t important". More important was the fact that the courses required a significant and regular commitment from them, and in turn the SDO showed faith and trust in them by retaining them for more courses or offering new opportunities. The investment and recognition this represented appeared to motivate coaches to continue, rather than any material reward. Several coaches were very proud of their association with Champion Coaching and identified strongly with it. One netball coach for example, wore her CC sweatshirt during the interview.

The structural factors that appeared to affect how coaches’ careers had been impacted by CC were: having a regional coaching forum, SDO policies, a regional network and club infrastructure. If this forum was in place and the NGBs supported coaches, as in cricket, the coaches were positive about their development opportunities. If the SDO was pro-active in maintaining contact with coaches and engaging them in training and development, they were more likely still to be involved, if not coaching with the LA, then elsewhere, even if this was irregular or voluntary rather than paid. Where the clubs and opportunities continued in a well-resourced infrastructure in clubs, coaches remained involved and active. For example, though no longer involved in the girls football, the (male) coach still had plenty of opportunity through local clubs and professional academies to continue with his coaching career.

**Coaching and development activity since CC**

It is difficult to trace specific impacts from the mechanisms used in the Scheme on the coaching reported in the interviews. The level and volume of coaching was not linked in a simple cause and effect relationship, but was multi-faceted, as noted above and subject to many influences. The fact that coaches were given some consideration of their individual development needs, whether or not they were always aware of this process, resulted in a diverse range of experiences and perceptions of the Scheme. The fact that their needs were considered at all, was quite a distinct feature of CC but one they often didn’t always seem to appreciate: “It was all about the kids”. was a typical response, echoing the results from the
survey, that generally coaches saw CC as developing opportunities for youth sport, rather than developing themselves, despite NCF or local SDU objectives.

According to the programme theory, being profiled and receiving development opportunities should lead to more coaching or coaching at a higher level. Though there was some evidence of this, there was equally evidence that it did not happen for various reasons. Several coaches, already active and qualified, perceived no impact of the Scheme on their own development, but identified instead that their personal motivation was the most important factor in keeping up to date and seeking out development, or doing more coaching. However, being profiled and encouraged did seem to reinforce the motivation to continue for coaches entering coaching.

A measure of whether coaches had a more positive attitude to continual professional development, was how far they continued to seek and engage in development opportunities. The survey had indicated this was very limited, though when explored in the interviews, various factors emerged that helped explain this. Even though many coaches commented on the need to keep developing to support their coaching and demonstrated quite positive attitudes to self development, they recognised some barriers: resources, like the money needed to pay for courses; an unsupportive governing body; barriers of time for family or work commitments; and coaching itself, which reduced time for development. Champion Coaching had provided some respite from the first and second, but did not impact on the final ones. Hence, except for the very active and committed, few coaches could justify taking part in development activities oriented around coach education courses, even if they thought them potentially useful. Several coaches had a positive experience of mentoring, even though this had not been a formal part of CC, it was more geared to their individual needs. They supported a move towards more individualised approaches to development, noted by Schembri (2002).

Most coaches saw that the really important aspects of developing oneself as a coach were personal motivation and an attitude of self-reflection. This could help overcome the barriers noted above, and was necessary to remain open to new ideas and receptive to changing and developing practice, as illustrated thus:
“I think myself, my own interest in it, wanting to better myself, always learning, always looking at others and picking ideas up, noting them down and putting them in practice”

Girls Football Coach, Knowsley.

Similar sentiments were expressed by cricket, hockey, netball and basketball coaches, male and female, of different ages and backgrounds.

Continuation or Disengagement with coaching

Despite the low levels of CPD engaged in since CC, few coaches had disengaged completely from coaching, though several were reducing their involvement or had temporarily withdrawn due to particular circumstances (for example, completing a degree or overcoming the loss of a partner). Such disengagement occurred when the costs of continuing were considered too high compared to the benefits gained, as explained by social exchange theory (Weiss and Stevens, 1993). These coaches referred to feeling they had given enough, particularly if their efforts were going unrecognised:

“enough was enough... I ended up feeling... you’re undervalued...you’re undervalued because you have an opinion that you’re not able to put forward”

Netball Coach, Flintshire.

Other reasons for disengagement included, not enough support from the governing body, a feeling of being put upon by parents who took their efforts for granted, or conflicts with others in the club or sport. These illustrate the importance of personal relationships to the coaches and their impact on motivation to continue, as indicated by Schmidt (2002) when discussing altruistic behaviour. Individuals would be less likely to continue where such altruism went unrecognised. One of the coaches who had disengaged completely despite having gained a degree in Sports Science, had never seen coaching as a career, but as something she did to help her with the degree programme. This was what Schmidt (2002) termed ‘self utility’ motivation. She was now working in accountancy and there was no place for coaching in a busy professional life, where she struggled to find the time to play her own sport.

Those who were doing less frequent coaching expressed dissatisfaction with their NGB, from whom they had heard nothing for over three years since CC ended.
Coaches saw this as an indicator of the low regard they were held in by their sport, even though they had worked for its development. Clearly this contributed to a perception of being undervalued, particularly when opportunities to develop oneself in coaching come at a high price, in finance and time. This was something that even the coaches who were committed and involved still recognised:

“I used to be involved – I was on the Cricket Development group, but obviously with me workload as it is, I’ve missed two meetings... but I’m up for Development all the time, the more people throw at me, the more I’ll try to do”

Cricket Coach, St Helens

Being paid for coaching, as noted above, seemed to have only a marginal impact on the decisions to coach or not. Two of the netball coaches mentioned it might be nice to have payment for coaching, or the opportunity to earn some money from it, but implied that this would be a bonus, rather than a reason for doing it. An experienced girls football coach discussed the financial aspects of coaching, identifying this as contributory to her giving up her regular coaching commitments to her club - the need to earn a regular income from her full time employment limited the time spent on voluntary coaching and any associated development activity:

“Opportunities are just not there to go full time in football............would love to be able to do it, but I can’t give up work...”

Girls Football Coach, St Helens.

Working to support her family meant that coaching other people’s children had to come second to supporting the sporting career of her own child:

“one of my problems at the time.. there was only me (earning) and it was a case of do I enhance my own coaching for the sake of it, because it’s a lot of money to take your badges....So my choice was no, I didn’t take the extra badges, which I probably wish I had done, but it was never even offered, somebody never offered to help me out with that”

Girls Football Coach, St Helens.

Coaches who remained active clearly had a strong sense of purpose and commitment to coaching, to the point that they would do it full time, if they could. This was found in male and female coaches in different sports. For example, a male Girls Football coach noted how attractive a career in sport would be and, with early retirement (from local government) a possibility, he saw the
opportunity to earn even a modest income from football quite beguiling. But this was likely to be with a professional club’s Youth Academy, where he already worked part time, and not in community coaching, or a voluntary club. He voiced his views of his Borough’s investment in new sport facilities, as providing an alternative to his current job, “I’d love to get a full time job from what I’m doing now to that industry...I’d even sweep the floors”.

One of the cricket coaches was already a full time self-employed coach and the other was contemplating a career change to sports development, to enable him to get more involved with coaching and his sport, so rewarding had he found it, since becoming involved in CC. These coaches clearly saw coaching as a worthwhile and sufficiently rewarding career and a realistic alternative to their previous roles.

7.3 Who supports coaches? The roles of agencies and organisations in coach development

Despite the many positive experiences on CC, one of the more disappointing aspects of the coaches’ interviews was the negative view of the NGBs in the ongoing development of coaches. Almost all the sports involved had provided very little support to these coaches since the end of the Scheme. Many coaches had had no contact at all, others limited information (for example, they may have received a newsletter), but not personal contact. Only the active and committed coaches were involved in development at significant levels, and so had regular contact with their NGB. However, even these coaches were not always positive about this contact or the role of the NGB in the sport. Exceptions to this were the FA (by the male coach only) and the ECB. Even so, the positive views expressed were about individual regional or county development officers, rather than the governing body per se. Though it is clear this is the perception of these coaches, it is nonetheless a criticism of the process of coach development that CC was part of, which must be recognised. It was not possible to include the views of development officers for every sport, though several coaches had acted in a developmental role and so were asked about that in their interviews. This lack of support for coaches from NGBs appeared to be a significant gap, which undermined the potential of CC to achieve its coach development objectives.
The interview with the Regional Coaching Development Officer (RCDO) for SCUK confirmed that progress had been made with sports-specific development through the County Partnerships for Active Sport and through coaching forums, but clearly, these improvements were not necessarily impacting on coaches who had been through the CC process. The Coach Management Information System (CMIS), a database developed for Active Sport coaches, was not linked to the profiles of coaches from CC, so they did not necessarily track its coaches. Also it was not clear how this information was being used to develop coaches proactively, something which was later taken up with the Merseysport/AS officers. This seemed partly to do with issues of data protection and problems of updating information regularly. This data was not necessarily the same as that held by the governing bodies, as the information was available only to the partnerships in Active Sport. This lack of pro-activity by governing bodies in seeking to identify, encourage and support individual coaches, therefore may have contributed to the coaches’ perceptions of being undervalued, and thus more inclined to leave coaching. However, this is not a clear-cut relationship, as some coaches did not say a lack of such contact impacted on their coaching commitments.

Nor had the SDOs kept in touch with all the coaches, as evidenced by the difficulties in contacting coaches for this research. The coaches interviewed included some who had had no contact with the relevant SDO since the Scheme ended, as well as others who were in regular contact, and involved with current programmes like Active Sport. Such contact seemed to depend upon the interest of the SD Unit in that particular sport and the specific coach concerned, that is, not in a systematic process. There was much less work on coach development in individual Boroughs in Merseyside, after the development of the Merseysport partnership for AS, which contributed to fewer individual contacts with coaches. Local and individual approaches had been replaced with a regionally based coach development strategy, which involved sport-specific development and generic activities, like child protection training and profiling. The SDOs still carried out profiling but the results were collated centrally, and there were central systems to identify training needs or coach education required.
According to the SDOs, corroborated by the RCDO, and the Active Sport Manager, the new Active Sport partnerships, including that for Merseyside, were "integrating coach development activities across the boroughs much more effectively". This integration included recruitment, profiling and coach education, planned and implemented on a sub-regional, Merseyside basis. As a result, when coaching courses or other activities were planned, they were more cost-effective in terms of take up and according to the needs of the Partnership as a whole. Employment practice was also standardised across the Boroughs, so they dealt with coaches in the same way, even if working for different authorities. Previously, courses may have been planned by individual Boroughs, but then cancelled due to the small numbers that could be recruited locally. Those involved with CC had taken lessons from their experience and applied this to the new systems. For example, the acting head of Merseysport, previously the SDO in St Helens, noted that systems for profiling and supporting coaches were based on her experience of what was successful and what was not, in St Helens. This was applied to all sports in Merseyside, regardless of whether they were part of AS. She indicated they focused on the processes, rather than just operating under the banner of a particular scheme, like Active Sport (AS was not referred to in their publicity as a conscious effort to develop their own identity for their programmes and a systems). However, the development of coaches on Merseyside was not without criticism, as indicated by the comments of the netball coach:

"sports development just doesn’t work with county netball...they put on a level one and that’s it, they don’t seem to follow it up and say, ‘how long is it since they did that level one’, we need to get in touch with them and say, ‘now you did your level one, are you coaching at present?’" Netball Coach, Knowsley.

There appeared to be some confusion or difference of view as to whose role it was to follow up coaches and develop them further. Roles and responsibilities for coaching in the governing body, the partnership and the Local Authority seemed to remain unclear and fragmented, and as a result, some coaches appeared to fall down these gaps. Therefore, though CC may have contributed to developing networks for coaching, it had not been entirely successful for individual coaches. The senior netball coach seemed to think it was not the role of the county NGB,
run as it was, by voluntary staff, to follow these coaches up, but of the professional SD staff, employed by the Partnership, about whom she was very critical.

Though this could be seen as an issue for netball, arguably there were similar issues for other sports, not just on Merseyside, for example, girls football and basketball. Some aspects of Champion Coaching, for example the need to meet annually with coaches, effectively ended once the NCF funding finished. The Flintshire SDO admitted that because of changes in staffing and pressure from other priorities, once the requirement for annual meetings was lifted, they were discontinued, as the time and resources could not be justified. Though the profiling system was adopted by the Merseysport partnership, not all qualified coaches had been profiled, and it did not always involve a one-to-one meeting with each coach.

The completion of a form by the SDO at a meeting with coaches (often several at a time), is recorded as having happened by Merseysport, then sent to be inputted on the CMIS database by SCUK. The SDO in St Helens assumes that this is data is being monitored by someone else, as he doesn’t have access to it himself, though he can call for a report. The database itself is apparently quite difficult to interrogate, as Merseysport was unable to provide a breakdown of their profiled coaches, by sport and level of coaching, for comparison with the Champion Coaching coaches. A breakdown of coaches was however, provided by the coach development officer for Merseyside. This showed 32% were female and 68% male (from almost 500 profiled across 10 Active Sports).

The CMIS enables the Partnership to identify the coaches in each sport and record the training they completed during the year. However, how far this enables individual coaches to be tracked and monitored is far from clear. A factor highlighted by the RCDO and the Merseyside CDO is that the inputting and updating of data is quite time consuming and labour intensive and due to the lapse of time before updating the data, is often not up to date. Even with such developments, there remains a gap in supporting coaches in their development and
some confusion over whose role it is to offer the support coaches clearly valued while on CC.

**Coaches' views of pathways**

The coaches provided some excellent insight into the development of pathways in the case study schemes, as they were often involved with clubs or county development squads. Many of the Champion Coaching coaches on Merseyside were also team coaches for the MYG squads, one of the key exit routes for the children. The resultant outcomes from the perspective of the coaches was however, somewhat mixed. The pathways experienced by the children differed, due to differences between sports or the local environments. For example, for cricket in Knowsley, it was always going to be difficult to develop club membership, as there were only two or three clubs in the whole Borough (one being technically in another district) and not all of them were receptive to creating new opportunities for under 13’s. The coaches therefore focused on the MYG team as the exit route. In contrast, St Helens had some good club opportunities in cricket and more clubs with an interest in gaining members. The eventual development of a younger age group “town team” and development squad for St Helens, was a result of the development work with the clubs and schools that started with Champion Coaching. Similarly, there were more opportunities in basketball in the Borough, in clubs and schools.

Coaches recognised even with sports within the Active Sport framework, changes in pathways had not always been effective or sustained. CC had provided a good pathway for girls to clubs in football in Knowsley and St Helens, but those links were changed when schools rather than clubs became the focus for recruiting girls. In St Helens at least, this had meant that the club previously gaining young members from Champion Coaching was getting fewer girls coming through, according to the club coaches. As noted in Chapter Six, the Merseysport Manager, formerly the SDO for St Helens) recognised that the pathways established were not well sustained in some sports.

Many of the coaches spoke very positively about their role in facilitating and encouraging young people onto pathways in their sport:
"I tried to make sure that I gave them information about which clubs they could go to..."  
Hockey coach, St Helens

Coaches saw that they could recognise and help to develop talented young people who had not been spotted by existing talent ID processes. Several noted examples of where they had encouraged youngsters to go on to clubs or development squads, but very little was mentioned about their communications with parents. This reinforced the impression gained from the surveys of children and parents, that perhaps the coaches did not always include the parents in this process. One netball coach noted that when parents asked for advice, she was happy to recommend clubs where she felt the youngster could benefit. Others briefly mentioned talking to parents, when asked ‘did you have much contact with parents?’ one of the girls football coaches said:

“Yes, well, when I say that, just they would ask you how we were doing and that was it basically”  
Girls Football coach, Knowsley.

He saw any more than this level of contact to be the role of the head coach. For several coaches, though they had wanted clubs to come to CC sessions, they met with limited success.

As noted in the earlier section, while coaches seemed to appreciate CC had a dual purpose, their own development was very much secondary to those of the children taking part, or even to the pathways established. The purpose of the Scheme, as they saw it, was really about this opportunity for youngsters to progress to the next level, particularly for those who were not already involved in club sport. However, the more active coaches seemed to see CC as a more holistic process and that this was where it had an advantage over other programmes they had been involved in. This was summed up in a comment from the questionnaire:

“CC enabled me to identify something I could excel at. It gave me the foundation to get involved with youth and club coaching and as a result I moved into elite coaching both at senior and junior level. CC is one of the best schemes ever designed as it develops both participants and coaches”  
Hockey Coach (Flintshire).
However, many coaches commented that even though some good exit routes were available while Champion Coaching was running, they had not all survived the period of time since the scheme ended (3 to 4 years previously). As a result, though it was a good scheme for developing pathways, it did not always live up to its potential:

“Whilst Champion Coaching was good, there was no continuity afterwards...no opportunities and no pathways.”
Netball Coach, St Helens.

“Once Champion Coaching had finished they were lost because there was nowhere to divert them to in the town”
Girls Football, St Helens.

“It took three years to create the opportunity for relationships with education, governing bodies of sport in St Helens – establish pockets of clubs and then it was just whipped from underneath you. It wasn’t a sustainable programme...”
Merseysport Manager/St Helens SDO.

So lack of sustainability of the pathways was attributed to lack of funding, changes in priorities and lack of infrastructure in the clubs. In Flintshire, where the Scheme had not been replaced, this lack of sustained outcomes was shown even more clearly. The better resourced sports, or where there was an established programme, showed some continuity, but this was evident only recently, with increased numbers of SDOs and increased funding through the Lottery being diverted to club development. In Merseyside, the development of sport specific development groups and coaching forums contributed to recent improvements in pathways, but clearly gaps remained, as shown in the strategy for development of sport on Merseyside (Merseysport, 2003). Much greater emphasis was being placed on club development work than they had been able to complete in CC.

*Coaching Development – a legacy in systems and processes?*

An outcome of the Scheme for coaching development could be seen as the development of a strategy or plan for coaching by the authorities concerned, which was achieved in all three cases. Coaching remains important to all three
local authorities, and they had plans and systems in place, using the good practice of CC and SCUK.

The adoption of the practices of coach profiling and increasing use of coach mentoring could be seen as evidence of this, even though mentoring was not always formalised in Champion Coaching. The support offered to coaches had varied, even though in theory they were all involved in the same Scheme. In general, however, they were profiled, access to training and development was available for those deemed to need it, and coaches developed new skills and knowledge, experience and confidence. As a result of these mechanisms, individual social capital had clearly grown. For the development of individual coaches, the support from an SDO was clearly very important.

However, some went on to do more coaching or to coach at higher level, others did not. For those already coaching at a high level, CC had little impact. The impact therefore appears to have been more on the processes developed and the experience of implementation gained by the SD professionals; the SDOs, Coach Development Officers and managers of schemes. Interviews indicated that the processes to develop coaching had been improved as a result of their experience. On Merseyside for example, this had contributed to forming sports-specific groups and coaching forums.

There was little evidence to suggest that Champion Coaching resulted in any substantial growth of the coaching resource working in the community, though training and development may have improved this resource in quality. However, this quality was never objectively measured. Therefore, the schemes’ contribution to developing ‘social capital’ in local communities appears to be limited. For some sports there was arguably a certain amount of ‘recycling’ of existing resource, as coaches were diverted to youth programmes from existing club commitments, but this represented limited growth if measured by recruitment of new coaches.

Though an increased profile or status for coaching was difficult to see for those outside the immediate policy and professional network, the RCDO indicated
coaching now had a higher profile with local authorities, the government and sports, as evidenced by the report of the Coaching Task Force (CTF, 2002), the commitment of significant funding for its recommendations and the recognition given to coaching in the Active Sport plans of Partnerships. However, even where Champion Coaching was perceived as a success by these local authorities, they were not able to claim an consistently higher profile for coaching in their area or nationally because of it. As the CTF report did not refer to CC, follow up enquiries with the DCMS indicated that it had not been an explicit part of the Task Force deliberations (Conway, 2003, personal communication, 5/12/03). Additional discussions with a senior CTF member confirmed that referral to CC would have been counter-productive, as their intention was to move coaching forward, rather than be seen to repackage an existing scheme (Campbell, personal communication, 28/05/04). Other senior figures in the CTF clearly contributed lessons from CC in more subtle ways, as many had some involvement with CC over the course of its implementation from 1991-1999.

Unfortunately coaching remains dominated by the adoption of output-based measures such as the numbers of coaches profiled, or the numbers of coaches who have achieved minimum operating standards (by attendance) at various child protection, first aid or equity training events, as there has been limited attention to how coaches or athletes/participants are impacted on by such training, particularly at lower levels of participation.

The impacts on the practice of coaches on Active Sport programmes is not actively measured or tracked, though their opinions about their training needs are gathered through surveys (SCUK, 2002) or profile forms. It is not clear how far this is improving the quality of coaching for young people and seems to present little difference to the situation prior to Champion Coaching.

Arguably the process coaches were engaged in has improved and become more standardised, partly due to the experience of those responsible for implementing the new Active Sports scheme. Those concerned clearly and explicitly linked the development of implementation policies in Merseyside to Champion Coaching. Though Flintshire did not have the same support to coaching from SCUK systems,
not having a replacement for CC, it developed its coach development practices using templates provided by CC.

While interviews showed consensus among coaches that this was a successful Scheme in developing opportunities for young people, they were less clear on the impacts it had for coaching. There still seemed to be gaps in terms of coach retention and continued development, which appear to be a missed opportunity.

Coaches identified that difficulties they encountered in maintaining their development were at both individual and structural levels. Individual circumstances were influential in whether or not they continued to coach and seek development. However, there were also structural problems, where apparently overlapping responsibilities for coaching development remained at Borough, Partnership or sport/regional levels. The picture is somewhat confused for coaches and those responsible for their development. Though recent changes have attempted to clarify these roles, it is too early to see if these will work more effectively (CTF, 2002; DCMS, 2003).

There were clear differences in the legacy of support offered to coaches in different sports. In these case studies the outcomes achieved in coaching development have been limited due to the nature of the sports selected (often female oriented), or the resources available for the sport to support coach education or development activities, and to track or monitor coaches.

7.4 Conclusions about Champion Coaching’s impacts on coach and coaching development

In terms of the development of the individual coaches involved, there were some very positive results achieved in all three case study schemes. Coaches gained in experience and confidence, were able to access a range of courses and qualifications, and showed that this had had a positive impact on their future careers and their coaching in the sport. However, the impacts were not seen on all coaches, and the survey and interviews were able to shed more light on why and how the process varied and the different outcomes it produced.
The interaction of several factors identified by coaches as influential in their ability and interest to continue coaching once the Scheme ended included personal and structural or environmental aspects. Personal factors were their own circumstances, home and family commitments and careers outside coaching. Structural and environmental factors included the role of agencies and their interrelationships, the level of support from key agencies and individuals, the local opportunities and infrastructure including clubs.

Coaching Development was the development of systems and processes to progress the ‘profession’ of coaching. In this respect, Champion Coaching seemed to have been successful in increasing the profile of coaching with the local authorities, and government policy makers, mainly through the influence of key individuals who gained experience of implementing CC. The current strategies for coach recruitment, development, and management practice were based on what was deemed good practice in Champion Coaching. However, assessing good practice seemed to be based on the subjective reflections of the SD professionals concerned, with coaches having only limited input in this process and other stakeholders, such as clubs, having only a marginal voice.

The interviews showed that the challenges of ‘professionalising’ an essentially voluntary occupation (in the community and club settings) can lead to conflicts and constraints of time and resources on individual coaches, which in turn, can lead to some choosing to disengage from coaching. Key to retaining coaches was maintaining a sense of value and recognition through regular face-to-face contact. The profile and status of coaching had been improved in these districts, but it was difficult to see outside the professional sport development sphere, as public awareness and increased status for coaching was difficult to discern. The tangible support for development of coaches varied substantially between sports and districts, which added to the problems of coaches at the community/club level. An impact of the move to compulsory registration therefore, may be a reduction in coaches willing to volunteer their services, whether paid or unpaid. The more coaching is seen as a professional role, with demanding qualification and regulatory processes, prospective coaches will have to decide whether investing in their personal development will reap appropriate rewards. For many, coaching
will always be secondary to their main occupation and it is at the lower levels of participation and performance that this conflict will be seen more clearly.

There is some evidence from the SDOs that the experience of working through the Champion Coaching process contributed to the Active Sport planning process. But AS was seen by the SDOs as a much more holistic and integrated approach to sport development than Champion Coaching and therefore more able to overcome its perceived weaknesses. This again was based on the subjective views of SD officers or SCUK officers, due to a lack of any objective data. Though CC was not referred to in the CTF report (CTF, 2002) a lack of evidence was alluded to:

“there should be more follow up evaluation to courses with a view to identifying how coaches may have changed in the longer term as a result of the courses” (CTF, 2002:77).

There remains an apparent fragmentation of policy in coaching, despite the lessons learned by individual officers, departments or agencies. Therefore we must conclude, despite its many significant successes, at local or individual level, the impact of the Champion Coaching Scheme on policy remains hidden and implicit rather than part of an overt rational process of policy development. The final chapter of this thesis examines this policy process in youth and coaching, using CC as its focus, within a realist framework.
Chapter Eight  The impacts and legacy of Champion Coaching

8.0 Introduction

This chapter sets out the conclusions about Champion Coaching, using middle-range theory, concentrating on the meso level impacts of the Scheme on policy making and policy learning in youth sport and coaching. It begins with conclusions on the outcomes achieved in each case, using the realist approach, linking what was achieved in each area with the inputs and mechanisms used, in order to draw out what worked, for whom, in what circumstances. How this evidence could contribute to a 'realist synthesis' in sport policy (Pawson, 2002) is also indicated. This fulfils the first major aim of the research, which is to examine how well Champion Coaching achieved its objectives in youth sport and coaching and make some contribution to understanding how such schemes work.

In the earlier section, the emphasis of analysis is the mechanisms of causality and evidence underpinning the development of policy based on the work of Pawson and Tilley (1997). I further explore how policy in youth sport and coaching continues to be shaped, whether by epistemic communities (Haas, 1992) or policy actors working together in issue networks (Houlihan, 2000). In Section 8.2, I examine the emergence of more powerful and influential individuals, communities or coalitions emerging in youth sport since the termination of CC, which draws on the literature in Chapters Two and Four. In this section the emphasis is on the analysis of, rather than for policy, and so uses the meso-level analytical concepts and frameworks identified in 2.2, consistent with the realist approach to policy analysis. Later sections consider methodological issues, limits to the research undertaken and include some self-reflection on the learning process undertaken. Lessons learned for subsequent evaluations are presented as suggestions for additional research and to provide some recommendations that can help facilitate greater evidence-based practice in sport. As Pawson (2002) succinctly identified, "evidence, whether new or old, rarely speaks for itself" and this research attempts to contribute to a critical, theory-led evaluation approach in sport policy, by highlighting lessons from this significant sport programme.
8.1 Contexts, mechanisms and outcomes across the case study schemes

The following sections are each devoted to a case study, in order to synthesise findings as a matrix of contexts, mechanisms and outcomes (CMO) for the Scheme and to appreciate the unique characteristics of each implementation. In this way, suggested Pawson and Tilley (1997), a more complete understanding of how the mechanisms have worked (or not) can be achieved, and there is more potential for generalizing lessons for schemes seeking to use these mechanisms in similar contexts. Patterns of outcomes are inevitably unique however, as there can be no exact replication of complex interactions of people, resources and circumstances in multi-site schemes. CC’s mechanisms operated in three main areas; the development of players/participants, the development of coaches and the development of the sports. Conclusions of these are shown in Tables 8.1-8.3 and Figure 8.1 summarises across the three cases, the CMO configuration for the Scheme.

**St Helens**

Despite limitations in facilities and venues, those who attended Champion Coaching courses and their parents, were very positive, about the quality of the experience. More than 90% of children enjoyed the courses and 70% were members of a club when surveyed, which was a higher figure than the national average for club membership (Sport England, 2003), that found by Buller and Collins (2000), or suggested by other authors with adolescents in the UK (Kremer *et al*, 1997; Daley, 2002). The range of exit routes enjoyed, including the MYG and development squads showed that courses were successful in integrating with other performance opportunities in the Borough. SDOs attributed this to the development of links between schools and clubs, facilitated by the funding from NCF and the quality of coaching provided. Children going on to clubs were very positive about them, with evidence that they were ‘youth friendly’ and thus encouraged continued participation.

The distribution of participants showed that not all young people in St Helens had equal ability to access CC for various reasons, illuminated in visits to schools: lack of promotion in schools, no specific targeting by SDOs, lack of support from parents, or lack of interest in the sports offered. Where schools used similar, low
key promotion, the take up of courses by children varied according to their interests and resources.

St Helens was among the most deprived districts in England, but the distribution of participants was skewed towards the more affluent parts of the Borough. However, there were some participants from every ward and even from deprived areas of neighbouring Boroughs, so any material or structural barriers had been overcome by these children. There was no significant difference in club membership for children living in the more deprived areas. Therefore, having taken part in CC, children were able to demonstrate the long-term engagement with organised sport out of school that indicated that effective sporting pathways had been established.

Though there was some evidence from teachers and SDOs that the SD Unit had not originally planned CC closely with schools, experience had reinforced the need for better co-operation, and led to more effective links being developed in subsequent schemes. Some problems remained with the monitoring of participants. The SD Unit was unable to provide data on participation by school or area, or to identify participation in sports programmes by those in receipt of benefits, except for their own Leisure Key Card holders, which indicated a persistent gap in programme evaluation and monitoring processes.

Local clubs in the sports selected for CC had varied capacity and interest in developing youth opportunities. As a result, improvements in access to clubs were not sustained once funding was withdrawn. For example, though there were more youth sections in some sports compared to 1998/99, others showed no increase. Pathways were established in sports with already well-resourced club base, or a stronger infrastructure of facilities in community sports centres, or where subsequent schemes (such as Active Sport) had continued development. For example, children, teachers and coaches indicated strong pathways in cricket and basketball but they were less clear in girls football and netball.

In developing coaches and coaching, St Helens had both successes and failures. The experience of working for CC was clearly beneficial to most coaches, many
of whom continued to be involved with coaching locally. Focusing on developing and retaining a relatively small number of coaches contributed to growing club membership through establishing long-term engagement in organised sport. As the Scheme grew, courses were offered to the same groups of children, to enable the coach to work at progressively higher levels, and establish longer-term relationships with the young people. This provided evidence of a growth in the personal social capital of coaches, which underpinned CC objectives. Despite this, as the majority of coaches had another occupation, there remained a problem in meeting the demand for coaches in early evening or daytime periods – so social capital growth had not been built upon.

Though coaches were very positive about the support and encouragement from the SDOs, some did not feel this continued after the Scheme. Also, scholarships and additional courses were limited, because coaches either had the necessary qualifications already, or NGB courses were not available. For these coaches, involvement with coaching had reduced, or reverted to more informal helping at clubs, and they had undergone little or no personal development since. Despite this, St Helens was recognised as being pro-active through leading many initiatives in coaching development on Merseyside. This was clearly influenced by the appointment of the SDO responsible for CC in St Helens as the lead officer for AS on Merseyside.

The weaknesses of Champion Coaching had been recognised and partly addressed in implementing Active Sport, where longer term planning (over five years rather than three) and cross-boundary working was now the norm, particularly in coaching. SDOs were also working to a tighter focus on fewer sports, through sports-specific development groups. There were greater also efforts to support clubs to gain external funds to achieve Sport England Clubmark status. This approach recognised the limited capacity of clubs to cater for young people, and the limited impact that CC had made on them. The CMO configuration for St Helens draws together the key conclusions, as Table 8.1
Table 8.1: St Helens – CMO Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coach Development:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some areas of high deprivation:</td>
<td>Profiling of each coach</td>
<td>Contribution to Merseyside partnership for coach development strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42nd most deprived district in England</td>
<td>Some use of scholarships</td>
<td>Some coaches continue development through AS – others more informally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Objective</td>
<td>Limited recruitment of new coaches – including some from local schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One status</td>
<td>Strong focus on coach development to underpin MYG teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well established SDU</td>
<td>Choice of sports and venues to fill gaps identified by MYG</td>
<td>Some established pathways remain, but only if supported through AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Sport Manager</td>
<td>Mainly community sports centres, use of some club venues</td>
<td>Distribution of registrations linked to lower deprivation, but later participation not linked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of Community Sport Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited club opportunities for some sports but well established MYG</td>
<td>Strong links to MYG squads</td>
<td>Repeat registrations and MYG contribute to high club memberships – for boys and girls, across different wards and schools Some squads and clubs continue with the support of schools or AS Not all links continued when funding and coaching discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Player Development:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses for different age groups or levels across the 3 years</td>
<td>Some selection necessary to reduce numbers in more popular sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to exit routes after school in community sports centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowsley**

Participants in the Knowsley CC scheme showed similar evidence of successful outcomes in club membership and participation over time. Though the survey took place two to three years after their courses, almost 60% were still club members and even more were regular sport participants. Though the proportion of girls joining clubs was smaller than for boys, it was still above the national average. Girls were more likely to note that a lack of clubs had prevented them from taking their sport participation further. This indicated that despite the positive impacts on participants’ motivations, skills and interests in sport, the achievement of the club membership outcome depended heavily on an appropriate outlet being easily available. In Knowsley, with fewer clubs in these sports, this was problematic. Opportunities for girls remain more limited than for boys, despite the good work in CC and the MYG.
The results from Knowsley showed that appropriate promotion by schools could result in good rates of referral, even in areas of significant deprivation. With staff encouragement, where sports are linked to children's experiences at school, in accessible venues, children were able to take part. Marketing and pricing strategies, for example, promoting the 'pay as you go' principle rather than a full fee in advance, may have reduced perceived barriers to CC and encouraged more children to attend, as this lowered the economic capital children or their parents perceived in relation to these activities.

Exit routes in some sports were clearly problematical, but children were encouraged to continue involvement in sport through the MYG, seen as a means of establishing habits of longer-term participation. There was no difference in outcome of club membership for children from the deprived and affluent wards.

Knowsley recruited coaches from their council employees as well as coaches with existing links to clubs. This was coupled with very good individual support by the SDOs and advice on development was offered to coaches, whatever their level. But despite this excellent support, not all coaches continued to be employed by the Local Authority due to changes in funding and priorities that limited opportunities for payment for coaching. Many were still involved in coaching in some capacity, in paid or unpaid roles, but the SDO only had limited knowledge of what coaches were currently doing other than those involved in AS, because there was no real mechanism for long term tracking.

As in St Helens, hopes were being pinned on the new national Coach Management Information System (CMIS) and the Merseysport Partnership’s Coach Development Strategy, but the benefits were difficult to see at Borough level, because records were kept on a Merseyside basis. If gaps existed in coaching, coaches could now fill these roles from across Merseyside more easily than before. Knowsley continued to monitor the delivery of programmes by coaches through participant questionnaires (though these findings were not made available to the author). This indicated openness to monitoring and an interest in listening to the views of participants of schemes not found to the same extent in the other cases. As in St Helens however, lack of data on participation in schools and clubs,
due to a loss of records from earlier years of Champion Coaching and problems with software meant it was still unable to provide baseline or comparative data against which CC or AS could be measured.

As a result of changes to funding and priorities, there is some evidence that the pathways established in some sports were no longer as effective as in CC. In netball for example, the Borough had not entered a team in the Year 7 (aged 11-12) age group for the MYG in 2003, as schools did not send children for selection. As water polo was no longer included in the MYG, there was less effort or interest in developing coaching in that sport. Cricket, badminton and basketball were cited as examples of links established as a result of CC being maintained through AS, for which there was some corroboration in interviews in schools and with coaches.

A legacy of expertise and knowledge gained by the SD Unit was evidenced in implementing AS and by high profile initiatives and lottery funded programmes established after 1999. PE staff across the Borough were positive about current relationships with the SDU and there were several initiatives benefiting from the CC experience: for example, Royal and Sun Alliance sponsored activities in schools, including coaching programmes. School Sport Co-ordinators and Sport Colleges had also been established in the Borough. Significant NOF funding was being invested in schools and PE as well as community sport facilities, where Knowsley had also received several large Lottery funded capital projects. In community facilities, the time from 4.00p.m. to 6.00 p.m. had been designated for youth sport in all Borough facilities. CC represented an important catalyst to youth sport development in Knowsley and provided a focus for the Department at a crucial time of growth. These features are summarised in the CMO Table 8.2.
Table 8.2: Knowsley CMO configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mechanism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of very high deprivation and one of the most deprived in England</td>
<td>Recruitment of coaches already working in youth sport (some employed by MBC)</td>
<td>Small number of coaches retained in AS, others continue in clubs or other voluntary activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large youth population and dispersed population</td>
<td>Good support to individuals through profiling and advice</td>
<td>Knowsley coaches and SDO contribute to Merseyside coaching development strategy through coaching for sports-specific development groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly appointed SD Officer responsible for Youth Sport</td>
<td>Few scholarships offered, except to coaches gaining new qualifications</td>
<td>Some loss of coaches for other factors (personal and career reasons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well established MYG programme, but some gaps in sports and opportunities for girls identified</td>
<td>Venues included community sport venues and clubs across the Borough</td>
<td>Lack of funding and changed priorities mean some sports have less involvement by SDU by 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community sports facilities, some in schools</td>
<td>Sports linked to MYG squads</td>
<td>Some community venues increased work with youth sport activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited clubs in many sports, particularly for girls</td>
<td>Repeat courses, linked to different venues to improve accessibility Pay as you go pricing</td>
<td>Lack of baseline data on club memberships – but opportunities remain limited in sports Not all pathways established through CC continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linked exit routes to MYG and other squads, some clubs</td>
<td>Distribution of participants not linked to ward level deprivation scores Some good levels of club membership and out of school participation for both boys and girls on CC – across all areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virtually no selection Players have usually been involved in school clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flintshire**

This is a very different District, that ran a county-wide scheme of comparable size to the other cases. Unfortunately due to problems with recording and archiving of data at a time of officer changes and departmental relocation, the available data on participants was more limited, and the resulting samples were smaller. In contrast to the previous two cases, there is much less deprivation and a better legacy of facilities across the county. However, though in a smaller sample, the outcomes achieved showed similar patterns. Children accessing CC achieved high levels of
enjoyment and a good range of exit routes. Levels of club membership, at 40%, though lower than the Merseyside schemes, could be partly explained by the length of time since the courses (for many over 5 years) and the average age of the respondents when surveyed – over 17. These rates were significantly higher than Sports Council for Wales data (SCfW, 2001), which showed about 17% of 15-24 year olds in Flintshire were members of a sports club. Those attending the courses showed patterns of sustained participation and involvement with clubs, which also contrasted with figures achieved in school survey of Flintshire (UWS/PCC, 2003), where much lower levels were the norm, despite sport participation in this age group being good compared to other Welsh counties.

Flintshire had done little work relating to secondary school aged children since Champion Coaching, so there were very few, if any, links sustained past the life of the Scheme. Most of their SD efforts since 1999 had been directed to primary schools and the Dragon Sport initiative, and there had been no replacement for CC as in Merseyside. Consequently, very few clubs were currently available in the sports involved in CC, and there was little evidence of any growth, compared to the situation at the time of CC’s operation. Without the equivalent of Merseyside’s MYG, Flintshire children had fewer exit routes available; some went on to county or development squads, or continued in their sport after school hours.

This case evidenced what CC was able to achieve without the continuity enjoyed in Merseyside after 1999. Despite a longer history of involvement with CC in North East Wales, through the former county of Clwyd, there had been a more limited legacy in practice due to staff turnover and organisational change (merger of two local authorities).

Coaches showed lower retention after CC for reasons similar to those found on Merseyside. Few had continued to work for Flintshire, though several were still involved with coaching, informally or infrequently. Significant problems were experienced in contacting the coaches used by the authority, which showed a lack of contact that may have contributed to poor retention. Though the Authority had drawn some young people into coaching, they were not retained, often due to their
changing personal circumstances. The Authority was not in a position to monitor or support them once CC ended and tracking and monitoring coaches continued to be a weakness, though it was being addressed with the development of their new database. At the time of the study, Flintshire was attempting to implement more consistent approaches to coach education, recruitment and development in different sports. Based on their experiences of implementing CC it used the templates as the basis for its own coaching development processes. According to the coaches, the governing bodies in Wales also struggled to support them, compounding the problems of retention and development in active coaching.

The scope and capacity of the Department grew consistently from 1999 to 2003, when it concentrated on football development and outreach-based ‘community sport’. The staff grew from two officers and a part-funded football development officer in 1999, to eight officers by 2003. In recognising its limited success with after-school sport, Flintshire’s focus was switching to secondary school and work with clubs, through various SCfW and Lottery funded programmes (Community Chest, Girls First). Learning at individual level had been more limited, due to the turnover of staff noted above.

The experience of problems associated with CC had clearly influenced the decision to engage in more baseline research (including this project and the UWS/PCC survey) and to use IT and improved record systems. The SD Unit as a whole was more aware of issues of equity and inclusion, and as in the other cases, was now being held more accountable for results in these terms. Despite this, the school survey in 2003 collected data on age and gender only, not on disability or socio-economic characteristics and performed limited analysis, based on schools. Their more recent approaches were more clearly focused on schools and in being less prescriptive, as each school was being supported in developing an action plan based on their survey results. Rather than trying to promote their programme to schools, the SDU was attempting to facilitate the aspirations of young people in schools. This, they indicated, was a major change in the way they had worked in CC.

Table 8.3 summarises the CMO for Flintshire CC.
Table 8.3: Flintshire CMO configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well resourced county for facilities and services</td>
<td><strong>Coach Development</strong></td>
<td>Very few coaches retained by Flintshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and urban areas, but with generally low deprivation</td>
<td>Recruitment of established and new coaches</td>
<td>Some coaches continue with previous clubs or as volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Population centres</td>
<td>Profiling carried out with all coaches, records limited</td>
<td>Coaches leave due to changing personal circumstances – work or study responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC had operated in former county of Clywd 1991-1995</td>
<td>Some scholarships offered</td>
<td>Lack of development or tracking of CC coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small SDU, with limited capacity</td>
<td>Support and advice offered by SDOs</td>
<td>Coaches very positive about their CC experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh policy context, SCf W led</td>
<td>Some attempt to build on experiences and use existing coaches where available</td>
<td>Clubs engaged with limited resources and focus on existing centres and established clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant turnover and change in priorities after 1999</td>
<td>Use of community and club venues, though focus on existing centres and established clubs</td>
<td>Participants show good levels of club membership over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganisation and change in local government structures and policies</td>
<td>Players recruited through schools with some selection</td>
<td>Many continued in sport after school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No equivalent to AS Limited clubs available for the selected sports</td>
<td>Templates for player development – Welsh NGBs</td>
<td>Range of exit routes, including development squads demonstrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applying realistic evaluation to CC’s impacts**

The mapping of different contexts, mechanisms and outcomes, in order to distill the key features and measures into a coherent and holistic overview has been difficult and complex. Figure 8.1 is an attempt to draw these various threads together for these cases, using the approach suggested by Pawson and Tilley (1997). These cases exhibit similar difficulties in demonstrating a clear link between the outcomes measured and the specific impacts of the youth sport/coaching policy, as in other policy areas. The overall policy aim, of coach
development underpinning youth sport opportunities was achieved with varying degrees of success in all three cases.

Coaches have been developed, but not all in the same way, or with the same results, despite similar mechanisms being applied, because their personal circumstances varied greatly, as did the contexts in which the Scheme operated. Youth sport opportunities expanded, but were not always sustained, because of intervening variables, over which the SD Units had limited influence. Since CC ended, the impact of subsequent programmes and policies, local and national, may have had greater impact on whether young people had access to a club. The designation of specialised sport colleges or the granting of Lottery funding for example, have all impacted on areas of Merseyside since CC, potentially contaminating the outcomes measured. Flintshire can be considered almost as a 'control', where there was no continuity of policy for after-school sport or coaching after CC ended. Figure 8.1 shows where certain mechanisms only applied in a limited way, and resulted in different impacts. Broken lines show less clear application of a mechanism or lack of evidence of influence. The final column shows that impacts are linked to the influence of intervening variables.

Pathway development was stronger where school sport activity was more closely linked to the coaching opportunities and this was supported by longer term engagement in organised sport (through Youth Games for example). Venues had to be accessible and functioned more effectively in or near schools, to attract their local catchments. This pattern supported the model suggested by Welk (1999), referred to in Chapter 4 on the interaction of personal and environmental factors influencing participation in organised sport.

Coach development was more successful where coaches were motivated to improve and develop their coaching, and also had the support of an NGB and an SDU to enable them to continue in regular coaching as well as development activities. However, as coaching was usually a secondary occupation, development could be difficult if the personal circumstances of the coach limited their time or placed them under pressure to continue.

The key lessons to emerge for wider application are summarised below.
For participants:
- Exit routes were better established when complementary to school, existing clubs and in accessible locations
- CC participants were more likely to join clubs than their peers.

For pathways and developing performance orientation:
- Recruitment of participant must be carefully planned with schools and should incorporate more research into the interests of local young people and consideration of their resources.
- Living in areas of greater deprivation did not necessarily mean that children’s intermediate outcomes were different, if courses were perceived to be low-cost, and accessible, though choices in the long term may be more limited, if the club opportunities are more difficult to reach or expensive
- A more significant limitation was the availability of clubs to convert interest and increased competence into performance-oriented activity, through structured and organised youth sections.

For coaches:
- A minority of coaches were engaged with LA funded coaching once CC ended
- Most coaches from CC were still coaching in some capacity or would like to be, but this depended too much on their own pro-activity and motivation
- Personal contact and help with career development did not continue after CC for many coaches, which meant that coaches were not retained.

Sporting capital, that is the sporting infrastructure and network in place in different districts, was an important limiter to the achievement of outcomes in participants and pathways. To develop greater understanding of the impact of sporting capital and how it can best be grown, we would need to test out some of these findings on populations in different areas, where club and community sport opportunities, have taken much longer to build. This could contribute to a ‘realist synthesis’ of sport policy and the development of meta-theory to explain how SD interventions work best. The time for such evaluations has now passed for CC but it should be possible with AS/CSPs and School Partnerships.
Figure 8.1: Context mechanisms and outcomes for the selected cases
8.2 Analysing the Champion Coaching legacy in individuals and organisations

This section examines the legacy of Champion Coaching, addressing the major research question concerning stakeholder perceptions of effectiveness, that is, how far did Champion Coaching represent an effective model for both youth sport and coach development? The legacy of impacts and influences of the Scheme on policy and practice are examined below. This section also considers whether this legacy was limited by the differences in objectives at national and local level and the working of the policy game in sport, drawing on Chapters Two and Four.

In the meso-level analysis of policy, this section draws out what CC has revealed about the development of policy in youth sport and coaching. The MSF of Kingdon (1975) was used earlier in the analysis of how CC came about. However, this is less useful when considering its impacts and legacy. Consequently the Advocacy Coalitions Framework and the concepts of network and communities are used to examine how policy continues to be shaped and by whom, consistent with the emphasis on the mechanics of causality within a realist approach. In this section I examine the policy learning and the lack of evidence-based practice which has continued since CC was terminated and replaced with AS, which demonstrates the lack of underlying rationality in policy.

**CC's legacy in the policy process and policy learning**

CC is clearly an example of policy developed ‘top down’, but delivered, ‘bottom-up’. It has also engaged various policy actors working over significant periods of time, thus the ACF (Sabatier, 1999) is a useful analytical lens, through which to view the impacts and legacy of the Scheme.

SD Officers interpreted and applied the broad guidelines as they saw fit, rather than being tied to a rigid format imposed from above. Guidelines were sufficiently flexible, so that as a result of local decision-making, often by individual officers, schemes varied considerably in how they were managed, delivered and experienced. This may be considered comparable, even if on a much smaller scale, to the implementation of the National Curriculum for PE (Penney...
and Evans, 1999), where individual teachers were seen to have different interpretations how and what should be delivered. Through a multi-method, realist approach to evaluation, these cases clearly demonstrated how CC was interpreted, delivered, influenced and experienced by stakeholders in quite different ways.

The deliverers of the scheme had different views of its reality, for example: for teachers, young people were gaining opportunities to develop their personal skills and competence in sports they might otherwise have not experienced; sports development officers were gaining experience of planning and delivering a multi-sport, multi-site coaching programme; coaches of planning and delivering courses to new and sometimes challenging groups.

Participants saw this scheme as a way of increasing their skill and knowledge of a sport. Despite the NCFs objectives, Coaches saw it mainly as a means of increasing sports opportunities for youth, rather than for their own development. Some SDOs saw an opportunity to devote new funding to a neglected sport or age group, which also filled a gap in coaching. A lack of clearly articulated programme theory underpinning CC’s different objectives meant that their relative significance was left to officers to determine, acting within local policy objectives.

Views of the legacy of the scheme also showed this individual interpretation. In the language and discourse of sport development ‘clients’, (the participants and coaches), the dominant theme was of enhancing youth opportunity, and coaching development was secondary. SD Officers, however, were apparently more concerned about systems for coaching and the development of sporting infrastructures, which for them was a long-term need. The stakeholders at different levels in this complex process - client groups, partners in national schemes (the NGBs) or local agencies, such as clubs, demonstrated different views of the ‘reality’ of CC and the impacts it had.

The local authorities, National Governing Bodies, and the NCF were important partners, but the NCF was pivotal to the reporting process of the Scheme’s impacts because of its control over funding. Reporting the scale and achievements
of CC was important to establish the significance of coach development as a key sport policy issue and to underline the importance of a more autonomous NCF. This concern must also have contributed to the decision not to allow the fledgling YST to take over CC when the NJSP was launched, despite them leading the other elements of the youth sport agenda in the mid 1990s.

The NCF view of the scheme success was limited to outputs: the number of coaches profiled, how many qualifications were gained and the numbers of registrations achieved (which were assumed to represent the number of children involved). It was less concerned about accessibility or equity, or indeed who the participants were, despite its own guidance on such issues. Though the NCF controlled funding, there was no requirement to recruit children or coaches on the basis of gender, socio-economic status or disability.

The significance of the relatively modest CC funding to resource-limited SD Units cannot be underestimated. The increased activity enabled these units to grow their influence and capacity at a crucial period, when Lottery funding for revenue programmes was less readily available than by 2002, through Awards for All or the Active programmes. By 2002, SCUK was able to point to the increased use of coaching development strategies by partnerships where CC had operated, such as Merseyside and Greater Manchester in the NW (Interview, CDO NW, 9/12/2002). The replacement programme, Active Sport, however, was directly managed by Sport England and consequently, the coach and player development objectives were more clearly delineated – coach development became an adjunct to rather than the prime purpose as in CC, and measures of sports equity were also required of the Partnerships.

The impact of the considerable autonomy in how CC was delivered and to whom was seen in the outcomes of these cases. Although they did not initiate policy, having been handed the blueprint, SDOs set about delivering it in different ways to meet different objectives. The explicit emphasis on coach development objectives in St Helens clearly influenced the outcomes achieved. As a result of more repeat registrations, and fewer children, a greater adherence to performance pathways, was an unintended rather than a planned consequence.
A greater emphasis on developing coaching meant that it mattered less ‘who’ the children, or even the coaches, were, but rather that the programme happened, and that those coaches had an opportunity to gain experience and competence. As a result, the programmes were less likely to reach the harder targets posed by less traditional markets for selected sports, or in more deprived areas, where sport club membership would be seen as unusual or atypical to their habitus (Bourdieu, 1978). Only if the experiences on the CC courses successfully challenged perceptions of the personal and economic capital required for club membership in non-traditional or more ‘middle-class’ sports, could sport participants from ‘working class’ areas demonstrate outcomes of increased performance-oriented sport through joining a sports club. As Collins and Buller (2002) pointed out, this was not part of a deliberate effort to overcome structural barriers to sport in more deprived areas. Only more recently were such efforts being made, as SDOs agreed in all three cases. Only in Knowsley, where officers were already keenly aware of the material barriers faced by young people, were such issues taken into account in planning, pricing and organising courses. Nevertheless, the outcomes achieved in all three cases showed little relationship between local deprivation and club membership, despite earlier work suggesting that CC appeared to favour the less deprived (Collins and Buller, 2000).

CC clearly provided further evidence that policy in youth sport and coaching was characterised by fragmentation and influenced by other policy areas, including education, employment, local government reforms. Because of this complexity and the exogenous variables at work, the legacy of CC in policy-orientated learning is very difficult to discern. The lack of reference to CC in any of the Coaching Task Force documentation, final report or in the minutes of steering groups was despite it being cited in the consultation document of the Coaching Matters review (UK Sport, 1999) as ‘a tool for coach recruitment’ and a ‘major national scheme’ (Worthington, A, 21/01/04; Conway, M, 5/12/03, Personal communication).

However, any assumption that CC had been ignored in policy development underestimates the role and significant influence of individuals with first hand knowledge of CC who were able to influence policy development through the
coaching policy review of 1999, the CTF in 2002, and the planning of Active Sport. These individuals were key personnel from YST, SCUK, Sport England and selected NGBs, notably Sue Campbell, Katy Donavon, and Steve Grainger of YST and John Stevens of SCUK.

Despite being taken up by so many local authorities, sufficient evidence of impacts had not emerged by 2000 to convince policy makers to make similar coaching mechanisms national policy. Though the Active Sport programme applied some mechanisms (for example, coaching courses, with payment for coaches, and development and training opportunities), this would take some time to be applied across sports and Partnerships. The pattern of AS implementation, phased across five years, in 10 sports, in 45 partnerships of varying size and resources, means that it will take time for results to emerge and be unpacked (Enoch, forthcoming).

Therefore, though learning was influential with individual SDOs, or senior figures in key agencies, this learning process has not been explicitly drawn on in policy development. We must conclude, therefore, that policy development has not been driven by an epistemic community (Haas, 1992) or a knowledge elite in the emerging profession of Sports Development. As pointed out by Parsons (1995) and echoed by, Sanderson (2002), Pawson (2001) and Rütten (1993), the impact of any policy on selected problems is more an issue of values rather than facts, “in the policy game: numbers mean whatever policy makers want them to mean” (Parsons, 1995:602). Policy makers will tend to listen to the facts that support their arguments and ignore others. But there has been little co-ordinated effort to provide evidence from CC implementation or other youth sport initiatives, into the policy development cycle.

The lack of evidence of a common causal model underpinning youth sport and coaching, or common political values is a key factor in rejecting the ‘epistemic community’ explanation. A continuing rift between the demands of elite and community coaching and mass participation and talented athlete development can be discerned in the ‘twin track’ approach espoused in recent Sport England and government policy documents, such as Game Plan (DCMS, 2002: Sport England,
Increasingly the influences of Australian and Canadian systems in coaching can be discerned, though they are clearly aligned to player and talent development, rather than building or widening participation. Through Sports Search (Hoare, 1996) and the Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD) model (Balyi, 2001; Côté, 1999) performance-oriented coaching in particular is apparently moving towards cross-cultural convergence. These models are not without critics, for example, Abbott and Collins (2002) criticised both the assumptions and methods underpinning Sports Search for young Scottish athletes. Despite its development in different cultural and sporting contexts, across sports, and according to SE edicts, the LTAD model is now central to sports specific development plans in England and Ireland (SE, 2003; NIIS, 2003). Meanwhile, long standing and persistent gaps in the sporting opportunities experienced by different groups in society remain (SE, 2001), which the LTAD does not appear to consider.

In the Education coalition within the sport policy network, policy documents setting out the schemes to support school club links, *PE, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL)* (DfES, 2003; 2004) show significant overlap with CC philosophies and assumptions about the role of schools in promoting club memberships and the use of coaches and volunteers in schools. In Sabatier’s (1999) view of ‘policy oriented learning’ this may be a legacy of CC, but coalitions do not appear to be guiding policy in a co-ordinated way.

The emphasis on performance-oriented athletes and performance pathways, encapsulated by ‘better coaching...better quality sport’, appears to infer that the purpose of increasing the quality of coaching is to improve performance standards. The selection of an increasingly narrow range of sports to benefit from Lottery and SE funding is evidence of the increasing influence of sport coalitions concerned with nurturing talent and success in international performance rather than building participation. The development of talent and participation are both underpinned by quality coaching and leadership, but significant differences remain in how the needs of both are to be met, and so they continue to compete in the policy arena. Consequently we now have two sets of partnerships involved in youth sport and coaching – Sport Partnerships underpinning the Active Sport
programmes, based in counties, and School Partnerships, delivering the PESSCL based in LEA’s and funded through NOF.

Figure 8.2: The new framework for English youth sport (Campbell, 2003)

The extent of control over knowledge and information in this area is also limited, which further reduces the potential for a knowledge elite to emerge. Though SCUK and YST are clearly important, youth sport is not the domain of a single academic or professional grouping, with psychological, physiological, pedagogical and sociological interests all represented, and not least the PE professionals, SD practitioners and coaches themselves. Within all these groups different views are apparent.

For example, the continuing divergence of views of the role and purpose of Sports Development, implied by MacDonald (1995), Lentell (1994) and Eady (1993), has apparently only been exacerbated since 1997 (Houlihan and White, 2002). When the New Labour government re-introduced the notion of greater social justice through sport, in A Sporting Future for All, it clearly expected greater investment in sport to reap social benefits. However, evidence of sports impacts on human and social capital has remained elusive, and the policy cycle in sport has moved more quickly than the research cycle, not least because the lack of funding or
initiatives for the latter. Youth sport policy 'could not wait' for such evidence and had to move quickly when a policy window opened.

This has been strongly influenced by the complex pattern of resource dependencies, which have also influenced the policy legacy of CC. Despite the growing significance of NCF/SCUK from the mid 1990s, and the investment represented by CC, coaches have remained an undervalued and scarce resource. SCUK's ability to implement change through local authorities was limited, since the direct link to them for funding was removed when CC ended. Despite the publication of the UK Vision for Coaching, it was only through the CTF and the publication of its recommendations in 2002, that there was significant progress in implementing coaching development strategies nationally. The significant funding CTF was able to lever, recognised the needs of community coaching and training for volunteers in clubs, despite not refering to the many thousands of 'champion' coaches already on SCUK's database.

Therefore, while there is limited evidence to suggest either a policy community in youth sport, or an advocacy coalition working towards the common purpose of improving the status of coaching, it is impossible to ignore the influence of individuals in this area. There has clearly been significant influence of what Kingdon (1995) called a policy entrepreneur, or Sabatier (1999), policy broker, in Sue Campbell. As a key member of the panel involved in the 'Vision for Coaching', and her position as Government advisor to DFES and DCMS on school sport (in developing the PESSCL strategy), a Chief Executive of the YST, former head of the NCF (and at the time of writing, interim Chair of UK Sport), she has played a significant role in bridging youth and coaching policy groups. Described as one of the most important people in sport (Independent on Sunday, 2004, 29/02/04:7), Campbell was one of the chief architects of CC, along with Katy Donovan, still with the YST.

Therefore, the re-emergence of coaching as an important arm of Sport policy with the intervention of the CTF in 2002 is not due to any convincing evidence of the success or otherwise of CC, but rather on the ability of such a policy 'champion' to promote coaching policy and youth sport coaching to government decision
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makers. What Houlihan (2000) termed 'policy-taking', rather than policy making, is therefore a characteristic of coaching policy in particular, as it has been more opportunistic than strategic, and has lacked the ability to drive the wider sport policy network. In contrast with youth sport, until more recently, coaching had not received the attention of government. Without the link to youth sport facilitated by CC, it is very unlikely it would have achieved the prominence and funding it did. By aligning coaching very firmly with youth sport opportunity, coaching was able to benefit from increased funding, and gain a foothold in the relevant policy making forum, mainly through Sport England planning for AS. Consequently, by 2003 each County Partnership had a specific officer responsible for coach development and an SCUK advisor.

The legacy of human and social capital – more active coaches and better pathways?

A central question for this research was whether CC was effective in building a legacy of more active and effective coaches. The evidence provided in this analysis is of a legacy of individual or personal capital, in participants, coaches and sports development practitioners (Bourdieu, 1978), and of social or human capital in the form of increased skills (Schmidt, 2002). This contributed to an increase in communal social capital in increased membership of sports clubs (Hall, 1999; Li et al, 2002).

However, this success was mixed with some failure to convert this capital into increased employment or volunteering in youth sport and coaching. Schmidt's (2002) view of trust being central to the development of altruistic activity, based on the work of Fukuyama (1995) and Puttnam (1993), is supported by the evidence of coaches' increased perception of being valued, when contact was maintained and support and guidance offered on their future development, and of reduced engagement if this was not sustained (even when some remuneration had been involved), an outcome suggested by social exchange theory (Weiss and Stevens, 1993; Janssen, 2000).

CC achieved only moderate growth of the social and human capital engaged in coaching because it recruited relatively small numbers of new coaches and there
were limited opportunities once the scheme ended. There was also only limited evidence that the status of coaching after CC was improved, given the findings of the CTF in 2002, despite increased numbers of coach development strategies in AS Partnerships.

Evidence in this study of a social capital legacy in what Aldridge et al. (2001) referred to as ‘social glue’ binding communities together, is much harder to find. CC had some impact on junior membership in clubs, a frequent indicator used in such analyses (Hall, 1999; Li et al., 2002). Club membership was higher among participants on CC courses than in youth generally, but these were children selected to receive the enhanced opportunities available. Many coaches involved in CC did not continue formal coaching or contribute to voluntary work in clubs, despite their positive experiences on CC.

This is arguably a limit of the loose theory on which CC intervention was based, as it did not account for the intervening or exogenous factors that underpinned voluntary coaching activity nor did anything to strengthen the club infrastructure. It was too simplistic to assume that employing/paying coaches and offering them development opportunities would lead automatically to greater engagement with coaching and the capacity of clubs to sustain this was overestimated. The motivations and situations in community coaching were too complex to be addressed by the mechanisms in CC, as indicated by Lyle et al. (1997), Potrac and Jones (1999) and particularly where women coaches were concerned (West and Brackenridge, 1990; White et al., 1989).

Similarly, the numbers and capacity of clubs to act as exit routes from CC were limited by factors outside the influence of the Scheme. Different sports varied in their capacity to support coaches in their professional development to add to this complexity. Where there was already sufficient sport-based social capital (sport capital) to support new growth in coaching opportunities, there was some success. In sports or areas with fewer resources, like parts of Knowsley and St Helens, there was insufficient social capital to develop new opportunities. As a result, though individuals developed greater skills and competence, adding to their feeling of self-efficacy or changing habitus, they were not always able to
demonstrate a change in disposition into practice, through club membership. Through what Rossi et al (1999) term 'theory failure', the theory underpinning CC was not robust enough to account for the various outcomes, or the limits to its potential. There is some evidence of ‘process failure’ in that clearly, the Scheme was delivered in very varied ways, even within the broad parameters available for local choice. Not all coaches or children experienced the courses in the same way, or consistent with the NCF’s Guide. As a result, the impacts and outcomes in terms of a legacy of the Scheme have been similarly varied and complex.

However, as Pawson indicated (2001:11) this variation is a common feature of social programmes and CC was not unique, as it is rare for there to be a complete revolution of the policy-research-policy cycle, which reinforces the particular problems of policy analysis in sport. Rütten (1993) identified this as ‘piecemeal engineering’.

The critical realist approach to policy evaluation contributes to a better understanding of how mechanisms worked and in different contexts, and as an overarching approach to the analysis of policy, it has much to offer. One key area where CC was seen to have an impact was in the development of practice of SD practitioners, identified in Chapters Six and Seven as unintended consequences of the Scheme.

**The impacts of CC on coaching and youth sport- a legacy in practice?**

As noted earlier, CC practices were clearly and explicitly subsumed into the implementation of AS in Merseyside, and certain aspects continued to be recognised in Flintshire as good practice in coach development. Specific targets for recruiting children based on socio-economic status, ethnicity or disability for example, and increasing the number of female coaches were being addressed in the Merseysport partnership, though progress toward these targets had not been reported and was outside the scope of this study.

At the level of the Districts and Partnerships, CC had a significant impact on practice, even if as pointed out above, officers on the ground appeared to have limited impact on national policy. The DCMS announcement that some CTF
funding will employ officers (one for each partnership) responsible for monitoring coaches and supporting the development of the National Coaching Certificate, albeit with a limited number of sports, demonstrated that the initial recommendations lacked some clear targets, and plans for implementation were being developed slowly (DCMS, 2003). The ultimate aim of this process is to move coaching towards a recognised profession, but what impact this will have on the amount and standard of coaching ‘on the ground’, is difficult to quantify. Developing evidence of effectiveness of such investment will be difficult without baseline data on the state of community coaching, only commissioned in 2003 (DCMS, 2003; SCUK, 2003). Until this (£28 million) funding was announced, implementing good practice in supporting coaches and developing qualifications and training had not advanced sufficiently to support the growth of AS programmes, which were evolving as multi-purpose development tools, outside their original remit of AS delivery (Charlton, forthcoming).

In terms of practice and systems for both coaching and youth sport development, the legacy of CC has been as much as in knowledge of what did not work as of what worked well. The limitations of CC schemes meant that SDOs were more aware of the limits of their influence and what they could achieve in a given timeframe. For example, a tighter focus on phased programmes that SDOs, NGBs and coaches could implement emerged on Merseyside, because of the recognition that limited resources had to be closely targeted to be more effective. Less prescriptive, sports-specific development groups, which had proved effective in CC, had better understanding of existing sporting infrastructure and social capital, as they included a greater input for all relevant stakeholders.

SDOs gave more emphasis to developing clubs because they recognised this was an area that they had not been able to address as effectively through CC. The most important of these mechanisms, profiling meetings with coaches and the work of sports specific development groups for coaching, were continued by the partnerships, with enhanced support of the CMIS for better monitoring than was available at the time of CC.
But these new systems were not without problems and coaches were still not having the regular one-to-one meetings they valued on CC. Reduced funding meant individual monitoring and support was problematic, as specific funding for such activity was withdrawn. Profiling sometimes happened in small groups, rather than one to one. The influx of new funding noted above could solve this problem, but only time will tell if it will lead to more sustainable personal social capital.

A further legacy in practice was the partnership working on coaching or player development pathways in AS. Although CC was said to represent ‘partnership in action’ at a practical level (Campbell, 1995), this was clearly partnership in the very loosest sense of the word. Very few, if any, schools and or clubs had an influence on the planning and design of CC, or even how it was implemented. In contrast, on Merseyside, AS implementation was much more clearly led and influenced by sport-specific groups, including school and NGB representatives. Attributing this organisational outcome to the experience of CC remains problematical; on the other hand in Flintshire, without AS, it was not possible to trace. The county was however, committed to a less prescriptive approach to developing sporting opportunity and was more focused on school-based planning.

Practice in sport has continued to be influenced numerous other policy initiatives since CC ended: key to these were: Best Value/CPA reviews, impacting on policies and programmes of the local authorities; changes in the regulation of part-time work, impacting on the employment of coaches; the policy for PE and after-school sport, impacting on the funding and arrangements of out of hours sport in schools and links to clubs.

One consequence of these porous policy boundaries is a growing concern for partnership working, between authorities in AS/County partnerships and with other professional groups, for example Education, Health or Youth Justice/Social Work. This has meant that the sports practitioners have been exposed to alternative working methods and been faced with the demands for better reporting and monitoring. Perhaps one of the biggest influences on practice this research has highlighted is the realisation by SDOs that previously acceptable levels of data
collection do not satisfy funding agencies more used to clearer evidence of effectiveness.

However, attributing outcome measures and legacies solely to CC is very difficult, and with inadequate control and baseline comparisons, likely to remain unconvincing to policy-makers. Though the evaluation of programme outcomes is increasingly required, there remains a problem of how SD Units collect and monitor data on both participants and processes and what this entails. There is a limit to how far ‘top-down’ approaches can overcome this. SDOs continue to struggle to meet these demands, whether through lack of confidence, resources or competence, as made clear in the interviews. Agencies will have to overcome reluctance, under-resource and lack of confidence to build a research base and act on findings if progress is to be made. The evidence of this was clear in these cases, where registration forms were not processed, and limited follow-up of course participants continued as the norm.

8.3 Realist Evaluations in sport policy and programmes

Choosing to evaluate CC through these selected case studies could be considered too narrow a focus for a national scheme, which, at its peak, operated in over 140 local authorities. The diverse and sometimes conflicting realities and concepts involved, across different settings for implementation required a multi-method strategy, which Pawson and Tilley (1997) recognised as not merely pluralist but essential to such a complex process. At its centre, they proposed, is the issue of the ‘mechanics of explanation’. Therefore, there were both practical and theoretical reasons for the methods and tools chosen. Though Coalter (2003) may call for evidence ‘beyond reasonable doubt’, given the nature of interventions in sport, it is more likely that we could produce evidence to ‘tip the balance of probabilities’. Certain factors contributed to the difficulties of producing evidence in this research, which illustrate this.

The timing of the research in relation to CC’s operation was perhaps the most crucial factor. This research, not commissioned by the NCF or SE, began to examine the results of CC at a time when it was already waning in policy terms,
and its successor AS, had already been announced. Local authorities and the NCF were reluctant to get too involved with a long term evaluation partly due to lack of time or resources, but also because they had already moved on to other programmes they saw little to gain from examining CC’s outcomes. This meant that the schemes selected for this study were as a result of a fairly tortuous practical process, involving enquiries to all of the CC schemes in the North West and North Wales. It was impossible of course, to conduct the research without the co-operation of the local authorities, who held details of participants (a pilot survey to Stockport schools confirmed there was little chance of finding participants without registration details). Arguably different case study organisations may have resulted in different conclusions; however, I have attempted to provide is a realist evaluation of the mechanisms of the Scheme and its outcomes, and there is some potential for generalizability for subsequent schemes given the contexts examined.

Though cases were similar in population size, and were all unitary status, or single tier authorities, there were differences in the characteristics of the populations, the size and scope of the SD Unit and the national sport policy context, England for two and Wales for the third. As identified earlier, all offered a unique blend of sports and represented different forms of existing sporting capital. Thus this range provided a limited matrix of contexts and mechanisms for a realist approach to CC, so even though it may not have met fully the demands implied by Pawson (2002) for a realist synthesis on youth sport policy, it has contributed tangibly to the evidence base.

One positive aspect of the case studies, was the ability to treat each case as an independent study, or ‘cluster’. As in aspects of health evaluation a ‘cluster-based’ approach has a sound theoretical basis, as suggested by Okoummune et al (1999). Changes in policy, organisations, or practice affect areas and not just isolated individuals. Therefore it made sense to look at clusters of young people with similar environmental and social backgrounds. However, a potentially negative consequence of the cluster based approach is that it resulted in smaller populations for the statistical analysis and the use of qualitative/interpretative approaches, which may not be as convincing to policy makers, despite what is
implied from literature reviewed in Chapter Two (e.g. Sanderson, 2002; Davies et al, 2000).

It was important to look at the population within the cluster boundary, as it was exposed all other intervening variables and schemes at the same time. As already indicated, cases also varied in how they implemented and interpreted the Scheme. CC participants were not randomly selected to receive the intervention, so the modest samples of participants (and coaches) were nevertheless robust, given the small populations involved.

Different stakeholders and partners in CC were anticipated to have different measures, which they would accept as evidence of effectiveness, as suggested by Palfrey and Thomas (1996), and they were incorporated into the data collection. But as Taylor et al (2001) pointed out, even strong evidence of effectiveness is not always enough to continue programmes once priorities change. This raises the question of ‘what counts’ as evidence when evidence did not seem necessary to convince policy makers to replace CC with AS, as Pawson (2001) in social policy in generally and Rütter (1993) in sport have pointed out, evidence can be rejected if it fails to fit the ‘rules of the game’.

Measures of sports development outcomes – what counts?

Outcome measures were selected by an analysis of the Program Impact Theory of CC, developed in Chapter Four. These were:

- Club membership sustained after the programme
- Pathways from school to other sporting opportunities (club or other settings) as identified by the exit routes of children
- CPD engagement of coaches, and local coaching legacy (more active coaches)

An important limitation of the study was the inability to track impacts on club and sporting infrastructures, as originally planned. Due to the transient nature of the local clubs and their organisation, these measures were based on reports by the SDOs, coaches and available directories of clubs in 1999 and 2003, or published on SE Gateway (www.sportengland.org in 2003). Effective pathways had
therefore to be demonstrated by exit routes reported by young participants, the views of local children and teachers, and inferred from club memberships indicated in the surveys. As pathways are essentially a conceptual construction, their perception by young people was only accessible through qualitative analysis.

CC interventions addressed specific structural deficiencies, namely the provision of coaches and courses. Club membership is therefore a good indicator of the ability to convert the interest developed by such programmes to performance orientation at a local level, and the effectiveness of local sporting networks and pathways to support the move from school-based to externally organised sport. Club membership is also a measure of both individual social capital and communal social capital (Li et al, 2002; Hall, 1999). Significantly it is being used as a measure in the Governments Plan for Sport, where the Government has specified it wants to “increase the proportion of 5-16 year olds participating in NGB or otherwise accredited clubs” (DCMS, 2001:29). However, club membership will not capture all activity of a more informal nature and could neglect recreational activity of young people who do not have clubs available (L’Aoustet et al, 2002), or who move into and out of clubs as their interests change (Kremer et al, 1997; Hendry et al, 1993).

Self-reported gains in confidence and sports skills (competence) are useful, as they point to perceptions of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977; 1986), and also allow for some inference of a causal link between the intervention (coaching) and the outcome (continued participation). Ideally greater sample sizes and the use of controls would improve the strength of any such inference, with before and after measures and comparator groups. In this study, and probably in most other CC schemes for the same reasons, such comparisons were not available.

Achieving the club and participation outcomes has also been confounded by other factors: on Merseyside, sport colleges, school sport co-ordinators and additional funding for schools to improve their after-school provision may have contributed to youngsters successful transition to clubs, over and above what could be attributed to CC.
A measure of the ‘width’ and the accessibility of pathways (the take up of the schemes by children in different areas) was based on geographical and population data analysis, using postcodes to map participants and convert to penetration rates in wards (in 6.2). Although equity was not a key concern in implementing CC, it is now much more important in all programmes, as a result of changing national policy. One area where CC took a lead was in promoting opportunities for girls, and CC recruited higher numbers of girls in these cases because SD units targeted them.

All three cases had participants from even the most deprived wards, though in Flintshire changes to ward boundaries limited the analysis linking population and ward deprivation. As Merseyside represents a region of significant social deprivation, this is an important lesson to emerge from the research. Thus, CC appears to have achieved some success in demonstrating a measure of gender and social equity in access, but it neglected issues of ethnicity and disability as noted above. Where greater efforts were made to attract children from a particular area, by siting venues in different parts of the Borough, as in Knowsley, similar outcomes in club membership were also achieved.

Coaches in the selected schemes were from a range of socio-economic backgrounds and included an almost 50:50 balance of male to female. Even if the intention was not necessarily to improve the gender equity in coaching, both male and female coaches clearly benefited from CC. The gender balance of coaches was much more even, compared to the figures provided by SCUK for Active Sports and Merseyside in 2003 (which were both closer to 70:30, male:female). This was due to the numbers of women coaches in sports where they are more likely, such as hockey, netball, and girls football. Women coaches were also involved in Girls Rugby, tennis, athletics, badminton and water polo.

Interviews showed that other factors influenced the retention of coaches as much or more than CC’s mechanisms. Despite the efforts of SDOs to retain active coaches, once the Scheme ended female coaches seemed to be less likely to continue.
A major outcome, which emerged as another unintended consequence, is the evidence of SDO’s expertise and competence, noted in the earlier section. The growth and development of the youth sport function of Sports Development in the late 1990s was partly fuelled by NCF’s resources for CC. The officers concerned with the delivering and planning CC represented a major resource for future work, which Merseyside and to a lesser extent Flintshire, were able to draw upon when implementing other programmes. CC had in effect, been their training ground. When describing what one SDO referred to as the ‘friendly Merseyside Mafia’ of SDOs, across all districts of the conurbation, people in many roles were identified with allegiances to CC. This represented a major professional network underpinning sports development. Undoubtedly, if the growth that this represents on Merseyside is replicated in other areas, this is a key legacy, not foreseen at the outset of the research.

**Longitudinal studies and tracking moving targets**

In evaluating schemes, the ability to track individuals over time is important, to establish whether sustained changes in personal competence and perceptions of self-efficacy can be demonstrated with the measures selected. This is more difficult with snapshot or cross-section surveys of different cohorts, as the chance of contamination by other variables is much greater. As indicated earlier, over the course of the research programme, other policy interventions and issues emerged which influenced both the populations in the study (young people and coaches) and their wider communities. In effect, the outcomes became moving targets. Thus it is difficult then to say whether differences are due to having different groups, rather than the impacts of the scheme. This could have solidified findings on CC as it did for McCormack (2000) when evaluating Solent Sports Counselling, a scheme for sport with serious offenders. It is not standard practice in AS County Partnerships.

By tracking the same cohorts of young people, who grew too old to benefit from AS, it was at least possible to reduce the interference for individual participants. This was more difficult with coaches, where AS had clearly impacted on some of
their careers. Including the Flintshire case study from was considered as close as possible to a 'control' programme, because CC was not replaced with another. National surveys (SE, 2003; SCfW, 2001) provided some points of comparison, but both took a cross-sectional approach with their respondents rather than tracking cohorts and each had different procedures for participant selection and data collection. In the approach used in the HALS health surveys, for example, where the same cohort was tracked over time (Cox et al, 1993), it was possible to see how various groups fared according to different health indicators, attitudes and behaviours. Vanruesel et al (1997), Roberts and Brodie (1992), Hovell et al (1999) and Malina (1996) have all shown that over time, the sport habit can be tracked into adulthood, particularly for recreational sport and club memberships. Adults are more likely to be in a sport club if they had joined as a young person. Cohort tracking is therefore a very useful tool to monitor the relative influence of different schemes on these forms of participation, but is used rarely (for example, Wade, 1997; Butcher et al, 2002).

The TOYA study (Rowley, 1992ab, 1995; Rowley and Graham, 1999) comprised a major longitudinal cohort based study of elite young performers, but there has been no equivalent in club-based, or performance-oriented sport, against which to judge the achievements of CC. There are various reasons for this including a lack of funding for longitudinal research, and neglecting routine collection of baseline and rolling data that would make it possible. Long standing problems in demonstrating impacts has been highlighted in recent policy documents as contributing to the peripheral role for sport policy, except in contributing to health outcomes (DCMS, 2002; 2003).

This was clearly demonstrated in problems experienced in the case studies, as well as Stockport MBC that had to be dropped from the study after two years. Even when the data required was agreed and identified before the end of the scheme or within months of the final course, it had not been collected, stored or organised so that initial follow ups or even basic analyses were possible.

As alluded to in section 8.2, there appears to be a tendency, possibly driven by the inexorable succession of sports initiatives which are short term and subject to
specific funding requirements, to focus on the present, and 'getting on with the job', without looking back at schemes which are considered obsolete or passé. This was highlighted in the work of Long et al (2002) and had been earlier identified by Collins et al (1999) in work relating to social inclusion. This attitude was apparent in the lack of interest in this project by staff in several major SD units, which ran CC schemes of considerable size, and also in the attitude of a Sport England senior SD manager (Collins, personal communication 18/03/04). This represents a gap between the rhetoric promoting the use of evidence and evaluation of SE (Brivio and Pickford, 1996; Stevens, 1996; Sport England, 2001) and the reality of SD practice, which shows the scale of the problem of convincing SDUs and agencies to commit resources to it. Even Active Sport’s indicators on participation remain focused on aggregate numbers (Enoch, forthcoming).

This research has shown that over and above such attitudinal problems, there are also practical problems, for example, loss of participants through normal house and job moves, and lack of detail or accuracy on original registrations. Data protection legislation (Data Protection Act 1988), cited by the SDOs as a limiting their co-operation in research, requires local authorities to register their data on participants and manage it carefully, but this does not preclude making it available in a suitable form for useful monitoring and eventual evaluation to assess effectiveness and reach of programmes. Relatively simple changes to registration forms and compliance with Data Protection can be achieved at low cost and with fewer limitations than appear to be assumed by the SD units, or even in some prominent criminal cases by police forces, as seen in the recent case of Soham murderer, Huntley (BBC, 2004), which gave rise to the Bishart enquiry.

Similarly for coaches, the introduction of coaching registration with CMIS or the National Coaching Certificate (NCC) acting as a licence to practice will enhance the ability for the agencies concerned, including SCUK, and NGBs to more accurately track and monitor the activities of coaches. Locally, the relevant authorities that employ coaches also need to be able to identify and contact local coaches and track their ongoing development, to enable monitoring of local coach development programmes, and highlight where remedial action is required.
Such data therefore should provide a baseline measure of coach activity before any intervention and enable any changes, positive or negative, to be more clearly attributed to the scheme in question. Also it should enable those responsible for coach development programmes to assess whether the coaches implemented changes in practice. Who is responsible for such monitoring remains at issue, and the new posts announced by the CTF seem to recognise this has been neglected, even though more authorities have been involved in AS and the CMIS has been running for several years. This reinforces the point made earlier about the problems of converting learning to action: despite what has been learned about coach development by the SDOs, they still have problems in devoting the necessary time and resources to it.

Because of timing and design, this research was unable to assess how far the practices of coaches had been influenced by their experiences of CC, except by their own self-reports. The implications of this for future research are dealt with in the final section of this chapter.

**Using geo-demographic data and analysis**

The application of GIS and use of census material and indices of deprivation has provided better evidence on the penetration of CC schemes into different areas, though it has been problematic. Combined with data on referrals from schools, this enabled the impacts to be mapped and linked to local environments for sport. More detailed GIS analysis can assist in monitoring impacts and on the eventual outcomes achieved, as areas of population not served by the programmes can be identified and subsequently targeted for any follow up.

The basis for this analysis is the participant’s postcode. As each postcode represents a set of households, it is not unique to the individual address, which would be ideal for tracking purposes. Postcodes are relatively easy to collect, unobtrusive measures, which can be converted to electoral or census wards (now Super Output Areas) and the systems available from the ONS and Census dissemination services are constantly developing. Commercial marketing organisations use this approach widely (e.g. [www.caci.co.uk](http://www.caci.co.uk), 2004) and there is a wealth of data available commercially on postcode oriented analysis. Such
applications are more widely used commercially, using ACORN and other socio-demographic classifications in market research (Dibb and Simpkin, 1994; Mitchell and Goldrick, 1994). Their use has been tied to research into health inequalities and access to HE (Tonks and Farr, 2001), giving rise to the notion of a ‘postcode’ difference in opportunity in a range of social policies.

None of the authorities concerned used this type of analysis as a matter of course, and its potential has only been touched on here. Such mapping would be useful to track the growth in coaching or club activity in different areas, enabling greater accuracy of outcome measures and better understanding of the impacts on local populations. The wider use of postcode based analysis of participation in sport and leisure is emerging only slowly, for example, Kennett (2002) and the Sportlinx project in Liverpool (2000). This trend is likely to increase under Best Value regimes and the need to analyse who benefits (or not) from public services (Hewson, 2000).

The use of a nationally derived index, the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IOMD) (DETR, 2000) rather than local measures of ‘need’, was partly driven by pragmatic concern for obtaining suitable data, and the increasing use of this Index in other aspects of social policy. The cause of sport in public policy can be more effectively promoted if the language and measures used in other policy spheres are adopted. This helps co-ordinate policy across neighbourhoods and policy areas, for example, in education and health, as indicated by PAT 18 (2000). While officers on the ground admitted that social objectives played a very small part in their planning of CC, increasingly, the impacts of schemes must be reported against these measures of equality of access, opportunity and outcome.

It has to be recognised, however, that measures of deprivation based on wards are too gross to pick out the impact of deprivation on households. As pointed out by Townsend et al (1992), not everyone living in deprived areas is deprived – and conversely, even in areas of low deprivation, some children and parents have to overcome significant barriers in order to access sporting opportunities. The value of the use of GIS and demographic data is in their contribution to the realist approach, by providing greater depth of understanding of the contexts and
mechanisms of implementation and in helping explain how a scheme has worked, and for whom. By asking young people and teachers about these issues in local schools, travelling across the Boroughs to interview coaches and SDOs, this study achieved a greater awareness of how CC was perceived and experienced in different areas, adding depth to case study analyses. The analysis of postcodes can contribute to the deeper understanding of what barriers, real and perceived, young people overcame in order to take advantage of the opportunity CC represented.

Thus the mixed methodology has gathered a wide range of data types, and in keeping with a critical evaluation, aims to challenge and influence future policy. However, policy learning in sport has been shown to be unreliable and haphazard, very much in line with Lindblom’s view of ‘muddling through’ (Parsons, 1995). Much more sport policy evaluations would need to be accumulated with realist perspectives, to enable meta-analysis, in a realist synthesis (Pawson, 2002). As Sanderson (2000:19) has pointed out, evaluating complex systems and processes through case studies has real value, as:

"a focus on the role of evaluation in reflexive policy learning is required to resolve a paradox in late modern society: that while increasing complexity of social systems progressively undermines notions of certainty in social knowledge, it simultaneously raises the stakes in relation to rational guidance of those systems".

Lessons from the research – self reflections on the process

The previous sections analysed the impact of the measures and approaches chosen for the study and other issues in sport policy evaluation. It is important also to provide some reflection on the research process undertaken from the researcher’s perspective, to place in context the final conclusions and recommendations for further research.

There was significant learning over the course of the project, about the problems of research, and the meaning of important concepts, often taken for granted, particularly about the relationship between knowledge and meaning. During the course of this research I was influenced by a symbolic interactionist perspective, which saw meanings as social products formed through the interactions of people,
derived from the social processes they are engaged in and impacted on by the settings they inhabit (Berg, 1992). I came to accept that there were multiple meanings involved in CC, and in order to understand its impacts I had to gain some insight into how it was perceived and experienced by the coaches and SDO's and (in a more limited way), by the participants. Visiting schools and offices, sports centres and the homes of coaches, to see their view of the world where they experienced CC enhanced this, and through comments on questionnaires and interviews, gain insight into how they saw CC's impacts on them. Travelling across these districts to meet respondents, I was able to see more clearly the environment (the clubs, sports centres and sports development programmes), in which CC operated. To interpret and understand the meaning of joining a sports club, being a coach or running a sport programme has required me to adjust some preconceptions previously attached to such activity based on my own experiences; for example, in interviews I had to be sensitive to different language and terms and to avoid jargon, the meaning of which I would have taken for granted. One example is the concept of a 'pathway' to describe the route taken by children to a club. Of course there was no literal 'pathway' and even conceptually, this was not always easy to grasp or articulate.

When the programme of work was originally planned, I had a more limited view of the complexity of CC and its place in the policy arena, even though I recognised it as an area of conflict and contested values and beliefs. What quickly emerged was an appreciation of a multi-layered programme, with greater potential for framing the sport policy process. Though it was not possible to follow the life-cycle of this Scheme contemporaneously, a retrospective, summative analysis of a complex and multi-faceted programme, incorporated many of the debates now raging in sport policy; such as selection and elitism in sport, state support for mass participation or talent development, or the role of schools in promoting sport through Physical Education. At the same time, calls for evidence of sport policy impacts were being made that reinforced more relevance and currency of the findings than many policy makers and practitioners would credit, even if too late to influence the AS programme directly. The time was clearly right for such an in-depth study and CC represented a unique opportunity as it had operated over such a long time frame.
Beginning by examining evaluation research led to investigating theory underpinning the CC Scheme, which in turn, led to greater appreciation of the nature of policy and the working of the policy 'game'. To understand how policy worked, it was important to understand better, why CC had come about, and thus required a deeper analysis of youth sport and coaching policy (Chapter Four). Then I had to face the problem of how to unravel the impacts CC on the individuals, the organisations, and national policy-making. As a result, it was clear a positivistic approach would be inappropriate, even if feasible, given my limited resources. Such an approach would not be sufficiently reflexive to go beyond describing outputs, and to understand of what it was about programmes that worked, and for whom. A positivist approach would reduce complex concepts to numbers to assist measurement, which I felt was too narrow and constricting. The value of a realist approach with a critical perspective on policy only emerged after extensive reading and some analysis had already been completed. As often in part-time study, this research did not follow a linear process, with the added complications of the time taken to obtain local data from the case studies.

Over the course of over six years of preparation and writing, local environment and context shifted considerably, as AS and other programmes emerged, took hold of the efforts of SDUs and the agencies and changed programmes, methods and structures. Key informants on CC went on extended leave, or left their organisations altogether, offices were relocated, departments were reorganised and restructured, participants moved through schools to work and left areas. Details on participants was lost, withheld or simply poorly captured on registration. CC was certainly less and less important to the organisations and individual officers as time went on. This had an obvious impact on the data collected in interviews or questionnaires, which were eventually completed some three years after CC was terminated and up to six years since some individuals had taken part. At times, the researcher became detective, using a range of techniques to reconstruct lists, correct details and track down those who had moved away.
If it was possible to start again, therefore, some changes would be made to alleviate the impact of these problems, but the same relationship or ‘closeness’ to the programme would not be possible after an even greater time. Arguably, where I have lost immediacy, I have gained depth, where responses have focused on lasting and deep impressions about impacts that have been sustained beyond the life of the Scheme. Of course, the issue of contamination, lack of recall or interference from other programmes noted earlier, makes the attribution of outcomes to CC problematic, but this is often the case with social programmes, regardless of the temporal factors; as Pawson (2004) said, uncertain outcomes with slippery measures are the norm in social policy, not the exception. The choice of methods and major features of the research would remain essentially the same if investigating a similar scheme, even if experience should improve their execution.

Some suggestions for further research were prompted by problems faced in this study; others were suggested by considering alternative perspectives. On a practical level, sport needs more relevant and local baseline data, on which to build understanding of the lives and experiences of those for whom policies are developed. This has reinforced the need to have more, not less, bottom-up policy and a greater autonomy to local decision-making, in order to achieve policy objectives.

As identified earlier, in order to produce convincing evidence of programme impacts, a comparison or control group, whether using qualitative or quantitative approaches would be useful. Unfortunately a comparison cohort in schools in each case study was rejected on practical and resource grounds, as co-operation from schools and local authorities would have been necessary much earlier in the process to identify suitable groups. Based on initial enquiries, this was not going to be forthcoming from schools, so an alternative had to be found, which was the use of group interviews in schools.

The use of children selected by the teachers needed more formal constitution/selection criteria, to ensure better reliability and representativeness. But I was not in a position to dictate to schools and teachers already reluctant to
get involved. Some groups were most illuminating but others gave little usable
data, with monosyllabic or chaotic responses. Despite the limitations, the groups
were useful for insight into how contemporary young people felt about and
articulated their views on local sport and their opportunities. Technical problems
of recording and transcribing sometimes rather hectic or noisy sessions also
contributed to problems of analysis, but conducting these sessions was in itself a
valuable learning experience.

The politics of the research process were illuminated by interactions with
professionals, volunteers and clients of the Scheme; the SDOs and coaches in
particular, whom I spoke to in some depth, were as open and helpful as they could
be. On the other hand, officers in some agencies, some teachers or school
administrators were sometimes unhelpful, or failed to respond to requests for
information. As an independent researcher, I was relatively easy to ignore. These
requests may have been considered differently had I been commissioned by the
policy makers, or represented a funding agency or other major stakeholder.
Though the research was independent, it nevertheless relied on such agencies or
individual gatekeepers for access to data; when these gatekeepers restricted or
prevented access, the research design had to be amended. For example, neither
data on the characteristics (by sport, age and gender) of the CC coaches, or full
details of programme outputs, were made available from the NCF, so questions
relating to these aspects were missing from the survey, and it was difficult to
check whether the recall of coaches and SDOs was accurate or representative.

The intention of the research was always to go beyond description of the impacts
of CC, to relate what was learned to wider issues of sport and society, and to
attempt to have some influence on practice and policy in future. The final section
of the chapter examines these issues and makes suggestions for further work in
this area.
8.4 Coaching and youth sport policy and the implications for future research

As a result of this research, I put forward evidence of what is was about CC that worked and attempt to generalise this to youth sport and coaching. In summary, this is that the provision of low cost, good quality coaching, in accessible venues can lead to increased long term involvement with sport, including membership of sports clubs. Voluntary coaches, if they are given sufficient opportunity and support over longer periods, can be encouraged to remain active and engaged in youth sport, some may even consider coaching as an alternative career. For professional development of coaching, there needs to be more recognition of the many pressures faced by coaches, working in challenging contexts and communities and more emphasis on personal development. Simply by being selected to take part in CC, both participants and coaches may have demonstrated a ‘Hawthorne effect’, as their sporting lives and trajectories were altered, regardless of the impacts of the programme itself.

Two different discourses can still be discerned in sports policy, and as yet they are not reconciled. They represent concerns for inclusion, accessibility and achieving life-long participation in sport on the one hand and concerns for excellence, performance and achievement of international success on the other. CC was clearly and explicitly placed within the ‘performance’ camp. Potential barriers to participants were recognised in the design, but not fully integrated into implementation, consequently, sports equity remains an aspiration as persistent gaps between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’ in sport remain, as in wider society. Coaching bridges both the inclusion and excellence agenda’s in sport, as it underpins success in attracting and retaining participants in sport, as well as in top class performance. It remains therefore, an area of potential conflict, when arriving at policy solutions, even though financial resources for coaching have increased.

The limitations of the research have been alluded to above. Of these, the failure to contact sufficiently large cohorts of participants to enable some conclusions regarding the performance of different sports involved with CC is perhaps significant. This is of more interest when considering the selection of fewer sports
to gain access to funding, as it raises the question, of whether these are the sports to help achieve policy objectives.

Though this study goes some way to contribute to a realist synthesis in the sport policy area, more cases and the testing of some of the conclusions arrived at are needed to fully map youth sport and coaching mechanisms. Though it would not be appropriate (or possible) to look at more CC schemes, such an approach should be taken with County Partnerships in AS.

**Future Research Directions**

*Research on coaches and coaching development*

Despite announcing significant funds for implementing CTF proposals, the theoretical and evidential base for recruiting large numbers of community coaches and the influx of thousands of young people into sports coaching and leadership as volunteers remains limited. This evaluation has shown that a national programme for paying and supporting coaches had limited success in retaining them as active, and that support of voluntary coaches in communities has been very haphazard.

There appears to be some evidence to support a Coach Development role, but gaps in knowledge remain about how such a role may work, and what objectives such officers should fulfil, but this has not slowed the implementation of CTF-funded posts. Concerns remain over the impacts on volunteer coaches of increased certification and regulation. With greater voluntary involvement in clubs being sought by AS and other policies, the impacts of the drive to professionalise coaching remain uncertain.

CC mechanisms of coach profiling and more structured development plans for individuals helped to retain some coaches, but were limited by their personal circumstances. CC could not offer many coaches more than a limited ‘career’ and for most, it would remain secondary to their main occupation. A similar number of coaches to that used on CC (3000) is expected to comprise the new community coaching workforce. However, we still do not fully understand whether the employment of this number of coaches will displace some of the voluntary
workforce, as the CCPR and sports administrators are suggesting (CCPR, 2003; Nichols, 2003).

Also there are still significant gaps in understanding the impacts on practice of current models of coach education and development, and whether sufficient improvements are being made to the quality of coaching, from leaders of activities in sports clubs to elite coaches. With the introduction of the LTAD (Balyi, 2001), there seem to be growing demands to adapt coaching practice to meet the needs of performer development models, but less understanding of the mechanisms of coach recruitment, education and development which would underpin such practice (Abraham and Collins, 1998; Potrac and Jones, 1999; Potrac et al, 2000). Increasing attention to the social interactions and contexts of coaching in communities would appear to be required (Potrac et al, 2002).

The introduction of the new CTF schemes, such as Step into Coaching and the development of the National Coaching Certificate, presents an opportunity to extend and improve knowledge of what makes better coaches and how they can be encouraged and supported to continue to develop. Though this project helps, much remains to be done to help policy makers devise appropriate methods of support, particularly for coaches at the lower levels of performance, where the bulk of community and club coaching occurs.

There is substantial potential for cross-cultural research, especially to compare the Scandinavian, volunteer-based sports systems with our own, ‘mixed economy’ of provision, particularly as they have such large numbers of adults engaged in coaching (CTF, 2002; Arfwidsson, 2003). Government policy (DCMS, 2002) seems to seek similar gains in participation to those achieved in Scandinavia, but our sport policies have moved towards Australian and as yet unproven Canadian sport systems (Balyi, 2001) to emulate their success in producing elite athletes, balanced with the re-introduction of community programmes. Given the nature of coaching resources in Britain, widely recognised as scarce, undervalued and increasingly regulated, research into alternative models for the community coach could be vital. Due to the concern noted above, that the increased requirement for qualifications and registration, may result in alienation for some volunteers.
particularly those in community clubs who already feel under too much pressure (Nichols, 2003), the Swedish model of high voluntary activity in coaching supported by a strong sporting Federation could provide some alternatives for the UK (Arfwidsson, 2003).

Research on Pathways and participants
There remains a dearth of published research on the workings of the AS partnerships and the outcomes on sporting pathways planned and or achieved by them, though initial work is beginning to emerge (Enoch, forthcoming; Charlton, forthcoming). The County Partnerships clearly need such data.

As a follow up to this research, more work on the relative success of the Merseysport Partnership and Flintshire as they continue to build pathways in after-school sport and systems for community coaching, either within AS or without, could certainly add to knowledge on the effective mechanisms. More longitudinal research is needed for example, to examine the impact of teachers and school policies on the sporting trajectories of young people after they leave school. The research here has indicated that the teacher played a pivotal role in informing and encouraging young people to join clubs. But the change of some schools to Sport Colleges may have had an even bigger contribution. Some students seemed to infer that they joined clubs despite not because of their experiences at school. Larger scale studies on these aspects of school-club links are essential to improve the effectiveness of such policies and provide much clearer evidence that the funds being devoted to such programmes, which are very significant, result in the increased involvement with organised sport the Government is seeking. Early results are not all that promising, with a reported 30% of children in SSCO Partnership schools involved in sports outside of school and 1 in 7 moving into clubs (DfES, 2004).

Though respondents in this study, as in Nottinghamshire, were very clearly satisfied with their clubs, those who were not are less likely to be involved in sport still and respond to a survey. More research is needed therefore into the impact of the club experience on youth sport participation, particularly with children in disadvantaged areas and a longitudinal approach to such research would be most valuable.
Sport and the Development of Social Capital

The final and linked aspect of further research is the development of social capital through sport. This would require a study into the nature of the social capital developed through AS and similar multi-sport programmes geared to increasing participation in organised, club sport. Coalter (2003) has asked whether this is bridging capital, which reinforces the links between different groups in society, or bonding capital, which reinforces the links within groups, and Stolle et al (1998) suggested the latter. If building more club memberships is only about improving the situation in those sports organisations, the ‘public good’ arguments for supporting such activity are diminished.

At the moment, it is unclear whether AS, as a more holistic programme, demonstrates more club memberships, or voluntary sport coaching as measures of social capital, or indeed whether such activity can be seen as evidence of such capital (I prefer the term sport capital to overcome the objections anticipated). Arguably, as indicated in this study, such activity was difficult to sustain in areas with a limited tradition of sports clubs and volunteering. Further studies would need to examine the responses to AS in different communities where such sport capital has taken generations to build. This research indicated that such structural deficiencies took longer than was possible to overcome within the time span of CC. Eventually it may be possible to identify how sport policy can best grow such capital and in what timescale.

Similar outcomes to those achieved by CC may have been achieved by Sport England funding clubs directly to recruit members and coaches. We still have only a limited picture of how clubs ‘work’ in the UK, and though MacPhail et al (2003) have shown the considerable potential of ethnography for understanding these complex settings, for practical and theoretical reasons I had to set aside such perspectives in this study.

Evaluating sport programmes - lessons learned

There are some key lessons that can be drawn from this research about evaluating sport programmes. Firstly, that realist approaches, which base measures of programme impacts on appropriate theory and which subsequently investigate
different contexts of implementation using a range of sources of evidence and perspectives, have much to offer sport policy.

This study has demonstrated structural barriers to sport can be overcome with appropriate actions, and that coaching programmes can contribute to changing perceptions of competence and thus *habitus* for young people, which in the longer term can contribute to changing sporting trajectories, even for those from more deprived areas. However, given the small scale of many clubs in the UK, compared to some European states (Theordoraki, 1999), a challenge remains in sustaining the clubs and settings where young people continue to develop their sporting careers once they leave school. In this respect, CC was only partly successful, as termination of the programme meant that unless the groups and clubs were already firmly established, withdrawal of support led to decline in opportunity, doubly disappointing to those with raised expectations and unmet aspirations. Evaluations of such schemes need therefore to take a long term view, and be funded to do so, with evaluation planned at the outset, and covering the withdrawal or termination stage of the process as well as the implementation, to gain more insight into the outcomes achieved and their value for money or return for effort expended.

CC was perhaps most successful in learning at the individual level, in young people, coaches, and SD practitioners. The learning by the professionals was essential to develop local coaching strategies and improve the resources available for sport. For reasons alluded to above, it was not always possible to convert individual social capital to a communal resource and utilise it to the full.

The use of unique identifications to track outcomes would be a useful tool and relatively simply to implement at local level. The resourcing of base line data for evaluations should become part of the funding available for large scale schemes such as AS, with measures aligned closely to the objectives of the programme at the outset, and taking into account the views of different stakeholders. Data collection would then be a matter of routine and organisational demands could be more easily matched to funding requirements. Departments would not simply be
‘jumping through hoops’ to achieve funding, but could see wider and long term benefits of this process.

However, Departments and individual officers may need more support in order to develop positive approaches to outcome-oriented evaluations. The development of meaningful outcome measures, such as membership of club or use of sport services, is essential. In genuine partnership with schools, this could be information, which all local authorities could gather and feed into strategic plans for sport at national level. The impacts of any scheme on the key outcome measures could then be more clearly seen.

Qualitative aspects of schemes need also to be recognised and appropriate measures devised to capture the perceptions of the participants, client groups and other stakeholders, on the effectiveness of both process and outcome. Sport England have clearly recognised the need for more informative data and their guidance is quite extensive on the mechanics of surveys and audits (SE, 2002), but at the same time, responsibility for such data collection and analysis has been laid at the feet of local government, where resources for non-statutory sport provision are under almost constant threat. Building more evaluations into the framework of schemes may be the only way such work is ensured and resourced. Resource intensive methods, such as interviews with representative groups of stakeholders must also be part of this process.

Youth Sport and Coaching Policy

This research has shown many positives flowed from CC, for individuals, organisations and in the progress of national sport policy. My final conclusions must be to highlight that the Scheme had an almost inestimable influence over many thousands of professionals in sport development, coaching and PE teaching from 1991 to 1999. It also reached many thousands of young people and influenced for many, their future involvement in sport for the better.

If my findings are replicated across other areas, the Scheme contributed significantly to the number of children continuing their involvement with
organised after-school sport and increased their likelihood of joining a sports club. However, national surveys provide an incomplete picture of this impact, as CC was not adopted nationally. If the national figures on involvement with clubs is taken as an indicator, then CC, as part of the National Junior Sport Programme, made only marginal impact on national figures, as club membership of young people in clubs outside of school grew only marginally from 42% to 46% between 1994 and 1999, when CC operated, then fell to 43% by 2002 (SE, 2003). One interpretation of this could be that the termination of CC contributed to the fall back to 1994 levels, despite the introduction of AS, with its clear talent pathways. Only time will tell if current policies will reverse this trend.

At the meso level of policy in youth sport and coaching CC has been influential, but other coalitions and programmes operating in the area of youth sport, have highlighted the tensions and conflicts still endemic in youth sport. For example, whether sport is valued for its own sake, or because it helps achieve other social objectives. A central argument is whether CC was about developing sports talent and improving coaching, or about developing young people. Arguably it was about both and so ran the risk of achieving neither. I must conclude it was not as successful as it might have been, if it been able to continue to grow and improve practice and coverage over time. Though the life-cycle of the programme was one of the longest in UK sport, because of the nature of the implementation, sufficient support for continuation had not accumulated before it was terminated, even before the replacement scheme could be adopted in its place. However, the legacy of CC can be seen in current DiES policies and the work of the YST, and the work of key individuals involved continues to impact on current policy, despite changes in the policy climate.

This reinforces the weakness of the application of policy learning to the policy making process in sport. This also tends to refute the notion of a clear policy community in youth sport and coaching, as these two areas have not demonstrated sufficient co-ordination of purpose over time. Despite this proviso, the underlying direction of policy that CC represented, developing the social capital of coaches and in coaching systems, had some success. Thus, CC unintentionally helped
confirm the fragmented and opportunistic nature of the development of policy in both youth sport and coaching.

This study has demonstrated the value of individual support to coach development, and the potential role for a designated officer. This may help produce a greater clarification of roles between NGBs, local authorities, AS partnerships, and SCUK for coaching development. Much more work is required to underpin further growth in employment, the move to professionalism and a licensed coaching workforce. However, with a lack of coherent ‘community’ apparent in youth sport and the competing discourses of talent and participation, there remains some doubt as to how best to achieve the desired outcomes, and indeed what is desirable and achievable in this crowded and dynamic policy space.
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## Appendix 1

### Coach Details

**Coaches Contacted in each scheme and their background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ed background</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>MSc, Degree</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Water Polo</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Girls Football</td>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Girls Football</td>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>degree?</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Girls Football</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>degree(sport)</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>degree - sport</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Girls Football</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Degree - sport</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Degree - not</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>Degree - not</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>degree - sport</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>degree - sport</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>41-64</td>
<td>not degree</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ages approximate at time of interview - April-July 2003)

? not known
Appendix 2

Letter to Schools and proposal

Sent February/March 2003

To selected schools in St Helens and Knowsley

June 2003 to selected schools in Flintshire
24th February 2003

Dear «Title» «LastName»

**Champion Coaching Research Project**

I am currently completing my PhD with Loughborough University, on the evaluation of sports development programmes for young people. I am a Senior Lecturer at Edge Hill College in Ormskirk, in the Department of Sport and Physical Education. The focus of my research is the long term impacts of the Champion Coaching Scheme of the NCF, in selected parts of the North West of England and North Wales. This scheme involved the Local authorities and sports governing bodies organising out of school sports programmes for young people and the development of coaches in these sports. The attached proposal gives additional background about the research and the progress so far. I have already given a presentation on the research to date to the Commonwealth Sports Conference in Manchester in 2002. Though the scheme ended in 2000, I am gathering evidence of its long term impacts on sport policy and practice in these areas.

The final stage of the research involves looking at the links established between schools and out of school sport. St Helens MBC Sport and Recreation Department is co-operating with my study, and I am therefore seeking to include your school in the research, as it was one of the schools involved in referring children to the Champion Coaching sports programmes.

The data collection will involve interviews with the Physical Education department staff and focus group interviews with several groups of year 11 students. The intention is to gather the details on school policies and programmes for linking with out of school opportunities and the attitudes of staff to the Champion Coaching scheme (whether or not they had involvement with it). The arrangements for interviews would be entirely subject to your agreement and
would all take place at the school. The group interviews would take the form of small group (6-12 students) discussions where young people are asked their opinions are regarding after school sport opportunities in St Helens and what their experiences have been. This age group has been selected as the one which is more likely to have had opportunities to be involved with Champion Coaching, though the selection of children to take part should be random. The school, individual staff and children will all remain anonymous in the research reports.

I would like to complete the research before the end of the current school year and could be available for visits at different times of the week between March and July. I would hope to be able to complete the interviews on a single visit, though of course, this would depend on the availability of staff and children and your academic programme.

If you would be able to co-operate with the research, or wish to have more details, please contact me on the numbers below, or return the slip attached and I will then contact the staff identified to make the necessary arrangements.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Yours sincerely

Barbara Bell BSc, MA, MILAM
Senior Lecturer

Department of Sport and PE
Tel 01695 584896 (W) 01565 652295 (H)
Email bellb@edgehill.ac.uk

Champion Coaching Research Project - St Helens
School :

PE Dept or staff Contact:

Delete as appropriate:
- You may contact the person above to make arrangements for the study
- We would like more information before proceeding, contact the named person above
- We are unable to take part in the study

Please return in the envelope provided
Evaluating Youth Sports Development - the Impacts of the Champion Coaching Scheme in the North West and North Wales

Research Project for PhD – Barbara Bell

Background and reasons for the Study

There is a strong commitment to the development of sport for young people by Sport England and equivalent agencies in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. There has also been a growing recognition of the need to encourage “performance pathways” to link the development into performance and excellence related work of the National Governing Bodies. However, the role of coaches in the development of these performance pathways has not been extensively researched. The Champion Coaching Scheme of the National Coaching Foundation (NCF) was established in 1991 at least partly to fulfil this role, and after a decade of operation, it was subsumed into the new Active Sport Programmes of Sport England.

While there have been reviews of recruitment and completion of participants on sport programmes (i.e., output measures) there have been few studies of how participation and performance has changed over time (i.e., outcome measures) in projects like this. Using data on the Nottinghamshire Sport Training Scheme, Collins and Buller (2000) looked children’s and parents’ satisfaction, at the new levels of competition reached, and at coaches’ views. They also highlighted issues worthy of further research, particularly in the success of the scheme in linking to ongoing participation. However, they also found that different parts of the county had different rates of take up of the coaching opportunities available. The consultation document of the Review of Coaching published by UKSport/NCF (UKSport, 1999) also highlighted the need for greater research into the work and development of coaches. The need for better understanding of the impacts of quality coaching and coaches on the development of sport, particularly youth sport, has also been highlighted by the announcements of the Coaching Task Force (DCMS, 2002), who called for an increase in the number of coaches working with young people in particular.

However, analysis of the longer term impacts or outcomes of sports development programmes remains a grey area in the literature. Tracking participants over time is seldom carried out, and analysis of participants is limited. Secondly, the issue of effectiveness of schemes is often assumed via anecdotes, rather than being objectively demonstrated and supported by evidence. The tracking of coaches involved with Champion Coaching (of which there were over 3,000) has not been undertaken thus far.

Research Objectives

Firstly the research seeks to analyse and make recommendations for future practice on the
impacts or outcomes for participants and coaches in sports development programmes

We have selected Champion Coaching schemes in NW England/ N Wales as vehicles for this work. The criteria for selection are that the schemes should:
1) have been running for 3 or more years
2) have substantial numbers of participants
3) be willing to co-operate by providing access to details of coaches and participants on the schemes

Secondly, to investigate the long-term impacts of the Champion Coaching Scheme and to provide some evidence of for example, the extent of continued participation by young people in organised, club based sports after taking part in Champion Coaching.

Other issues to be addressed include:
- The nature of such participation – has Champion Coaching contributed to the development of performance?
- The impact of “quality assured” coaching and coaches on the experiences of young people and to continuation in performance oriented programmes
- Whether the links established from schools to clubs demonstrate the “performance pathways” for sports in the case study organisations
- Did Champion Coaching demonstrate sports equity, via the analysis of take up and access to the programme as well as the outcomes achieved.
- To examine the links between school based and out of school sport in the areas selected, to identify where and why “drop out” occurs from performance oriented programmes.
- Examine the effectiveness of National Governing Bodies in taking up where Champion Coaches finished, with regard to performance oriented young people and coaching opportunities, as well as in continuing long term coaching careers for the coaches developed through the schemes.

Methods for the Study/ Progress so far;

Contact was made with all Champion Coaching Schemes in the North West/ N.Wales area, operating since 1995 in the local authority areas of St Helens & Knowsley, Stockport, Tameside, Manchester, Flintshire, Sefton.

Of these, Flintshire, St Helens and Knowsley agreed to co-operate with the study and were able to continue (Stockport and Sefton were interested in co-operating but were unable to supply details of participants required).

Methods of data collection:
- A survey of participants in Champion Coaching 1996 –1999, where available, including a questionnaire for parents views, in each of the selected programmes
- Survey of coaches in Champion Coaching (national sample and all coaches in selected programmes)
- Interviews with coaches and Youth Sport Managers
- Interviews with NCF co-ordinating staff
- Interviews and focus groups in schools involved with Champion Coaching in the selected Local Authorities
Additional data from each authority on local socio-economic indicators, club contact information, school contacts, enabling case study analysis of each programme.
The information will be collated into a series of case studies, with opportunities for comparison and analysis across sports, where possible.
The field work started in April 2000, once the format for questionnaires was finalised after consultation with case study organisations, with initial interviews with Youth Sport Managers and the development of the participant surveys. In 2001/2 additional surveys were conducted, interviews with NCF staff and the Coach survey was also completed. Socio economic data on the various Local Authorities was gathered from national statistics and Census sources. School visits and coach interviews are to be completed in 2003 in the final phase of the field work, along with interviews with the new Active Sport partnership representatives.

Additional data from the NCF (now Sportscoach UK) as part of their co-operation in the study, includes:
The number schemes and participants 1997/98, 1998/99 and 1999/00 in the relevant sports.
Coach recruitment details – number of coaches, the qualifications they obtained as part of the scheme, their characteristics.
Funding arrangements of Champion Coaching and details of the monitoring process by the NCF – further interviews with NCF staff involved in the project and their views of the lessons learned from the “blueprint” and how it has been adapted by the local authorities involved in the new Active Sport Partnerships.

The study will provide evidence of the outcomes achieved by the Champion Coaching scheme in these selected case studies, though the findings can be used to develop understanding of the operation and outcomes of similar schemes. Furthermore it can also provide some benchmarks against which subsequent schemes can be evaluated, for example in attracting participants from more disadvantaged areas, or in the long term development of coaches.

For further information or if you have any queries, or comments, please contact at the address below,

Barbara Bell
Department of Sport and Physical Education,
Edge Hill College
St Helens Road
Ormskirk
Lancashire
L39 4QP
Tel: 01695 584896 (W) 01565 652295 (H)
Email bellb@edgehill.ac.uk

Research Supervisor at Loughborough University: Mr M. F. Collins Tel: 01509 223289
Appendix 3

Mailing sent to participants and parents (Knowsley)

St Helens (November/December, 2000)

Knowsley, (November/December, 2001)

Flintshire (March, 2002)
Dear Participant

Champion Coaching Evaluation

I am currently conducting a project on the Champion Coaching Scheme, as part of my research into Youth Sports Development. This research is being completed with Loughborough University as part of my PhD. Your local Sports Development unit has agreed to help me in distributing this questionnaire to a selected number of young people who took part in Champion Coaching, between 1995 and 1999.

I am hoping to find out what the long term impacts of the scheme have been and what young people and their parents feel about it. I am looking at schemes in various parts of the North West and North Wales.

I would be grateful if you could complete the enclosed questionnaires and return them in the envelope provided - there will be no postage to pay.

If you would like to be included in a prize draw for £25.00 of vouchers for JJB sports, you can include your details. However, this is not required, as the information you provide in the questionnaires themselves is the most important part of the study.

All the information obtained will be confidential and is only being used for my project. The eventual results of the whole project may be used by your local sports development unit in order to help them in providing sports opportunities for young people.

If you have any queries about the questionnaire or would like to know more about my project, please feel free to contact me, or my contact at the sports development unit, named below.

Many thanks for your help

Regards

Barbara Bell

A research project in conjunction with

Sports Development team Contact: Christine Nevinson
Tel 0151 443 4356

Knowsley Council
Champion Coaching – Participants’ Questionnaire

Please complete the following questionnaire to help us improve future sporting opportunities for young people.

Knowsley Council

Champion Coaching

1. Which Champion Coaching course did you take part in?
   (please tick all that apply)
   - Hockey
   - Netball
   - Cricket
   - Basketball
   - Girls Soccer
   - Badminton

2. Where did your most recent Champion Coaching course take place?
   - Kirkby Sports Centre
   - Scotchbarn Sports Centre
   - Prescott Comprehensive
   - Halewood Comprehensive
   - Huyton Cricket Club
   - Haydock Community L. C.
   - Newton Cricket Club

3. What year did you take part in a course?
   - 1996
   - 1997
   - 1998
   - 1999

PLEASE ANSWER ALL OF THE REMAINING QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR MOST RECENT CHAMPION COACHING COURSE.

4. Was the venue easy to get to? Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐

5. If not, please explain why below

6. Did you enjoy the Champion Coaching course? Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐

7. What did you enjoy about the course?
   - Learning more skills ☐
   - Making new friends ☐
   - Improving my performance ☐
   - The sessions were fun ☐
   - The coach was friendly ☐
   - Any other reason? Please enter below:

8. If you did not enjoy the course, please explain why below

9. Do you feel that you were able to benefit from the coaching you received?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☐
   - Not sure ☐
Your Sport Participation
This section of the questionnaire is about your involvement with sport, following the Champion Coaching course and your general involvement with sport whilst at school.

10. At the end of the Champion Coaching course, did you:
(please tick all that apply)
- Carry on playing the sport for fun? □
- Join a local sports club? □
- Join the county squad? □
- Join a newly set up junior club? □
- Give up playing the sport? □
- Join a development squad for the sport? □
- Carry on playing the sport for school? (outside of lessons) □
- Join the Youth Games Squad? □
- Any other alternative not listed? Please note here.......................... □

11. If you gave up playing the sport, why? (please note your reason or reasons below)

12. If you joined a club, did it
- Welcome you into the club? □
- Have a junior section? □
- Have organised matches and competitions? □
- Have friendly coaches or leaders? □
- Have low fees and charges? □

13. How did you find out about the club?
- Teacher at school □
- Parent □
- Friend □
- Champion Coaching course □
- Other (please note) □

14. Have you any other comments about joining a club?

15. Are you currently a member of a sports club?
- Yes □
- No □

16. Do you currently play sport on a regular basis? (more than once per month)
- Yes □
- No □

17. What sport have you taken part in at school – during lessons?
Please tick all that apply.
- Aerobics □
- Hockey □
- Basketball □
- Swimming □
- Cricket □
- Table Tennis □
- Football □
- Volleyball □
- Dance □
- Tennis □
- Rounders □
- Rugby League □
- Gymnastics □
- Athletics □
- Netball □
- Badminton □
- Baseball/Softball □
- Squash □
- Rugby Union □
- Outdoor Activities □ (please list .........................)
18. What sport have you taken part in **outside** of school lessons on a regular basis? *please tick all that apply*

- Aerobics □
- Hockey □
- Basketball □
- Swimming □
- Cricket □
- Table Tennis □
- Football □
- Volleyball □
- Dance □
- Tennis □
- Rounders □
- Bowling □
- Gymnastics □
- Athletics □
- Netball □
- Rugby League □
- Badminton □
- Baseball/Softball □
- Squash □
- Skiing □
- Cycling □
- Golf □
- Snooker/Pool □
- Judo □
- Table Tennis □
- Boxing □
- Karate □
- Rugby Union □
- Outdoor Activities □ - …………………

19. What are your favourite sports?

20. What sports do you not enjoy taking part in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please list in order</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. If you are currently a member of a sports club, please complete the section below, by indicating with a tick, which of the following statements apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The sports club,</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is very friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a lot of juniors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has encouraged me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has kept me busy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped me to make new friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped me to improve my skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has given me opportunities to compete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has offered me coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Please note below any other comments you would like to make about your experience of Champion Coaching. Use the back of the sheet if you need to.

24. My post code is: ... Age ........

Gender (circle) M □ F □

You may complete the details below, if you wish to be included in a prize draw, for £25 of vouchers from JJB sports.

**IF YOU DO NOT WISH TO GIVE THIS INFORMATION IT IS NOT ESSENTIAL.**

Name

Address

Tel No

MANY THANKS FOR YOUR HELP WITH THIS STUDY PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED ALONG WITH THE PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE.
Champion Coaching – Parents’ Questionnaire

**Champion Coaching Evaluation**

We are very interested in your views and comments on the course your son or daughter completed as part of the Champion Coaching scheme. The questionnaire attached is for your child to complete.

**PLEASE ANSWER IN RELATION TO THEIR MOST RECENT CHAMPION COACHING COURSE**

**Please tick the appropriate box**

**Sport:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>Kirkby Sports Centre</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>Scotchbarn Sports Centre</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>Prescott Comprehensive</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Halewood Comprehensive</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Soccer</td>
<td>Huyton Cricket Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haydock Community L. C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>Newton Cricket Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please comment on the following** *(place a circle around the appropriate figure)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unable to comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The standard of coaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation of sessions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental contact by coach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration from centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The enjoyment of your child</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about progression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of the course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The accessibility of the venue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any other additional comments to make about your involvement with Champion Coaching or that of your child?

Gender of Child

M F

Age of child (at time of the course) ............

**PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED ALONG WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED BY YOUR CHILD. MANY THANKS FOR CO-OPERATING WITH THIS STUDY**
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Mailing sent to Coaches in National and Case study samples
March 2002
Interview recording sheet and schedule for coach interviews
Champion Coaching Evaluation Project

Coach Questionnaire
The aim of this questionnaire is to establish some of the long term impacts of the Champion Coaching Scheme on the coaches involved, as well as to evaluate a specific number of schemes in various Local Authorities. Please complete all questions as fully as possible. Your responses will remain anonymous and will be used for academic purposes only. The final report may include some recommendations for practice by Sports Development agencies and organisations. If you are prepared to be interviewed, as a follow up to this survey, please indicate at the end of the questionnaire. Many thanks for your co-operation.

1. What was your personal level of involvement with Champion Coaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Level</th>
<th>Number of courses delivered</th>
<th>Years (please note the year or years of coaching)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you receive coach scholarship support? Yes □ No □

3. Did you have the opportunity to attend any additional coaching award opportunities? Yes □ No □

4. What education or training opportunities were you able to take advantage of in Champion Coaching? Note in the box below the training opportunities you were able to take advantage of, as a result of Champion Coaching.

5. Prior to the Champion Coaching sport programmes, were you already coaching young people? Yes □ No □

6. Did you become a qualified coach to work on the Champion Coaching Programme? Yes □ No □

7. Please add any additional comments below:
8. If you are a teacher, have you delivered coaching in school sport programmes in the
the last two years?
In curriculum time  Yes  □  No  □
Out of school hours activity  Yes  □  No  □

9. Has working through the Champion Coaching Scheme had any direct impact on
your own level or amount of coaching activity? Please indicate by a tick in the relevant box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time spent coaching</th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work with young people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance oriented coaching (e.g. Development squad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved with a club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work as a coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have the following aspects of Champion Coaching impacted on your current
coaching practice? Please indicate by a tick in the relevant box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral/No impact</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach Profiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments?

11. What were the reactions from the following people about the coaching courses you
were involved with? (please tick the relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What was the general Coach : athlete ratio for your courses?

13. Do you feel you were more effective as a coach as a result of the development you
were able to have through the Champion Coaching Scheme?
Yes  □  No  □  Not Sure  □

Please indicate why:
14. As Champion Coaching Programmes were centrally administered, can you please note your observations about administration of the programmes, from your point of view as a Coach

(Please circle the appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The arrangements for the coaching sessions</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The venues selected for coaching</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The progression arrangements from Champion Coaching programme to other opportunities:</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration from Local Authority</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information provided to participants</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with parents</td>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Are you still involved in coaching with the Local Authority responsible for the Champion Coaching Scheme? Yes □ No □

16. If not, what is the main reason?

17. If yes, are you involved with the Active Sport programme? Yes □ No □ Not applicable □

Please give brief details of your current coaching involvement in the box below:

18. Are you currently a sports coach UK member? YES □ NO □

if not, what is the main reason for not joining?

19. Have you taken part in any of the following since the end of Champion Coaching?
(Please tick all that apply)

- sports coach UK /NCF workshop □
- NGB Update or Professional Development with NGB □
- Coach Profile meeting with Local Authority □
- Running Sport Workshop □

20. What do you feel the most valuable aspect of Champion Coaching has been, based on your own experience?

- Development of coaching expertise □
- Opportunity for coaching scholarships □
- Coaching young people □
- New opportunities for juniors in your sport □
- Being part of a national programme □

Other reason □

Please note below:

□
Space for open comments – please note any other comments about your experience of Champion Coaching in the box below

Contact details if you are willing to be contacted for interview (not required)
Name
Address
Tel number

Once completed, please return in the envelope provided.
Many thanks for your help with this study

Please Return by: 2nd April 2002
Telephone/ Interviews

Name

Taped/not taped
Location of interview

Scheme

Sport

Approx Age
18-25
26-40
41-64
65 and over

Gender

If completing telephone survey

Go through attached questions in the order set and ask for comments in the appropriate places, record all responses on the sheet.

IF limited time, ask key questions only to give yes/no or brief responses, or ask as general open ended and code depending on response

Q1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19

Interviews

See attached schedule

Preamble

Explain the purpose of the research – research for PhD, on the scheme overall in selected LA's. this focusing on impacts on coaches development and their careers since being involved with CC. Confidential responses though will pass overall results to scuk eventually in the form of summary report and may publish findings from the finished PhD.

Note any comments here:

If prepared to be taped, turn this on for qualitative comments and confirm.
Developing themes from the earlier Questionnaire

1. Personal level of involvement with CC/impacts
Open Questions to explore:
What was your involvement with Champion Coaching?

(Prompt if ....
Access to scholarships?
Access to enhancing NGB award?
Already qualified?
Personal development through CC – in working with young people, or at performance level?

Tell me how working through CC impacted on Your coaching

How did it impact on
-Delivery/Coaching effectiveness?
-Your coaching career (involvement with coaching)?

Any problems with CC from your point of view – the sessions/programmes themselves, or how they were organised? What happened to the children at the end?

Relationship with the Local Authorities:
How would you describe the relationship with the local authority?
Explore?
Did you find the Coach briefings useful, did they continue after the scheme?
What impact did it have that you were being paid by the LA?
How would you describe your current relationship with S dev unit?

Attitude to CPD and scuk since CC

Do you belong to scuk? (if not why not)

NGB support for coaches? – how does the NGB support you since CC ended?

CPD or workshop during/since CC? (NGB or scuk?)
If not why?

developing your coaching – explain what this (developing your coaching)
means to you and what helps it or hinders it.
Do you think CC has made any long term difference to coaching in your sport, generally or locally?

Add any other comments to make about the "legacy" of CC?
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Interview Schedules:

a) YSM/ Scheme manager (and Active Sport Manager)

b) Coach Development Officer

c) Teachers

d) Pupil Groups
a) Youth Sport Managers

Youth Sport Managers (my notes in italics)

To explore their experiences of the CC process and outcomes achieved. Attitudes and opinions of the effectiveness of the scheme, where it fitted in to organisational objectives and work programmes, what it achieved locally/nationally.

Operational effectiveness – Program compared to theory
What was the role of the YSM in the authority, compared to the “blueprint” of CC?
To cover:
Work programme
How much of their time was devoted to CC
What specific objectives were set (if any) in terms of the year/sport in CC
Relationship between the two
Job description – specific responsibilities
Line management by?

Co-ordination with other agencies
How prepared were you for the amount of co-ordination needed?
Were there any difficulties in practice with this?
Who were the main partners in your scheme and how important were they?

Administration
What was the admin of CC like?
(heavy/light etc)
were you very driven by NCF requirements? Any difficulties with this?

Training for CC?
(to establish how well prepared the individual YSM felt about the scheme)
Was there any?
Was it helpful?
Did you feel it was necessary?
Support materials (e.g. the Blueprint and guide)

Monitoring and Evaluation
(to establish what monitoring took place and how this was used)

Did you have any problems fulfilling the monitoring requirements of NCF?

What internal monitoring took place? (measurement of ?)
How did you evaluate the scheme each year? (ref to targets?)
What sort of things were changed as a result of the monitoring or evaluation process? (evidence of quality based approach)
To whom /how did you report progress – (internal organisational working and externally)
What sort of profile did the scheme have locally / as a result?
(Evidence of externally produced public relations or other copy – re profile?)
Implementation/Delivery (Process – compared to programme theory)

Any particular problems with the implementation of CC highlighted in your scheme?

How dealt with?

Sports Programmes themselves
Difficulties (if any) in arranging the sports programmes?

SELECTION POLICY – HOW DID THE LOCAL SCHOOLS RESPOND?

TIMING OF THE PROGRAMMES?

LOCATION/VENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback from?</th>
<th>What sort of feedback did you receive about your progress as a scheme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The NCF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHERS/ SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was this adequate/helpful/ did you act on it?

Were you concerned with any particular equity issues when planning or delivering the scheme? (Choice of sports, special arrangements, targeting?)

Did you take these into account in any aspect of selection of sports, location or publicity?
What aspects of equity (Don’t prompt : deprived/disability/ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative/quantitative – views of children, coaches, clubs?</th>
<th>Whose perspective would be important in evaluation of the long term impacts of CC locally?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were they gathered at the time?</td>
<td>(where would you look for evidence? What are you looking for?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease or otherwise of gathering the evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of concern about scheme as it progressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you feel this is being achieved?

Has CC experience influenced the way other programmes and schemes are implemented?
Coach Development (to Examine Coaching legacy and process of coach dev compared to programme theory)

How important was the coach development part of CC to your dept?

Scholarships – were they offered? What was the criteria for offering them
If not, why not

What was the take up like/
Coach recruitment
How were coaches recruited onto CC – existing coaches or new to LA?
Coach profiles – were you doing this already? Was it new thing, has is carried on
Local database of coaches?
Retaining coaches as active?
How did you monitor the actual sessions taking place? (any form of quality assurance?)
Participant feedback? – was this ever sought from the participants? If it was, what did it tell you
NVQ link - help or hindrance?

Demands on coaches re organisation or admin – how did they react?

Did your dept have NCF involvement outside of CC, eg CPD of coaches?

To what extent did CC practices continue after NCF funding and support withdrawn?
**Did practices continue e.g (don’t prompt but see which ones they identify and add q if needed)**
Coach briefings?

Payment rates?

Matching to existing pay scales? Keep these after scheme?

Coaches and NCF (now scuk)
Does the dept have a Coach Dev strategy (when did it come in) can I have a copy?

*(has CC contributed to coach dev strategy? long term impacts on perceptions of CPD or ongoing development outside of CC)*

**Outcomes and Achievements – Legacy of CC**

7. What are the main lessons learned from CC:
   1) about sports development in general?
   2) About youth sport work in particular?
   3) About coach development and education?
   4) Anything else?
   5) Lasting legacy – was it sustained?

**Leave open at first then prompt to cover the eventualities listed/noted**
What happens next? – *(what has/will replace CC – eg Active Sport Partnership)*

What has this been shaped/influenced by CC?

Active Sport Interview (follow on with person now manager of the Active Sport partnership)

What have been the main things learned from Champion Coaching in the Active sport partnership

e.g. how Coach Development links together with performer/athlete development in Active Sport

Junior Club Development *(re the legacy for pathways locally)*

Clubs and exit routes

Was there any pre assessment of clubs against the “youth friendly” criteria identified?

What did the authority do to support/encourage youth sections in existing clubs or new clubs?

*(This to be explored with the club contacts)*

Did you have “junior club workshops”

Were they effective as a means of building relationships with clubs?

Were action plans developed for/with clubs?

What sort of proportion of clubs got involved?

How did CC scheme help facilitate club development locally?
b) Coach Development Interview

Interview with CDO for the region (Coaching Legacy)

Even though you weren’t in post for CC scheme, can you tell if there has been any impact on regional coach development?
Do enough Local Authorities have Coach Dev strategies and do you think they effective in:
  Recruiting and Developing coaches
  Retaining coaches
What about links to clubs and the performance pathways – do we have enough coaches locally to meet the demands for opportunities?
What about CPD and training – can you monitor whether coaches are keeping up their CPD?
Does this CPD make a difference do you think, to whether children progress?
Do you do any follow up, other than course evaluation sheets, on the courses you run, eg. Ask coaches some time later, what benefits they have had through their development
What progress is being made do you think, toward the Vision for Coaching? – does coaching have a higher profile now than in 2000 when you started?

Follow up from the visit for report to scuk – requested by email:
Documentary evidence – reports and summaries for CC for 1996/99 on scholarships and numbers of coaches involved to put my survey results in context
Courses run and tracking of coaches re impacts
Any summary from the CMIS? – Coaches registered in region and levels?
No response – need to get from SD officers, and annual reports – regional details from Merseyside CDO
c) Teachers (interview with teachers preceding/following meeting with pupil groups)

To measure attitudes of teachers to the scheme and links established or reasons why not involved, if any long term legacy at the school, local circumstances.

To teachers of schools referring or not referring children (low or high)

1. Were you involved with CC personally?

If yes
Tell me about your experience of it (get them to expand on their experiences)

If no
Tell me what you know of it.

How usual is it for your school to get involved or not with a scheme like CC

If they had referred:
Was CC beneficial to the school?
If not:
Why didn’t your children get involved with the scheme?

Were any long term links set up for your children?

Tell me about your relationship to Merseyside (Club Cymru) Active Sport Partnership?

Do you think schemes like CC or Active Sport, with an emphasis on performance have anything to offer PE staff/Schools?

Do you think young people locally perceive a “performance pathway”?

Are there any problems, do you think with young people accessing opportunities locally? Is there the interest from children in our school in out of school activities? How do you track it?

d) Focus Group Questions

(mixed group) same question whether high or low referral school need to be sensitive to childrens responses – these are rough guides only

What do you think of the opportunities (in >>>>>>>>>>>>) for young people with a real interest in sport?
Do you think there is a clear pathway to follow if you have talent? (amend or expand on this if needed – explore concept of pathways and opportunities)

Supplementary if needed - What about clubs or coaching programmes?
Do you think all young people can take advantage of what is on offer?
If not, why not

What do you think is needed locally for young people interested in sports
What experiences have you had in sport after school –
Did any of you ever take part in Champion Coaching (hear of it?) –
What was it about?

Have you heard about Active Sport (Merseysport)

Where children have had experiences get them to explain what they think about them

Experiences of PE in school – how does this relate to the outside experiences
Appendix 6

Interview Transcript (manual coding)

(Coding process was usually done straight onto transcripts and notes transferred to tables later)
This shows how the interviews sought to explore issues with coaches: in this case the link from career to coaching on CC and the impacts on their career in coaching afterwards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Barbara</em></th>
<th>What impacted to get you involved with champion coaching?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>I was basically fast-tracked to scholarship by the rugby union of the north west</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Barbara</em></th>
<th>So it was more the RFU taking the lead on that?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Yes, they did that, when I got the job champion coaching was still working and there work, I definitely qualified one female coach but in terms of my own stuff I was already qualified and working towards a qualification, champion coaching didn't push me any further on that type of thing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Barbara</em></th>
<th>What about in terms of working with young people specifically, did it make any impact on that area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Not really a great deal because I was working for ...077... borough of which 2 boroughs were under the banner so champion coaching because of my experience, I had a lot of experience working with kids but I didn't have a lot of sports development experience in those days so I was basically being told by sports development officers this is what you're doing and I was learning as we went along so my experience again, I wouldn't of said that champion coaching specifically gave me any other different relationships of working with youngsters or experiences because I was already getting a great deal from my other work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Barbara</em></th>
<th>Which may be different from other coaches that were involved.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>I had a specific gaol in life, I got my degree and worked as a sports development officer for university which was their first post. I then took a job as a youth worker down in Garswood, specifically sports development but they call it sports development but it was actually youth work using sport and then I could see where I wanted to go, I'd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Coding notes |
| Governing body support |
| Qualified coach |
| Impact on career |
| Experienced with youth linked to career Sports Development |
| Impact on career limited Learning process |
| Motivated - career in youth sport |
| Related career |
worked with my predecessor and I said I'd like to be a development officer so I had a goal. I left that job and went independent and work for whoever as a free-lance coach I will not get paid to get the experience because I knew that my predecessor was leaving and he said I'm leaving in 2-3 month, the job will come up I'd like you to apply for it. So I knew there was 3 jobs going in Lancashire so I was working towards the goal of being rugby development officer.

Other people on champion coaching probably have full-time jobs totally unrelated ......... and they were brought across just to do some coaching could have been linked to their clubs or governing body.

Interview: GC, 4/7/04: Rugby Coach Knowsley/Merseyside
St Helens Council - Participation in Champion Coaching

Rank of Deprivation
- 110 to 720 (5)
- 780 to 1,040 (4)
- 1,040 to 1,600 (3)
- 1,600 to 3,370 (2)
- 3,370 to 4,250 (1)

Ward | kd
--- | ---
Rainford | 1
Billinge & Sanley Grn | 2
Moss Bank | 3
Windle | 4
Haydock | 6
Blackbrook | 6
Eckleton | 7
Newton West | 8
Broad Oak | 9
Querns Park | 10
Part & Hardshaw | 11
Newton East | 12
Ormside Park | 13
West Sutton | 14
Sutton & Bold | 15
Thelth Heath | 16
Marshalls Cross | 17
Rainhill | 18

Rank based upon national picture where 1 is the most deprived and 8414 is the least.
Reproduced from the 1996 Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office (C) Crown Copyright, St Helens M.B.C. LA 07635X.
# Appendix 8 Open Comments from Participants, Parents and Coaches

## PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Participant and parent comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hockey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>it helped me improve my physical fitness, but also my mental awareness. I really enjoyed the coaching sessions, they helped to improve my skills and fitness and I have on to play for a ladies hockey team. Parent: It provided access to a higher standard of coaching than was available at school. It improved Emma's skills and confidence considerably. She has continued to play hockey at school and at local club level. Involvement in the scheme has given Emma a sport she can enjoy for the next 20 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I really enjoyed it. I have competed for 3 years and there has always been a good team spirit and the coaches were good too. Parent: I feel greater provision for girls football should be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hockey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>It was at least 15 minutes drive away, there was no direct bus route from home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hockey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>It was a lot of fun and very worthwhile. Parent: she enjoyed it very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hockey</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>too far away. I would have liked to have been informed of further training sessions after the coaching finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hockey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>only gave up when I started college due to lack of time available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>had to get a bus then a fair walk if no car available. It began my great love of football. My coach helped me to join league team at under 10 years. I now play a very high level of football, playing for Burnley girls and I am a member of Tranmere Centre of Excellence. I have also applied to the National Women's Football Academy in Durham. I still see my coach from Champion Coaching on a regular basis for advice. She has always been there for me. Parent: I am an FA coach and thought the standard of coaching by ********* was of an excellent standard. My daughter enjoyed champion coaching and even in 98 &amp; 99 attended when she could even though she was not eligible to participate in the Youth games as she attended a centre of excellence (attended 3 courses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>it is a good opportunity for young people to show their talents and improve them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>gave up - taking time out because of college. M* really enjoyed her years at Champion Coaching she went on to play for Everton girls football team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hockey f 16 the session were really enjoyable & different every time, I never got bored. Last year when doing GCSE PE I had to coach a group of younger children as part of the course. I chose to do hockey and got lots of my ideas for practices, games etc from champion coaching. I found it very enjoyable.

Parent:
Kay really enjoyed the Champion Coaching scheme and she says she really benefited from it a lot. It's the only thing I know that would get her out of bed at 9am on a Sunday morning.

hockey m 14 Parent: My son developed (by the coaches) abilities so much that in his 2nd season has progressed to county standard and now plays for Lancashire and st helens 1sts(open age) at the age of 14

cricket m 17 Parent: Andrew is a talented cricketer and I feel that the range of abilities meant that he could not achieve his full potential. Non the less, the enjoyed the sessions. Presentation is a good idea and Andrew was pleased to win the fair play trophy for 2 successive years. More information could be put in the local papers about availability because not all schools are very good at passing on information

hockey f 18 I didn't like the coach, he was a very unfriendly person, and made the sessions more like a chore than fun. The coach I had was useless and was glad to see that he was replaced the year after I never had any contact with the coach

hockey f 15 I think you need to get to know other people there because you don't perform your best because you feel awkward

Girls Football
hockey and f 18 there were no girls clubs where I lived or at school

netball f 15 I gave up playing sport of any kind because I damaged my back in a car accident

netball f 15 It was a bit too young for me

netball f 15 good but too many juniors

Basketball m 16 Very competitive league (club) Coaches work you very hard, but it certainly improves fitness and skills well worth it

netball f 15 I enjoyed the champion coaching very much, however, I feel the skills were repeated constantly and became boring to the end

netball f 16 Parent: girls with higher ability were quickly identified which meant that girls of less ability didn't receive equal levels of coaching which were equally paid for

hockey f 14 gave up: I didn't enjoy it as much in school
hockey f 14 (2 years) I probably would have declined to participate had I been without parental transport so early in the morning. Reason enjoyed: I got a 'player of the year' award (my only one). Not enjoyed: although most of the people were friendly they tended to stick in groups because they were introduced from school and came with their own friends. I didn't stretch my abilities further because I was the only participant not to get picked for the MYG - two years on the run! @ club: there are none!(not in St Helens). I miss my coach who moved to America! It was the best disco I ever went to (after presentation)

netball f 15 split the sessions into age groups so older people can play with their own age
Parent:
The courses need to be better publicised so more people might attend. It would be good if these courses were during the week during the summer holidays

netball f 15 not enjoyed: we did the same things every week. I paid £20 for the coaching and the sessions were supposed to be 2 hours long and that's why I thought £20 was a reasonable price. However the sessions never started on time so we never got a full session

cricket m 16 venue: was in the middle of a lot of housing off main road (haydock)

Basketball m 19 very difficult to find a club in St Helens options very limited as a parent I was not involved at all for the duration of the programme. No correspondence between the coach and myself was ever experienced

cricket m 18 what enjoyed: coach was known to myself and comes with high reputation as a player and a coach. The environment was good, good pupils and coaches. Selwyn Jones sports centre was fairly new when I undertook CC and the facilities for cricket were not brilliant, the matting on the floor was average and the light poor for cricket

hockey f 18 I found that the sessions were a bit unorganised

Basketball m 17 very useful coaching course for individuals who want to improve their skills whilst making new friends and enjoying participation in sport - excellent!

Girls f 17 gave up after a couple of years due to commitment in other sports.

Football (and rugby) f 17 did not have time to go outside of school although I wanted to

hockey f 15 Parent: Simon enjoyed the sessions. I was disappointed with the lack of contact when the course was running

cricket m 15 enjoyed: playing against others of a different ability

netball f 14 enjoyed: got playing at a high level for my age. Intense enjoyable sessions of basketball, something to look forward to through the week liked playing football. It gave me confidence then at the same time as me playing football I played rugby in the MYG

Basketball m 16

Girls Football f 16
hockey  m  17  the team was overcrowded with juniors (club). Champion Coaching was a great experience, the certificates made my record of achievement look a lot better

Girls Football  f  15  enjoyed: it gave me the chance to get out and have fun. I gave up last year due to problems with my knee. I joined LSH girls RU and it was a great experience. @CC: all the coaches and other trainees were very friendly
Parent:
My daughter really enjoyed the course and the coach was great with her

hockey  f  14  venue: was tucked away in the corner, had hardly no signposts to it had to go down lots of one way streets to get to it Not enjoyed the course: a lot of the kids were horrible, and thought that they were great. Some of them were snotty. Also, the coach had favouritism towards the kids who had been before. I would not go back again because I did not enjoy it at all. I din not like the people & when it was freezing, windy & rainy at the same time, we still had to play, because of that I got the flu (cont)
Another time when we were playing a game some men came to play with us, they had nothing to do with the course. They were very rough even though there were children aged 10 there....... They weren’t interested in the hockey, just the fee (more in this vein) Parent rating =4*4 and 1*1 (progress)

parent rating - 4*4 and 1*1 (progress)

ail f 17 venue: you couldn’t get the bus there, but if you had a car you were fine. Club: it helps you learn to play as a team

Basketball m 16 venue: it was on the other side of the Borough-(haydock) 20 minutes away and my parents had to make this journey 4 times every week. It would have been better in a more central area such as broadway or sutton
Not enjoyed: there was a big divide between the players - some would only pass the ball to their friends. Attendance was poor, some weeks there would be only 4 or 5 players. @ club: St helens lacks basketball clubs, rainford is too far away. At training at broadway leisure there is often a poor turnout - possibly because it is too early on a Saturday. I think instead of coaching a team should have been set up and needed more advertising.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Participant and parents comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I would like a football team around Whiston so that me and friends can play for a girls football team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Off main road, no signposting, no bus route - about club: improved general fitness: helped me realise there was a sport I was good at. It was good doing it and I would do it again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Playing cricket and performing and also knowing I was improving. Gave up: because my senior school don't do cricket or football, so lost contact. Yes, I would advise any youth to join a club, to improve their skills and feel excellent about themselves. Champion coaching was a great experience that I thoroughly enjoyed doing. It was excellent for socialising and feeling great about making friends and playing a sport that you really enjoy performing and learning and feeling great about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket and Girls</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Playing badminton and performing and also knowing I was improving. Gave up: because my senior school don't do cricket or football, so lost contact. Yes, I would advise any youth to join a club, to improve their skills and feel excellent about themselves. Champion coaching was a great experience that I thoroughly enjoyed doing. It was excellent for socialising and feeling great about making friends and playing a sport that you really enjoy performing and learning and feeling great about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bit of a distance to travel. Without a car I wouldn't have been able to go on the course. Was in the winter so very cold. Unfortunately I couldn't join a club as I never knew of any where I live. Although the Champion Coaching Scheme was good and fun I have not heard anything since. I thought they would help me get into a football club, but this never happened. Although it was fun considering the travelling I ha to do it seemed a waste of time the scheme would be better if they helped children join clubs instead of just showing them new skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>They made me feel very much at ease and helped me to understand sports more, they also taught me well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Playing netball anyway because I played it in school and I love it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reason enjoyed: to get out and do something I enjoy. The coaching for the clubs is excellent. I quite enjoyed it. They are all good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>the venues were mixed and we had to organise our own transport to get there. We ended up paying £10 for a taxi fare to attend several times. (enjoyed the course : I got to represent Merseyside in the youth games). It made me take an interest in my health and I joined a Gym not long after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>It was easy to get to as I live very close to the venue (Scotchbarn). Thank you. Gave me the chance to compete at a higher level and improve my confidence in sport. Thank you for the opportunity to take part. Parent: good to see top coaches being involved with our son, giving coaching tips and help improve his all round game &amp; improve tactically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>very good scheme overall. Parent: Ian's cricket coaching has totally changed his life. He now has a main interest and has shown his natural talent for it. Long may it continue!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>just enough staff to educate everyone (parent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>It was really fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not indicated (3 courses)

Girls
Football
netball
f 14 I enjoy doing sports. I didn’t stick it once I left junior school
gave up: as I never had nowhere to go and play it, but I play a different one now. I think the coaches are very friendly and you learn a lot
reason enjoyed: to increase my knowledge so I could pass it on in my JSLA lessons to other pupils. Have finished playing netball now but would love to start again but I do not know where to go. I really enjoyed taking part and I learned a lot which will benefit me and will also allow me to pass on my skills

Girls
Football
netball
f 15 Reason enjoyed: I love football. Comment about club: I would like to be in a football team. Champion Coaching was a good thing to do it kept me occupied
it was good coaching.
Coach christine often late, sometimes did not turn up at all without notice, qualified coach margret metcalf(one of the other girls mum) often took the sessions without hesitation when the coach did not arrive
Basketball
m 16 helped me become more confident within myself. It was really fun to take part in and I am now considering becoming a sports coach over a police officer
it was good and helped me develop my skills
Girls
Football
netball
f 16 Why gave up: I joined longmore barcelona girls f.c. I torn my cartlidge but
Football
it has healed About club: I am glad I did it and would like to play again. Champion coaching was great I really enjoyed it, it helped me to loose weight and keep fit. If there is anymore activities going on I would really appreciate it if you could contact me & let me know. I would really like to play again my knee is sorted out now and I am able to play again parent: my daughter really enjoyed the course and wishes to be contacted if any more courses are available
we always had to drive from kirkby
It was a really great experience
reason enjoyed: it was something fun to do - It gives you something to do so your not bored. It keeps you busy and you benefit from it in the long run. parent: gave her something to do very enjoyable
reason enjoyed: playing the sport
the sessions were not enjoyable. About joining a club: it was a lot more enjoyable and friendly. I learnt a lot from the coaching sessions but the coach needs to be friendly and patient about the less skilled people. Parent: I know my child didn’t enjoy the sessions even though she learned a lot from them

Tennis
m 18 Some kind of follow up course would have been even better
like learning to play the sport
it improved my performance and give me the chance to go in the flintshire trials
too far away, no transport other than car. Sessions were not fun and the coach was unfriendly
Tennis m 16 it should be advertised to school and clubs more

athletics f 19 gave up: time commitments due to A levels and degree course

netball f 18 reason enjoyed: something else to do after school with friends (from my school) Why not enjoyed: I found that the coaches knew some of the the people taking part and had their favourites (they got more out of the courses as they had more opportunities). I gave up after I left school (Sixth form) no club for older people. I enjoyed the coaching and the practices we did. I didn't go every week because of lifts, (I shared with 2 other girls) the coaches had their favourites and not everyone got the credit or the positions they deserved. Parent: because of the location and communication between parents/coaches and teachers I was unsure when & where they were on. The time was very late with kids leaving at gone 9pm

netball f 15 the actual sports hall was hard to find as it around the back of the building (hawarden) I went to N wales c of excellence. its good fun to be part of a team and it improves your game

Tennis m 16 due to medical reasons I cannot take part in aggressive sports (e.g. rugby) or activities that require a lot of running. This is why my participation in sport is quite low! Tennis was a sport I could take part in. I enjoyed the course and playing the game

Tennis f 16 Parent: From what I remember my daughter enjoyed the course. I can not answer accurately s it was such a long time ago. She still plays on a fairly regular basis. I do feel that there is little progression from frequent practices to full matches.

hockey f 16 Although I enjoyed Champion Coaching I would have liked a younger coach that would have been easier to talk to for advice or help Parent: We were not very involved with the course. It's a shame that it couldn't continue on a regular basis

hockey f 19 now in dance group

netball f 16 public transport hard if not got own car

hockey f 19 gave up: when left school at 18 I enjoyed it as it was people that were interested in the sport, not just like a club- for people that were very good players. Also I broke my arm in the middle of the course and as I still came, I was made to feel part of the course even though I was unable to play

hockey f 19 About a club: It is an excellent way to develop your skills and game as it offers more of a challenge. I was encouraged to go by my school. Champion coaching developed my basic skills and advised me where to go next

netball f 18 Parent: children would have benefited from playing a series of competitive games and tournaments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I love my sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>already member of a club - as our whole netball team went we were able to use new play patterns during matches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>gave up the sport: to concentrate on football and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would love to do it more because I never had a chance to do it over a period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>warm-ups etc were more fun, enjoyed playing the game @ benefiting - view of coaching useful, tips etc @ joining a club: enabled to play matches, events/tournaments etc broadened skills. Made me appreciate team and working as a team. Parent: that course, small cost, would struggle without a car, approx 10 miles from us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent: timing quite easy, no contact with the coaches and didn’t watch the session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>was in walking distance. Enjoyed - challenging went on to do some coaching of youth team. @ club - any youngster would benefit, well worth it, useful skills and benefits, club encouraging. Before CC not very active, after enjoyed it more, not really sporty before, joined football and badminton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Parent: great - we had something for the holidays good for getting into the sport, away from computers etc. Thought very highly of the coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>long time ago, but was good and enjoyed it, had impact yes Parent: good way away. Not problem but they concentrated in towns (leisure centre) in outlying villages, got to have a car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>really good course Parent: had nothing to do with it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>coaching really improved my game, very good @ club: holywell club closed down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>primary teacher involved in netball - delyn ladies inc a junior team. School had a few opportunities (maes garmon) teachers would help get involved, tournaments, courses etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football?</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>no other opportunities at school etc. Not able to benefit as no follow up, wasted in a way. Went along to a club training - bit frustrated as was told I couldn’t join club until age 13 (aged 11), later found out I could have joined at any time. No follow up, but apart from that, really good course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>enjoyed every aspect - the opportunity. Didn’t give up until left school. @ joining a club: they’re not really advertised very well, don’t hear about them much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hockey  f  18  picked up a lot of skills  Parent: went for trials with the welsh squad, so there was some progression. All the contact was with the school, didn’t have much to do with the coach

### Champion Coaching open comments: Coach Survey – National Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>I was developing as a coach anyway, taking LTA Development Coach award and I had to attend LTA courses to obtain points to retain my coach license – I was busy enough really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>current</td>
<td>I am a club coach at Leominster Tennis club and involved in teaching tennis in various primary and secondary schools in curriculum time and after school clubs + involved in Primary school project in partnership with Sports Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open comment</td>
<td>Hereford and Worcester were one of the first counties I believe, to take part and it was very successful – the LA Sports Development officers were pretty hopeless at organising details and in the end I had to take over as it would never have happened in time – local publicity poor and getting information to schools before Easter holidays was the main problem – the coaching experience was excellent though and all kids loved it and understood what it was all about due to them having taken part before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Open comment</td>
<td>There has been a gap in prog since CC was stopped. Some local authorities in Wales now have own scheme (Cardiff Sportstar). Majority now rely on NGB delivery. Resulted in less schemes &amp; less school club links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Current involvement</td>
<td>Active Sport Stages 1, 2 for Rochdale, Bury, Tameside. Player centre manager stages 3,4 for Greater Sport &amp; Lancs schools and Youth HA county coach U17 club coach Macc HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open comment</td>
<td>Paper work for players was too much Links with clubs had not been forged and no follow through for players. NCF courses half time didn’t get work book till the night, courses are regularly cancelled, no ongoing training for coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comment on qualifications</td>
<td>The champion coaching scheme was an excellent concept for the development of potential (athletes) individuals. There was also the opportunity for me to teach and mentor junior coaches, but little or no opportunity for me to further develop my own skills, too many skill courses cancelled. (I had been coaching over 20 years before CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add comments</td>
<td>I wrote the programme, introduced the skills, advanced the participants and mentored the junior coaches, I enjoy coaching and promoting sport but got no development personally as a result (unpaid coach) Working in schools but not a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Coach athletics at Paralympic level (medallists at Sydney 2000), Coach national level able bodied athletes, advise and mentor other coaches. Director British Blind Sport Director EFDS Member of sports Panel (ILAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open comment</td>
<td>The scheme should not have been stopped. There is always a place for junior development without changing a proven system. The problems is coaches are “used” then abandoned, Those controlling sport at LA level need to look more pro-actively at the coaching levels that are available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6    | Open comment | Young people that were part of the 2 year programme became the
basis of the Newport Ladies Hockey Club U16 team – they have been Welsh champions for the past 2 years

Open comments
There was no take up of offers from the local jnr clubs, not one. This comment is a bit negative, but the children did get coaching at a level not available through their schools.

Open comments
I no longer coach for local authority/council. I went abroad (Cameroon) for 6 mths as volunteer doing sports and community development. Upon my return I felt outcast by new staff and changes at LA. Have not coached since.

Comment
Champion Coaching has changed my career. I am coaching approximately 20 hrs per week working with most agencies, schools, different towns and cities; Hitchin, Stevenage, Luton, Dunstable, Bedford and London.

More effective
I am able to develop my coaching skill to catch all age group, I am also making a living from coaching. I have a better understanding about young people.

Open Comment
Outcome: cc project has created 2 basketball clubs. There are approximately 400-500 primary and secondary schools taking part in basketball in the surrounding area – both boys and girls.

Involvement with CC
Began CC in Stockport in 1993/94 on first series of courses. My involvement with coaching with SMBC has diminished over the last few years post GM YG of 1995-97

More effective
No – any development I have made would be down to experience and absorbing ideas from other initiatives/coaches. I don’t believe CC had a significant role to play.

Open comment
Participated in CC from 1993-1997, therefore memories a little unreliable. My involvement with the local authority at that time was frequent, however this is now virtually nil, although I am still a member of the authority coaching association. CC was a good idea and many benefited from it.

On involvement with CC
Total lack of local national involvement by my sport NGB(hockey) not one seminar on skills/tactics to pass onto participants.

More effective
Yes – was able to have long term coaching plan in action and links with other coaches.

Open comment
Enjoyed my time. I found the CC very good for getting youngsters into sport. However a lack of competition / opponents restricts participants growth.

On involvement with CC
I was interested in attending all and any Coach Part 3 training or coaching modules but despite my constant requests no further advancement was possible from the Badminton Assoc of England.

Impact on current practice
I scour the internet for opportunities to develop my skills i.e. Psychology Diploma & Advanced sport psychology from NCF home study.

More effective
Good coaching habits, goal setting, record keeping etc. Gave me more confidence and mentoring opportunities.

Open comment
I loved the programme and fully supported it. I wish I had been able to have done more of them. I have all my notes and info as memorabilia of a good time in my coaching career.

Open Comment
I found CC a very good opportunity for both myself and the people I was able to coach and would gladly be involved in a similar scheme again.

More effective
Yes- working with children of varying ages and abilities, it was a chance to try different methods and learning off other coaches.

Open Comment
Most of my coaching is done for my own club Hull YPICC and about 8 boys joined our club from CC Scheme and have proved useful members and have improved their game.
32 Open Comment Very worthwhile. Would do it again if time available and would recommend it to others. Good support from Local Authority. Need to publicise it more on the aspects of developing future champions.

35 Open Comment No exit routes for players therefore CC was ineffective – needed to develop volunteers first, i.e. Active Sport

36 Open Comment Once CC finished there were no further opportunities for young people; appetites whetted but no follow up work developed. Also found that the age group targeted was wrong – we struggled to get KS3 pupils involved, those interested were already involved in school teams – the last course we ran included Yr6 pupils to boost numbers otherwise it would have been cancelled

37 Open Comment Good idea. Well administered in our area by local authority. Age group too old for someone beginning for tennis, maybe not for other sports

39 Open Comment This type of survey would have been best done within a year of CC S ending. I currently work as a self employed cricket coach but not as a direct result of working on this scheme, but it did give me the confidence and much needed experience to go on to better things

47 Impacted on practice More effective Open Comment Brought together a group of girls who eventually formed a team

48 Involvement with CC Impact on practice More effective Open comment CC was just as I'd qualified. It was a positive experience which gave me confidence to move onto bigger and more performance oriented based coaching

St Helens Group

41 On more effective Open comment Able to develop my own skills as a coach. Many youngsters have joined local clubs and some have progressed to county level

43 Open comment Able to develop my own skills as a coach. Many youngsters have joined local clubs and some have progressed to county level

58 On getting involved briefings Open comment Didn't continue after the scheme – no relationship with the LA now at all

58 On comments about getting qualified After Champion Coaching On impacts on coaching practice Reactions from others Didn't continue after the scheme – no relationship with the LA now at all

I got the award because I enjoyed the coaching – before then I was helping out at child's school – worked as a classroom assistant so liked working with youngsters

Though immediately after did same or less, doing much more now, involved with a club - voluntary

Improved confidence and knowledge of courses – able to learn from the head coach, worked as a group – this was very good for (development of) how I coach

SDO came along now and again
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on netball</th>
<th>The level of netball has definitely improved locally, kids able to progress further</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own career</td>
<td>Very busy with own children now and still playing so that cuts down time I have for coaching. I did enjoy it, gave me a lot more confidence - this has led to getting involved with club and high school and primary school - I'm still committed to my coaching and will definitely carry on. Shame the courses didn't carry on, as there's not enough of it for girls, if they don't have enough confidence to join a club, can do this (CC) first then join club if they develop and enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own career</td>
<td>Very busy with own children now and still playing so that cuts down time I have for coaching. I did enjoy it, gave me a lot more confidence - this has led to getting involved with club and high school and primary school - I'm still committed to my coaching and will definitely carry on. Shame the courses didn't carry on, as there's not enough of it for girls, if they don't have enough confidence to join a club, can do this (CC) first then join club if they develop and enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own career</td>
<td>Very busy with own children now and still playing so that cuts down time I have for coaching. I did enjoy it, gave me a lot more confidence - this has led to getting involved with club and high school and primary school - I'm still committed to my coaching and will definitely carry on. Shame the courses didn't carry on, as there's not enough of it for girls, if they don't have enough confidence to join a club, can do this (CC) first then join club if they develop and enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On past experience and getting involved</td>
<td>As ex international, asked by sister (head coach) to go along as assistant, used the experience to pass on what I knew from my experience as a top player - we were involved with the Youth Games for years before this. Never took any awards not really that interested in taking my coaching any further. My sister had all the qualifications and I was quite happy to work with her. I'm in an environment where I pick up a lot about sport, children, husband, family all involved with something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on impact on coaching practice</td>
<td>Not really involved that much so most not really relevant to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on sport locally</td>
<td>Some of the girls from CC still involved through their club - age group teams, now U14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On coaching career</td>
<td>Looking at getting qualified now, to move on from being unqualified, I realise I'd need a qualification for working in the community, something I'd really like to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On getting involved</td>
<td>Was a student at the time, local boy, had friends in basketball who also got involved - went on to complete degree in coaching science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On getting involved</td>
<td>Went from being a player, got involved through friends level 1 award gained while on CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective</td>
<td>Definitely more confident - very good support from head coach, important to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open comment</td>
<td>Very good thing, children got a lot from it, going into the club still have at least 3 18 yr olds in the club that were through CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open comment</td>
<td>Not sustained (girls football) - great pity it ended in that format, nothing has really taken its place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowsley Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44</th>
<th>On more effective</th>
<th>Not sure - no debrief at close of scheme, therefore without feedback, unsure of effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open comment</td>
<td>During my time spent on the CCS (football) as PT coach, I found it most rewarding. I feel the children attending the sessions certainly benefited, and parents did appreciate the scheme. The LA (KBC) supported the scheme 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>More effective</td>
<td>No - CC was a brand name/banner under which I worked. Had not 'extra's / incentives as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>open comment</td>
<td>Attracted kids from a non-traditional cricket background – linked to youth games and other things, very positive – successful at getting boys into clubs, but only 2 (clubs) in Knowsley, the others had to go further afield which may have put some boys off – costs, travel etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Training other opportunities</td>
<td>Level 2 was offered but I didn't have the time with all the other commitments I had, too involved with school (groundsman at private school and responsible for hockey throughout school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on coaching practice</td>
<td>Did have an impact, very different kids, some with no background in hockey – had never been on an astro etc I gained a lot from having to work with such a varied group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More effective
Yes. I helped develop other coach as an assistant, got a lot out of that.

Open comments
Very positive about Chris N – (sdo) – kids had never played, many went back and asked to play at school – I enjoyed teaching these kids – they enjoyed their hockey and I feel we got the best out of them - it was more about them really. Quite a few went on to join clubs (non in Knowsley) and I know they still play, one of the parents even went into coaching after helping out some sessions, but some of the links we got going not really kept going.

Flintshire Group
46 More effective
Not sure – been doing a lot of coaching before. Helped me progress slightly but not sure how much, possibly just confidence.

46 Open comment
Thought the programme was good but maybe would have been better if better organised or used more of the facilities.
### Appendix 9

**Flintshire Results of Ward Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward (converted)</th>
<th>IOMD score</th>
<th>IOMD rank</th>
<th>pop:1 CC</th>
<th>% parts</th>
<th>Pop U16 (2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ewloe</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brighton</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mynydd Isa East</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northop</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold South</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwernymynydd</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwernaffield</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilcain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold East</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Pentrobin</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Bistre East</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halkyn</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Mountain</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold Central</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitford</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Trelawny</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold North</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connah's Quay Golftyn</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Coleshill</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckley Bistre West</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holywell East</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holywell West</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher and East Shotton</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Castle</td>
<td>43.26</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Shotton</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total U16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flintshire</th>
<th>21615</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(from 5-15 Census 2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U 16 pop in worst 5 ranked wards: 1978 as % 9.151
CC parts in worst 5 ranked wards: 3 as % 4.11
(from 1991 wards for participants)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Pop U16</th>
<th>Participants on CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flint Castle</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ffynnongroyw</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mold West</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagillt West</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher and East Shotton</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of under 16 pop in worst 5 wards = 9
% of CC parts in worst 5 wards = 4

Flintshire IOMD and Participation Ratio

![Graph showing the relationship between IOMD score and Participation Ratio with \( R^2 = 0.0671 \)]
Analysis of participants by Wards in Flintshire

![Graph showing analysis of participants by wards in Flintshire.](image-url)
### Appendix 10 Summary Results St Helens and Knowsley

#### Summary Results St Helens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>hockey</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>netball</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cricket</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>basketball</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>girls soccer</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some children attended more than one sport (6.4%)

n=78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age* at survey</th>
<th>at course</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>age 10-12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>age 13-14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>age 15-16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>age 17-19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*shows frequency

#### Venue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Venue % (of most recent course)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruskin Drive</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>WA3 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Park</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>WA1 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydock</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>WA5 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selwyn Jones</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WA8 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>WA9 14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WA10 17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>WA11 27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WA12 8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Was the venue easy to get to?

Yes 86%  WN5 5 6.8
No   10%  WN8 1 1.4
Not sure 4%  L34 1 1.4

Q6. Did you enjoy the sports course?

Yes 90%  Improving performance 85
No   3%  Learning more skills 77
Not sure 7%  Sessions were fun 56

Q7. What did you enjoy about the course?

Coach was friendly 50
Making new friends 48
Other 18

Q9. Were you able to benefit from the course?

Yes 87%  Improving performance 85
No   5%  Learning more skills 77
Not sure 8%  Sessions were fun 56

n=74
### Appendix 10 Summary Results St Helens and Knowsley

**Q. 10 At the end of the course, did you...?** (respondents may select more than one)  
(n=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry on playing for fun</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join local club</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join new junior club</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join county squad</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join Development squad</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on playing for school - out of lessons</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined the Youth Games squad</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other involvement in sport</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give up playing the sport</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. 12 Experience of a club** (Large proportion of missing values)

If you joined a club, did it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have organised matches competitions</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomed you into the club</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have low fees</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have friendly coaches and leaders</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a junior section</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. 13 How did you find out about the club?** (n=55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion Coaching Course</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already member</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advertisement</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. 15 Currently member of a club:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. 18 Sports played during lessons in school:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Time since the Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. 19 Sports played outside of lessons:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Time since the Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q19 Favourite sports - all favourite sports coded and summarised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q. Currently member of a sports club:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club Attribute</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is very friendly</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a lot of juniors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has encouraged</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has kept me busy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10 Summary Results St Helens and Knowsley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has helped me make friends</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped to improve skills</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has given opportunities to compete</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has offered coaching</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parent Responses - St Helens Survey 2000/2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of coaching</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of sessions</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Contact by coach</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin by centre</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of child</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of the course</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about Progression</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of the venue</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### St Helens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unable to comment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % by sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>Hockey</th>
<th>Netball</th>
<th>Cricket</th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Soccer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unable to comment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below average</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Coaching</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of sessions</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental contact by coach</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration by centre</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyment of child</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information about progressi</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost of the course</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessibility of the venue</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A50
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Results Knowlsey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Badminton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Cricket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Netball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 Water Polo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Age at survey**        | at course | hockey | netball |
| 8                        | 1         | 17%    | 32%    |
| 9                        | 4         | 8%     | 15%    |
| 10                       | 4         | 10%    | 19%    |
| 11                       | 9         | 10%    | 19%    |
| 12                       | 5         | 10%    | 19%    |
| 13                       | 5         | 10%    | 19%    |
| 14                       | 12        | 10%    | 19%    |
| 15                       | 8         | 10%    | 19%    |
| 16                       | 1         | 10%    | 19%    |
| 17                       | 7         | 10%    | 19%    |
| **Total**                | 53%       | 53%    | 53%    |

| **Venue**                | % (of most recent course) |
| Kirkby Sports Centre     | 41% Postcodes of respondents: All 100% |
| Scotchbarn S.C.          | 13% none 100% |
| Prescot Comp             | 35% L12 100% |
| Halewood Comp            | 4% L14 100% |
| Huyton Cricket Club      | 4% L16 100% |
| Missing                  | 4% L18 100% |
| L24                      | 0% L24 100% |
| L25                      | 0% L25 100% |
| L26                      | 3% L26 100% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q4. Was the venue easy to get to?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q5. Did you enjoy the sports course?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are 5 children (6%) who attended more than one course.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q.9 Were you able to benefit from the course?</td>
<td>Making new friends</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Improving performance</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Sessions were fun</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Coach was friendly</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.10 At the end of the course, did you…?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on playing for fun</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>join local club</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>join new junior club</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join county squad</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join Development squad</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry on playing for school - out of hours</td>
<td>65% (respondents may select more than one)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join the Youth Games squad</td>
<td>22% n=54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other involvement in sport</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give up playing the sport</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.12 Experience of a club</td>
<td>(applicable to 27 respondents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you joined a club, did it:</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have organised matches competitions</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome you into the club</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have low fees</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have friendly coaches and leaders</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a junior section</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.13 How did you find out about the club?</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>44% n=53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion Coaching Course</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.15 Currently member of a club:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.16 Currently play sport regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.18 sports played during lessons in school:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.07 n=54</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.19 Sports played outside of lessons:</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. Currently member of a sports club:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the club: n=31</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is very friendly</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a lot of juniors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has encouraged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has kept me busy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped me make friends</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped to improve skills</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has given opportunities to compete</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has offered coaching</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent Responses - Knowsley 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Label</th>
<th>code</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>netball</th>
<th>cricket</th>
<th>basketball</th>
<th>girls socce</th>
<th>Badminton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unable to comment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Coaching</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of sessions</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental contact by coach</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration by centre</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyment of child</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information about progression</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost of the course</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (list) 49
Summary Results Flintshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>hockey</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>netball</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tennis</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one sport</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>athletics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>At Survey</th>
<th>On course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average age:
Survey 17.58
Course 13.16

Q4. Was the venue easy to get to?
Yes 93%
No 7%
Q. 6 Did you enjoy the sports course?
Yes 98%
No Not sure 2%
Q7. What did you enjoy about the course?
Improving performance 67%
Learning more skills 80%
Sessions were fun 36%
Coach was friendly 31%
Making new friends 31%
Other 25

Q. 10 At the end of the course, did you (respondents may select more than one)

- Carry on playing for fun 70%
- join local club 46%
- join new junior club 3%
- Join county squad 28%
- Join Development squad 13%
- Carry on playing for school 85%
- Joined the Youth Games squad 5%
- other 1%
- Give up playing the sport 3%

Q.12 Experience of a club (n=20)
If you joined a club, did it:
- Have organised matches competition 90%
- Welcomed you into the club 95%
- Have low fees 65%
- Have friendly coaches and leaders 85%
- Have a junior section 75%
Q13 How did you find out about the club?
Friend 25
Teacher 29
Champion Coaching Course 25
Parent 4
Already member 4
advertisement 0
other 8
(n=24)

Q. 15 Currently member of a club:
Yes 41%
No 59%

Q. 16 Currently play sport regularly
Yes 65
no 35

Q.18 sports played during lessons in school:
Mean 9.7
Q.19
Sports played outside of lessons:
Mean 5.5

Q. Currently member of a sports club:
the club:
Agree disagree Don’t knw % Agree
is very friendly 16 1 94
has a lot of juniors 7 6 3 41
has encouraged 16 1 94
has kept me busy 11 3 2 65
has helped me make friends 16 1 23 94
has helped to improve skills 15 2 88
has given opportunities to cc 15 2 88
has offered coaching 15 1 1 88

parent rating - multiple responses
Percentages:
hockey netball tennis athletics
poor 2 10 0 0
below average 10 6 8 8
average 16 13 15 38
good 35 28 36 29
excellent 22 21 24 13
no comment 14 23 17 13
33 valid cases; 9 missing cases

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Coaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.26667</td>
<td>1.72073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of sessions</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>1.75518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parental contact by coach</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>1.5606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration by centre</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.54839</td>
<td>1.68994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyment of child info about progression</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.81818</td>
<td>1.4222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost of the course</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.64611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessibility of the venue</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.21212</td>
<td>0.89294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix 10 Ward Analysis

### St Helens Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From ONS (census 2001):</th>
<th>IOMD score</th>
<th>IOMD Rank</th>
<th>%&lt;16 98</th>
<th>wardpop 01</th>
<th>no of CC</th>
<th>% Part*</th>
<th>ratio 5-16</th>
<th>rank ratio</th>
<th>iomd rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billinge and Seneley Green</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>3373</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12717</td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbrook</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9128</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Oak</td>
<td>60.05</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9169</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccleston</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10528</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange Park</td>
<td>44.86</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9940</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haydock</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11962</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshalls Cross</td>
<td>51.38</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8099</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Bank</td>
<td>36.01</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10276</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton East</td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10176</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton West</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11242</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr and Hardshaw</td>
<td>68.19</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8277</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Park</td>
<td>45.65</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8987</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainford</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>4242</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8344</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainhill</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>2868</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11913</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton and Bold</td>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9394</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatto Heath</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9393</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sutton</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8677</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windle</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>2158</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8621</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indices of Deprivation 2000, rank of index of multiple deprivation rank (out of 8414 wards)

Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% parts in most deprived wards (1-5)</th>
<th>highest ratio pop to part</th>
<th>Rowan and Hardshaw 719 to 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.49 (of the borough)</td>
<td>lowest</td>
<td>Rainford 54 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% pop16 in most deprived wards (1-5)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio - u16 population per participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of 234 participants for postcode data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 5-16 population = 26514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants in Wards outside of St Helens Ward</th>
<th>IOMD Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>no of part</th>
<th>% parts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashton-Golborne</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh East</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halewood South</td>
<td>64.32</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadgreen</td>
<td>59.21</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescot East</td>
<td>51.39</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roby</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Micheals</td>
<td>66.11</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiston North</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiston South</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allerton</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Knowsley Results Summary of Ward Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>%PARTS</th>
<th>IOMD score</th>
<th>iomd rank</th>
<th>pop98</th>
<th>Est pop16% 982001</th>
<th>5-16 ratio</th>
<th>rank ratio D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BXFP</td>
<td>Princess</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFH</td>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFB</td>
<td>Cherryfield</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>79.64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFF</td>
<td>Kirkby Central</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>77.37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFJ</td>
<td>Northwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>77.26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFA</td>
<td>Cantril Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>74.33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1 to: 711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFU</td>
<td>Tower Hill</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>71.56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFG</td>
<td>Knowsley Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>66.27</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6900</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFS</td>
<td>St. Michaels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>66.11</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFR</td>
<td>St. Gabriels</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>65.45</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFD</td>
<td>Halewood South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>64.32</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFY</td>
<td>Whitefield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>63.12</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFK</td>
<td>Page Moss</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>61.99</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFL</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFE</td>
<td>Halewood West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>6600</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFM</td>
<td>Prescot East</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>51.39</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFX</td>
<td>Whiston South</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>46.23</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFW</td>
<td>Whiston North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFN</td>
<td>Prescot West</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>36.76</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>% Parts</td>
<td>% U16 Pop</td>
<td>% CC Parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFT</td>
<td>Swanside</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFQ</td>
<td>Roby</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BXFC</td>
<td>Halewood East</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest = most children in ward to each CC participant = 711:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest = least children in ward to each CC participant = 54:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Participant:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIVERPOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYFC</td>
<td>Allerton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYFG</td>
<td>Broadgreen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYFP</td>
<td>Dovecot</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYFY</td>
<td>Netherley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BYGE</td>
<td>Speke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BZFD</td>
<td>Eccleston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BZFP</td>
<td>Rainhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BZFR</td>
<td>Thatto Heath</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% U16 pop living in most deprived wards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% CC parts in most deprived wards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNMATCHED</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total liverpool</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total st helens</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11

List of interviewees

Sports Development Units:

St Helens MBC D Boocock, Principal Officer, October 1999

Stockport MBC D. Hale, Youth Sport Team Manager (acting) November 1999.


NCF (now SCUK)

NCF/SCUK Regional Training Unit Jan Turley, by telephone, 14th July 1999, Regional Coach Development Officer (H Mann – 9 December 2002)

Schools and Teachers (all 2003)

St Helens (3 schools), including 4 Teachers and various groups of Y10 and 11 pupils (57 children)
LEA Advisory Teacher/ PE: Julie Frazer, 20 June 2003
Knowsley (2 Schools), including 2 teachers and groups of Y10/11 pupils (74
children)

Knowsley PE Curriculum Co-ordinators Meeting, June 2003

**Flintshire**

Visits to 2 Schools, involving 2 teachers and 2 groups of Y10 pupils, 25 children

**Coaches**

Interviewed in person (11):

Knowsley  5 coaches, 5 sports
St Helens  4 coaches, 4 sports
Flintshire 2 coaches 1 sport

Telephone interviews (8):

St Helens  3 coaches, 2 sports
Knowsley  2 coaches, 2 sports
Flintshire 3 coaches, 3 sports

**Other communications:**

J. Turley, Sport Cheshire – Active sport Manager (May, 2001)
M. Conway, DCMS, 5 December 2003 (by telephone)
A. Worthington, ILAM (CTF member) 26 January 2004 (by telephone)
S Campbell, YST, 28 May 2004
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Copies of Letters sent to SDOs and original short proposal (August, 1999)
Mr Mike Hornby  
Asst Director Leisure  
Flintshire County Council  
County Offices  
St. David's Park, Ewloe  
Deeside  
CH5 3ZQ

Dear Mike,

Youth Sport Development  
As you know, I am currently the programme leader for Sports Studies at University College Warrington and have registered for an MPhil/PhD with Loughborough University, with Mike Collins. The enclosed proposal briefly outlines the research I would like to do, focusing on Youth Sport Development including Champion Coaching Scheme and similar schemes. I am contacting all the local authority leisure departments concerned with Champion Coaching in the N.West/N.Wales area, as well as other organisations involved in Youth Sport or Coach Development, to seek their co-operation with the study.

I would be grateful if, after considering my proposal, you could agree to your authority being involved in the study and pass this on to the relevant officer within your department. Myself or Mike Collins (01509 223289), can be contacted if you have any queries.

I will follow up all responses in late August in order to progress the study, and make arrangements for my field work, which I hope to commence late in 1999/early 2000.

Any comments on the proposal, whether or not you are able to assist in the study itself, would be very welcome.

Yours sincerely,

Barbara Bell  
BSc(Hons) M.A., MILAM  
Programme Leader, Sports Studies
Youth Sports Development and Champion Coaching Study

Background and reasons for the Study
There is a strong commitment to the development of sport for young people by Sport England and equivalent agencies in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. There has also been a growing recognition of the need to encourage “performance pathways” to link the development into performance and excellence related work of the National Governing Bodies. The Champion Coaching Scheme was established to fulfil this role, and after a decade of operation, there are plans to integrate it into the new Active Sport Programmes of Sport England. Some local authorities have preferred to devise their own youth sport development programmes.

While there have been reviews of recruitment and completion of participants (i.e., output measures) there have been few studies of how participation and performance has changed (i.e., outcome measures). Using data on the Notts Sport Training Scheme, Collins and Buller (1999) looked children’s and parents’ satisfaction, at the new levels of competition reached, and at coaches’ views. They also highlighted issues worthy of further research. The recent consultation document of the Review of Coaching published by the UKSC has also highlighted the need for greater research into the work and development of coaches.

Analysis of the longer term impacts or outcomes of sports development programmes remains a grey area in the literature. Tracking participants over time is seldom carried out, and analysis of participants is limited. Secondly, the issue of effectiveness of schemes is often assumed via anecdotes, rather than being objectively demonstrated and supported by evidence.

Research Objectives
Firstly the research will examine and seek to make recommendations for future practice on:
- impacts or outcomes for participants and coaches
- the organisation of schemes
- the role of coaching organisations, local authorities, and clubs.

We wish to use some Champion Coaching and local authority schemes in NW England/ N Wales as vehicles for this work. The criteria for selection are that the schemes should:
1) have been running for 5 or more years (we wish to track back 4 years at least)
2) have substantial numbers of participants

Secondly, to investigate the long term impacts of the Champion Coaching Scheme in a number of areas within the North West/North Wales area, and to provide some evidence of for example, the extent of continued participation by young people in selected sports after taking part in Champion Coaching.

Other issues include:
- the nature of such participation - does it lead to performance?
- the impact of “quality assured” coaching and coaches on the attitudes to continuation in performance oriented programmes
- an audit of the links established to clubs and their long term effectiveness in the “performance pathways” for sports in the case study organisations

Examine Champion Coaching from the sports equity perspective.
Examine the links between school based and out of school sport in the areas selected
Compare the Champion Coaching approach to alternatives - e.g. Cheshire Youth Sport or others
Examine where and why “drop out” occurs
Examine the effectiveness of NGB’s in taking up where CC finishes, with regard to performance oriented young people and coaching opportunities
Proposed Methods for the Study

In all Champion Coaching Schemes in the NW/NW area, operating since 1995 in the local authority areas of:
St Helens & Knowlsey
Stockport
Tameside
Manchester
Flintshire

- A survey of participants in Champion Coaching since 1995 (or longer if data available), including a section for parents views
- Survey of coaches in Champion Coaching
- Interviews with selected coaches and Youth Sport Managers
- Interviews with NCF co-ordinating staff

For other authorities a survey of participants on coaching/ performance oriented programmes and similar interviews as above.

Additional data will be required from each authority on local socio-economic indicators, club contact information, school contacts.

The information will be collated into a series of case studies, with opportunities for comparison and analysis across sports, where possible. There may be the opportunity to consider follow up studies, or tracking of participants or coaches in the longer term.

In order to participate in the study, contact details for participants will be required. At least 4 sports per authority are also needed to generate sufficient detail.

For further information or comments,
Contact
Barbara Bell
Department of Leisure & Sport
University College Warrington
Padgate Campus
Crab Lane
Warrington

Tel: 01925 494494 ext 23123
E-mail b.bell@warr.ac.uk
Champion Coaching in St Helens (1996-1999)

Participants in Wards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St Helens</th>
<th>Participan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowsley Participation in Champion Coaching (1999)

Legend
Knowsley Wards count
1 - 3
4 - 6
7 - 9
10 - 14
15 - 21

## Appendix 14 - Coach Survey Frequencies

### Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Scheme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintshire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coach Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coach</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total years involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scholarship Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid no</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Coaching Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid no</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coaching Young People**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Become Qualified for CC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid no</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid no</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivered coaching in curriculum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Out of hours coaching at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time spent coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work with young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance oriented coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club involvement</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid work</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of Coach Profiling</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral/no impact</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of mentoring</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral/no impact</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of scholarship</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral/no impact</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of training</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral/no impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant reaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent reaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School teacher reaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority reaction</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club reaction</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no comment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Effective through CC</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangements for sessions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue for session</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progression arrangements</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Valid Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority administration</th>
<th>Frequency Valid Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information to participants</th>
<th>Frequency Valid Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact with parents</th>
<th>Frequency Valid Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Still involved with the LA**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Involved in Active Sport**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Currently scuk member**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**scuk/NCF workshop**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NGB Update or Professional Development**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coach Profile meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Running Sport Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid no</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development of coaching expertise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid not noted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunity for Coaching scholarship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid not noted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coaching young people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid not noted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Total

|       |       | 67 | 100 |

#### New Opportunities for juniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid not noted</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part of national programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid not noted</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### years coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Football</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netball</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Polo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation rating by Coach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low/moderate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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