

Sport for adults

Using frame factor theory to investigate the significance of local sports instructors for a new Sport for All programme in Sweden

Anna Renström

Umeå University, Sweden
<anna.renstrom@umu.se>

Staffan Karp

Umeå University, Sweden
<staffan.karp@umu.se>

Abstract

In Europe, Sport for All includes increasing adults' physical activity levels. Drawing on frame factor theory, this article examined the establishment of a sports programme offering recreational and fitness activities for adults within the Swedish Sports Confederation. Data from eight interviews with local sports instructors were analysed to investigate the content of activities for adults and how and why the instructors carried out these activities. The main finding is that sports as fitness and recreation activities for adults are carried out by the instructors within three patterns: participatory, mediation, and continuous. There is a 'logic of enabling' that emerges from these patterns: the instructors strive to make it possible for adults to practise sport for fitness and recreational purposes through a range of adjustments. However, the cues for the instructors regarding how to carry out a practice for adults are vague. The results also show that these groups for adults will only be offered as long as the resources for the traditional elite groups and groups for children and youth are not at risk.

Keywords: fitness, sport for adults, sport for all, sports instructors, policy implementation

Introduction

This study concerns Sport for All, here meaning adults' accessibility to practise competitive sports for fitness and recreational reasons. Sport for All as part of the European sport policy was stated in the European 1975 'Sport for All Charter' (European council, 1975), then elucidated in 'The White Paper on Sport' (EU Commission, 2008) and the document 'Developing the European Dimension in Sport' (EU Commission, 2011). Denmark, Norway and Sweden (the case here) have Sport for All as their main policy goal for sports (Skille, 2011). These countries also have among the highest participant rates in Europe (EU Commission, 2014). However, Sport for All is not a single or static concept; for example, it manifests itself in the idea of the Olympics as well as in the Scandinavian idea of accessibility rooted in both the relation to the welfare state with equal opportunities for all citizens, and in ideas on public health (Skille, 2011, SOU 2008:59). The idea of accessibility has been the backbone of the Swedish sports movement, not least concerning how funding from the state to the Swedish Sports Confederation has been legitimised (Norberg, 2011; SOU 2008:59). Also, in Europe, including Sweden, the concept of Sport for All is no longer only about accessibility for children and youth; it is now also about increasing all citizens' physical activity levels for health promotion (EU Commission, 2008, 2011; Green, 2006; Westerbeek, 2009).

Sport for All implementation in Sweden: resistance and change

There is a global concern about the adult and elderly population; across many nations, including Denmark, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Australia and Sweden, high expectations are placed on local sports clubs to target these groups (SOU, 2008:59, Westerbeek, 2009). Consequently, in Sweden, the Swedish Sports Confederation (SSC) Programme Manifesto and the SSC Declaration of Strategy 2016-2017 argued for the importance of accessibility and lifelong sporting opportunities for all individuals, including adults (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2009, 2015). The SSC now emphasises giving adults opportunities to practise competitive sports activities for fitness and recreational purposes. This also aligns with the SSC's strategy for public health work, *Idrott hela livet* ('Lifelong Sports'), which states that 'the sports movement has to develop the range of activities so that it, to a greater extent, can appeal to

adults, both women and men' (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2008, p. 31). This study engages in exploring such activities to elaborate the knowledge on Sport for All policy implementation in terms of accessibility. In Sweden there is, according to the SSC, a lack of activities for adults who want to participate in competitive sport for fitness and recreational reasons (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2015). It seems that voluntary sports clubs within the SSC have focused mainly on children and youths, with no programmes directed at adults who are not on an elite level (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2016).

The body of knowledge concerning the sports movement's ongoing attempts in Sweden to increase accessibility has highlighted several explanations for the limited range of fitness and recreation activities for adults. For example, Fahlén and Karp (2010) identified difficulties in transforming accessibility projects into permanent activities due to organisational resistance to change; on the other hand, Fahlén (2013) and Fahlén and Aggestål (2011) argued that economic funding structures make it uneconomical for sports clubs to target adults. These results point towards organisational frames that limit both accessibility to the sports clubs and the range of the activities within the clubs. These results are well in line with the extensive research on sports policy implementation, which has shown that sports clubs are rather resistant to external change initiatives (Fahlén, 2015; Fahlén, Eliasson & Wickman, 2015; Harris, Mori & Collins, 2009; Skille, 2008) and that ideals formulated on a political level have little impact on everyday practice in the sports clubs (Phillpots, Grix & Quarmby, 2011; Sjöblom & Fahlén, 2010; Skille, 2010; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016). Scholars have described these structures as solid and consequently hard to change (cf. Coalter, 2007; Green, 2006; Skille, 2008, 2010; Stenling & Fahlén, 2009). However, there is also an ongoing discussion about the solidity of these results because of the lack of empirical studies from a local actor perspective (Skille, 2011) and because of the need to fill that gap for a deeper understanding of the processes of implementation and change within sports systems (Donaldson, Legget & Finch, 2012; Fahlén, 2015; Harris, Mori & Collins, 2009; Haudenhuyse, Theeboom, Nols & Coussée, 2014). In empirical studies, the sports instructors' role in creating change (Strittmatter & Skille, 2017) has scarcely been researched due to the theoretical apparatus used (Skille, 2008), and due also to difficulties for researchers to gain access to what is going on at the local level in sports clubs. To further elaborate on the impact

of instructors' role regarding policy implementation, in this study we engage in an actor perspective through the use of frame factor theory.

The focus of the study

In this article, we focus on the concept of Sport for All within the Swedish Sports Confederation in terms of accessibility for adults who wish to take part in competitive sport for fitness and recreational purposes within the sports clubs' regular activities. More precisely, we investigate whether local sports clubs have activities corresponding to the policy of implementing sport programmes for adults. Empirically, we do this by examining what is going on in sports instructors' day-to-day activities, thus meeting the call for research from a local perspective in which instructors are seen as institutional actors with significance for development and change.

We draw on frame factor theory (Bernstein, 1971; Lundgren, 1972), which helps contextualise the day-to-day activities in terms of the latitude sports instructors have, to carry out policies within the sports clubs. This theory also provides tools for analysing whether a logic guides the instructors' making of activities for adults, as that would point to a new sports programme for adults being established within the Swedish Sports Confederation. In the following section, we present the theory more in detail and explain how we have used it in the study.

Conceptual Framework

In Sweden, Nilsson (1988) developed a theoretical model for the description and understanding of how individuals adopt, understand and influence social practices in Swedish sports clubs. According to Nilsson, day-to-day activities in sports clubs are dependent on structural and historical factors as well as on the participants. Nilsson's theoretical model leaned heavily on frame factor theory, which Dahllöf (1967, 1969) devised and Lundgren (1972, 1979) expanded upon. This theory was originally used for research on educational practices, indicating that teaching could not simply be regarded as a result but that it was also a process limited by the subject's frames of reference (Dahllöf, 1978). Lindblad, Linde and Naeslund (1999) described how the development of what they called extended frame factor theory inspired research and discussion about the

pedagogical principles of reproduction and the conditions for change in education. Nilsson (1988) and others (Bäck, 2010; Karp & Stenmark, 2011; Lundvall & Meckbach, 2008) put the theory to use in research areas other than education. Researchers have often used these features to examine actors in a given context (although they form a part of a reproduction process), including whether they have latitude within which they can operate and thus contribute to the development and change of practices. In this article, we study how instructors use their latitude to engage in the making of sport for adults.

According to the theory, day-to-day actions (i.e., the practices of sports clubs) follow a pattern, which is an adaptation of ideology regarding the actual frames (constitutional, organisational and physical) that restrict practise. Ideology is a general term for conceptions about the ultimate purpose of practices. Such conceptions synthesise formal and informal values and goals. Formal values often reflect the constitutional frames governing a practice. Informal values are individual ideas about what is required of an actor and about how the work should be carried out. Informal and formal values may be the same, but they may also run counter to each other. Constitutional frames are delimiting factors in the form of acts, ordinances and regulations that the government, the municipality and the Swedish Sports Confederation have established. The organisational frames are measures taken as a result of the extent of available financial resources. Examples of such frames are the size and number of exercise groups, the distribution of priorities for those groups, and the number of instructors for each activity. Physical frames refer to material resources such as facilities and infrastructure. In other words, frames are the legal, economic and physical boundaries within which instructors conduct day-to-day activities for adults.

A pattern provides day-to-day activities with a structure (activities included/excluded), a function (what sport is for) and a methodology (how sport is organised and conducted) (Nilsson, 1988). According to the theory, instructors are involved in a process in which formal and informal principles are constructed, negotiated and communicated. Through these processes, a logic is formed that limits what actions and behaviours are desirable and worth striving for (cf. Friedland & Alford, 1991; O'Brien & Slack, 2003). In this study, we focus on the patterns that emerge in fitness and recreational practices for adults in local sports clubs within the SCC, and on whether a discernible logic guides instructors' activities. By describing the patterns in day-to-day activities and consid-

ering the potential presence of this logic, we can empirically answer the question of whether a new Sport for All programme for adults is being established in Sweden. Our study also adds to the body of knowledge concerning the significance of local actors in the processes of renewal and change in sports systems.

Method

With previous research indicating a need to focus on the grassroots level of policy implementation (Fahlén, 2015; Harris, Mori & Collins, 2009; Skille, 2011), we scrutinised the regular activities within local sports clubs to identify the logic of instructors' everyday work. Because scholars presume that some sports activities are particularly flexible or suitable to policy implementation (Fahlén, 2015; Spaaij, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016)—that is, the adoption of ideas and their realisation in practice—our starting point for the selection process was all (at that time $n = 67$) National Sports Organisations (NSOs) within the Swedish Sports Confederation (SSC).

Our first strategy for a purposeful sampling (Bryman, 2012; Miles & Huberman, 1994) was to use the NSOs' websites to search for sports clubs that offered fitness and/or recreational activities to adults. Only four of the 67 NSOs matched: athletics, canoeing, orienteering and cycling. However, none of these was included in the sample because the activities presented were supplemental in character, not integrated into the sports clubs' everyday practices (cf. Stenling, 2013). Failing to find instructors through the NSOs' websites, we used a snowball methodology (Bryman, 2012); this began with a meeting with key SSC personnel. The meeting helped us focus on certain NSOs and clubs and drew our attention to individuals who could help us find instructors.

The main criterion for instructors to be included in the study was that they were leading groups of adults who were engaging in competitive sports activities for fitness and recreation; however, we also wanted the instructors to have experience leading groups of adults who were training for future competitions. This had to do with our theoretical approach, as we wanted to capture data related to the frames and the instructors' latitude in carrying out competitive sports practices for fitness and recreational purposes. To better understand this, we wanted instructors who could talk about competitive sports practices in terms of preparing for

competition; in other words, we wanted to compare less common activities to more common ones. We also sought to have an equal number of female and male instructors as informants.

At the end of the selection process, we had assembled eight instructors, representing swimming (4), boxing (1), karate (1) and basketball (2). In light of the efforts made, we concluded that the group we were focusing on was hard to find, mainly because fitness and recreational sports instructors typically work with children or adolescents (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2016). Due to the difficulty of adding more instructors through SSC-related contacts, we decided that the eight instructors would serve as the study's entire sample. One strength that should be emphasised is that the sample includes a variety of sports activities with instructors representing both team and individual sports. This means that although the sample is small, we expect the information-rich variation to be suitable for analysing if there is a logic, cutting across different sports, that guides the choice of activities carried out by the sport instructors (cf. Patton, 2002).

All the respondent's sports clubs were located in or near major cities in northern or central Sweden. Each respondent's NSO, sex, age and alias are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. *Instructors According to Sport, Sex and Age*

Sport, sex (approx. age)	Alias
Basketball, female (30)	BasketF
Basketball, male (35)	BasketM
Karate, female (40)	KarateF
Boxing, male (45)	BoxM
Swimming, female (25)	SwimF1
Swimming, female (30)	SwimF2
Swimming, male (40)	SwimM1
Swimming, male (45)	SwimM2

Throughout the study, we followed the Swedish Research Council's ethics advice for the humanities and social sciences (Vetenskapsrådet, 2011, 2017). We informed interviewees about the voluntary nature of participation, and they consented to the use of the resulting data for research purposes.

Data collection

Trying to capture experiences, mindsets and values in relation to a specific context required interviews (Kvale, 1997; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Although we were interested in how instructors used their latitude to encourage the use of competitive sports as fitness and recreation activities for adults, observations were not an option because we needed information about how the instructors conceived the activities that they were performing in relation to the frames for the context in which they acted. The interviews were semi-structured, allowing us to probe and ask follow-up questions (Kvale, 1997). The interview guide was theoretically grounded and focused on capturing the instructors' detailed descriptions of 'what they did in practise', 'how they did it' and 'why they did it in a certain way' (Nilsson, 1988). The guide focused on the content (e.g., exercises and time allocation) of the group training events held, with two main types: those aimed to improve performance in future competitions, henceforth called competition-focused groups for adults, or CGs, and those in which adults engaged in competitive sport for fitness and recreation, henceforth called fitness- and recreation-focused groups for adults, or FGs. The guide also focused on how the content was performed (e.g., through logistics, instructions or feedback) and on why the instructors used their methods. These descriptions, we assumed, would capture the patterns in terms of structure, function and methodology while also allowing us to trace the participants' ideology and frames. We also asked the instructors questions over email about their sports-related education and their general background in sports. Five interviews were conducted face-to-face, and three were conducted over the phone. The interviews, which ranged from 40 to 70 minutes in length, were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

We coded the data using a mixture of predetermined and emergent codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The predetermined codes were the themes from the interview guide, which is called What Is Actually Done in FGs and CGs, How and Why. For example, the instructors talked about the exercises that comprised the FGs ('what'); a sub-theme that emerged was the use of a practise-light structure in which the exercises used in FGs were almost the same as those used in CGs, even though the technical skills and physical demands were slightly toned down in the former. These

descriptions also provided a hint of frames and ideology; the frames of the National Sports Organisations and sports clubs did not provide the instructors with educational or other support for unfamiliar activities, making it hard for them to manifest other activities. The question of how focused on leadership and communicative nuances; a sub-theme emerged in which the instructors described how a much less authoritarian style of communication was used with FG participants than with CG participants. The question of why resulted in a sub-theme about the FGs' function within the clubs; for example, whether FGs were considered part of the clubs' regular activities or were considered complementary. After this initial coding phase, the next level of analysis was to interpret the sub-themes in congruence with the conceptual framework of the study, i.e., to find patterns (themes) capturing what was going on in the day-to-day activities in the sports clubs. In a final step we made an axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Charmaz, 2006) by analysing the content of the patterns to find if there were commonalities indicating a logic in carrying out sport activities for adult participants. Accordingly, the analysis was both deductive, driven from concepts in frame factor theory, and inductive grounded in data from the interviews (cf. Bryman, 2012).

Results

Though we did not consider the individual sports as distinct cases, we still followed the advice of scholars (Spaaij, 2009; Stenling & Fahlén, 2016) who argued that individual sports are suitable, in different ways, in the policy implementation of wider social goals in sports. Therefore, we present the instructors' experiences clustered by sport, with boxing and karate combined in the category of martial arts.

Basketball

BasketM and BasketF each held FG training sessions once a week. BasketM's FG consisted mostly of former elite players who were now in their 30s, but it also included rookies, whom he described as being 'pretty good at basketball'. BasketM's club chose to include all non-competitive adult players in the same group and asked the instructor to hold practice once a week with this mixed group (men and women, experienced and inexperienced players). To put it into theoretical terms, in terms of age,

the structure mainly focused on adults. The club did not define any other particular aim or function for the practise. BasketM stated that the very purpose of the activity was to ‘play basketball; that’s what they want’. However, he described the practises as, essentially, regular basketball practises—the kind that would suit former basketball players. He noted that there was friction within the club regarding whether this kind of activity was beneficial. Referring to organisational frames, he argued that it is good to have as many members as possible; for example, because the municipality administrates the basketball arenas, having a larger group made it easier to get time slots. He also argued that ‘even if you are not that ambitious, you should be able to be a member of the club and practise in some way’.

BasketF received a request from acquaintances to start a recreational basketball group, and then self-recruited participants; the participants were in their 30s, with no basketball experience. The club supported her intention, and more participants have since joined the group; however, indicating the ideology of competitive sports as main activities, it was not yet an official activity within the club. Overall, BasketF described no obvious function for the activity, which can be summarised as having an ad hoc function based on her personal interest and on her friends’ request to play basketball as part of their fitness regime. She described basketball as ‘a sweaty activity that gives an all-round workout’.

Both basketball groups trained in small arenas and modified their sessions to suit a single basket, as in street basketball. This meant that the sessions did not compete with reservations of arenas for elite groups in the clubs. Methodologically, BasketM described his FG activities as being based on CG activities that he had modified to have lower requirements for technical skill and physical capacity; a relatively small fraction of each training session was allocated to the game itself; he focused on various shooting and technique exercises. He said it was difficult to balance the experienced and less experienced players’ preferences; the experienced players wanted regular basketball training, which also affected the sessions’ structure:

It is almost the same with my competitive and fitness groups; it’s a warm-up followed by technical drills, some physical work and then we play. (...) Everybody is welcome, but I think the ones who stay with the FG already have some sort of interest; they can’t keep up with the best players, but they manage to learn the basics of a basketball practise.

BasketM described his role as that of a mediator, to introduce rookies to basketball training as a concept. This he thought was difficult but important because ‘otherwise, the more experienced players will take over, and then there will be no fun for the rookies’. Hence, a part of his job is to make the rookies want to stay in the group. BasketF’s FG also involved exercises that were based more on competitive gameplay; these comprised a large part of the training time. She focused on the participants’ desire to play basketball and added exercises that would develop their skills, which meant that her session focused on playing basketball. The participants’ idea of what was fun (playing)—not the instructors’ assessment of participants’ skills—made up most of the training sessions. BasketF described an internal struggle between her own ambitions (which made her want to add other drills and exercises) and the participants’ will to play:

Sure, they want to learn how to play basketball. I mean, some of them even bought basketball shoes (laughs); they really want to learn, but perhaps not all the details. (...) They like to work hard, and they quickly get bored. Sometimes I have to add some short drills to make them get the point, but I have to do that quickly. (...) We play a lot, and it doesn’t matter if they take one step too many before they pass the ball; sometimes it breaks my basketball-heart (laughs), but it’s their practise; it’s their time, and they will never become elite players anyway. I cannot have it my way with all the rules and technicalities.

Swimming

Unlike the basketball FGs, the swimming FGs and CGs, in terms of physical frames such as arenas and equipment, had to compromise on time slots and tracks. All of the instructors had been engaged in both FGs and CGs for several years. In terms of structure, they described two categories of participants. SwimM1 and SwimM2 both talked about the fitness athletes as retiring athletes; their FGs consisted of former elite swimmers, some of whom had chosen to compete at a lower level or not at all. They both described the uniqueness of a (competitive) swimming club that welcomed swimmers who practised only a few times a week or less. SwimM2 stated:

The first thing people ask when they contact us is, ‘How many time slots are there and how many do I have to attend?’ And, I mean, they

seem to be quite confused when I say that they can choose to practise as many or as few times as they want to.

Both SwimM₁ and SwimM₂ had joint groups in which FGs and CGs practised at the same time. However, both of the instructors talked about having distinct competitive and non-competitive groups because the participants had different goals. In this context, the non-competitive group was synonymous with fitness. Both SwimM₁ and SwimM₂ argued that the FG activities were not for beginners. SwimM₁ stated:

Everybody is welcome to see for themselves whether they fit, so to speak; if you tend to be in the way of other swimmers, you will notice and perhaps choose our technical group, where you can improve to fit in with our group later, or you can choose to swim on your own.

They both stressed the organisational frames in terms of not having too many non-competitive adults in the club because these members neither generate grants (as children and adolescents do) nor contribute to the promotion of the club at competitions. Meanwhile, SwimF₁ and SwimF₂ focused on initiation. The participants taught by SwimF₁ and SwimF₂ were beginners who participated to enhance their basic swimming skills. These participants were thus able to treat swimming as a fitness activity. Beginning triathletes who wanted to improve their crawl skills also participated in these FGs.

SwimF₂ taught both CGs and FGs as part of her full-time job at the club; this was not the case for the other interviewees. In terms of function, SwimF₂'s club had a policy of engaging in grassroots sports and in FGs that targeted adult beginners:

We [in the club] know that there are many people out there that want to swim as a fitness activity but at the same time belong to a club (...) We have a policy that states that everybody should be welcome—independent of sex, cultural background and age, but also when it comes to goals; we welcome people with ambition to become national top-level swimmers and people without any kind of competitive ambitions.

SwimF₁, SwimM₁ and SwimM₂ work on a voluntary basis, stressing, in line with the ideology of Sport for All, the importance of voluntary work because it enables low fees for the participants, which in turn makes it possible for more people to be part of the club. However, this is not an official policy within the clubs. SwimF₁ started the FG on her

own initiative when the parents of children who were active in the sports club requested their own activities. Her FG was labelled a course and consisted of approximately six low-cost lessons; the cost of the lessons included membership in the club. She stated that the club supported her initiative as long as instructors and time slots for the pool were available:

The course is a bit new to the club, but my feeling is that the club wants to continue and develop this concept. I've got a lot of positive comments, both on the idea and my way of carrying it [the FG] out, from our head coach. (...) I really think this is something that we can develop, unfortunately not for the moment. Since we are short of instructors, we have to prioritize the competitive groups; we can continue with the course but not add more groups of that kind.

Methodologically, SwimM1 and SwimM2, who trained their FGs and CGs simultaneously, said that the competition season framed the content and structure; they noted that the FG participants had to adapt to that schedule. They both described a difference between the FGs and the CGs, as the FGs had less demanding physical exercises; basically, the FG athletes did not swim as fast as the CG athletes did. SwimM1 and SwimM2 also described their FG feedback style as less authoritarian than their CG style. They did not push as hard and did not provide as much technical feedback for the FG participants as for the CG participants. SwimF1 and SwimF2 had more opportunities to vary their session content because their FGs and CGs met at separate times. SwimF1 had the greatest difference between the CGs and FGs in terms of content and structure because she had three entry levels that, as she said, made it possible to better identify individual goals and exercise levels. All four instructors focused on techniques and skills. They all measured progress in terms of technique, but SwimF1 focused on giving participants the tools to work out independently when engaging in swimming as a fitness activity. SwimF1 also said that the training itself should be fun, but the other swim instructors maintained that having fun was more of a social aspect that went on between exercises. All the swim instructors except for SwimF1 also argued, in line with the ideology of competition, that socialising between participants was considered more acceptable among the FGs than among the CGs, claiming that CG participants should focus more on the exercises than socialising. SwimF2 was the most qualified swim instructor, a former national elite swimmer. She stated that she struggled internally not to push her participants, even the CG partici-

pants, too hard. She considered herself a demanding instructor who had to hold back her own ambitions. The other swim instructors considered this restraint to be important solely when working with FGs because they were all motivated by a similar belief that pushing too hard would make the activity less fun, causing the participants to be uncomfortable and ultimately leading them to leave the club.

Boxing and Karate

BoxM and KarateF were former elite instructors who taught FGs twice a week. In both boxing and karate, the sports clubs' activities for beginners are aimed at competition; however, KarateF stated that a special beginners' group was available for participants aged 30 and older, and these participants were, in terms of organisation, not supposed to compete at all. Both KarateF and BoxM described the need for the competitors to be dedicated and to practise as many times as possible every week. According to BoxM, this also had to do with the fact that competitive boxers are framed as both assets and costs to a club; practise was assumed to pay off in terms of success at competitions. BoxM stated that, at his club, the CG has half as many participants as the FG, and he noted that the CG had two instructors working together. Neither BoxM nor KarateF could really be clear about why FGs were important to their sports clubs aside from their function as a gateway to the competitive groups. BoxM also stated that competitive boxers were what the club aimed at, noting that he encouraged skilled participants in the FG to try out for the CG:

I usually ask talented, fast-learning individuals if they want to try a match because I think that perhaps that person holds an idea or a wish to try to push themselves a bit further. And usually they say 'yes, I would like to participate in a match', and then I talk to the coaches [in the CG], and they make arrangements for that person.

Both KarateF and BoxM stressed the importance of the ideology of Sport for All, and they wanted as many people as possible to have the opportunity to try a sport. KarateF described friction within the club; on the one hand, the non-competing participants were financially necessary because competitions are costly; on the other hand, the club, as she said, 'is about competing', so it first and foremost recruits children instead of adults because children come with governmental funding and the possibility of developing into successful competitors. However, she

also explained that the fees were slightly higher for adults, compensating to some extent for the lower funding.

In terms of methodology, both KarateF and BoxM described FG activities that were very similar to CG activities in terms of content and structure, with a warm-up followed by technique training, strength- and aerobic-enhancing exercises and, finally, some sort of match or sparring. Both KarateF and BoxM described how their technique drills were focused regardless of the group. Among other issues, poor technique could lead to injuries, especially since both activities involve physical contact, so techniques such as controlling one's movements are crucial.

The karate and boxing FG participants spent less time on particular exercises and did lighter physical work than the CG participants, and both instructors described the FG feedback style as 'not as much yelling' as the CG style. The adjustments were about not pushing the non-competitors so hard that they would quit. There were higher disciplinary requirements for CG participants, who were not allowed to talk as much between exercises and who were expected to follow the instructor's directives. This was justified by the CGs' specific competition-related goals; participants were expected to reach the required level of discipline; for example, they were expected to pay attention to the instructor at all times. The FG participants had a greater influence on the content during the training; both KarateF and BoxM seemed to lead these groups in a more democratic way than they led the CG groups. As KarateF said:

If you decide to compete, I as the instructor make the call on how to practise. You have to work hard, pay attention to me, and I will be harsh in my comments and critique; otherwise you will end up injured, as a worst case scenario, and you will not win any competitions. (...) If you do not have competition as a goal, I'm polite and not as nagging (laughs). I mean, the fitness part is about having fun, and one does want them to stay, right?

In both sports, fighting sequences occurred; the FG participants in both karate and boxing requested more of this type of activity. The instructors often complied, motivated by the idea that 'the FG participants do come here for fun', as KarateF said. Both martial arts instructors stressed (as did SwimFr) that the FGs should be about having fun during the activities, but none of them could really describe how fun was generated, other than by using a less authoritarian leadership style.

Analysis

In this section we interpret the results by using analytical concepts from frame factor theory (Dahllöf, 1969; Lundgren, 1979; Nilsson, 1988). The findings show that sport for adults manifests itself in different ways, not only across different sports but also within the same sport. Based on the instructors' experiences regarding structure, function and methodology, we suggest three patterns and an emerging logic guiding the activities carried out. In the following, we describe how these patterns and this logic emerged in the analysis of the interviews and list their characteristics.

The first pattern is called participatory; this includes the stories of BasketF, SwimF1 and SwimF2. Regarding the function of manifesting a policy, the club and/or the instructors themselves recruited adult men and women who wanted to learn basic swimming/basketball playing techniques. Hence, SwimF2 had to adapt methodologically because her FGs were part of regular activities that were ideologically grounded and planned for in terms of the club's organisational and physical frames (arenas, time slots, instructors, etc.). BasketF and SwimF1 acted in favour of a new group of participants—people who had expressed a desire for fitness activities (swimming or playing basketball as a fitness activity); the instructors initiated this structure in dialogue with their sports clubs. The FGs found their way into the clubs only because the frames allowed them—meaning that arenas and instructors were available. During these three instructors' FG activities, they methodologically acted upon the participants' goals and ideas about content and time allocation, even when they—as instructors and as former elite athletes—had other ideas about the best practices in their sports.

The second pattern can be referred to as mediation; this includes the stories of BasketM, BoxM and KarateF. In terms of structures, these stories were quite distinct; BasketM had no clear directives from his club, and the participants in his FG turned out to be a mix of experienced and rookie participants, but the karate and boxing FGs were structured as regular activities and had more homogenous participant skill levels. Still, we argue that these three activities can be understood in terms of a mediating methodological approach and that the three instructors all worked hard to balance the groups' competitive aspects with a “practise light” approach. The instructors, in other words, tried their best to make the practises fun for the less experienced (basketball) or less competi-

tive (karate, boxing) participants. In terms of the instructors' methods, this meant lowering the technical and physical demands and using a less authoritarian communication style—described by all three instructors in terms of 'not scaring the participants'—so that participants would not leave the FG or the club. The karate and boxing FGs, in particular, were permeated by an ideology in which competition was the utmost goal; this was closely related to the economic frame that did not support adult participants.

The third pattern is termed continuous; this includes the stories of SwimM1 and SwimM2. Their FGs had the (informal) main function of attracting new members by offering an alternative level of practising for those who wanted to retire from a highly competitive level, providing them with a way to stay within the sports club and attracting swimmers from other clubs. This was a regular function that was limited only by economic and organisational frames in terms of providing proper support for competitive swimmers. The methodology was almost identical to that used in the CGs; both were related to the racing season. This also meant that it was not possible for beginner adults to enter these FGs; even the "practise light" approach of these FGs was still quite demanding.

The instructors described little or no support of how fitness and recreation practices, within the context of competitive sports, could be carried out. All instructors struggled with methods and had to carry out a balancing act, either amongst participants or between their ambitions and instructing experiences

However, we argue that these three patterns contain the contours of the emerging logic that we call the logic of enabling. Whether acting because of policy or on their own initiative, the instructors within the participatory pattern opened doors to new groups of participants. Some methodological and/or ideological concerns still indicate that this is not totally in line with a distinct fitness and recreational logic. In the case of the mediating pattern, adults are not the primary group of interest to the clubs, so the instructors' methodological efforts were what made it possible for adults to practise a competitive sport (to some extent) as a fitness and recreational activity. We also consider the continuous pattern, which offers as an enabling logic the possibility of being amongst peers while practising at a chosen level and within an elite sport context. This logic is about the instructors' objective to help all those who come to the local sports club to participate in some sort of FG. All of the instructors thus

seek to adapt the CG activities to the FG context in various ways and to various degrees. Hence, the instructors in the study seem to be involved in the formation of a new logic, thus enabling increased accessibility for adult participants in the Swedish sports movement.

Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, we used an explorative approach with analytical concepts from frame factor theory (Dahllöf, 1969; Lundgren, 1979; Nilsson, 1988) to understand how instructors use their latitude to create fitness and recreational sports activities for adults.

In our findings, regarding instructors' everyday work, implementation of sport for adults is present in terms of the logic of enabling—but not specifically in terms of the logic of competitive sport for adults. This means that the instructors receive only vague cues regarding how to carry out a practice for adults, particularly for the adult beginners who see competitive sports as a fitness and recreation activity. This resonates with previous research showing gaps in adult sports programme curricula, including instructional aspects (cf. Young & Callary, 2017). If the logic of enabling stems from accessibility in accordance with the Swedish Sports Confederation's policy, then developing organisational readiness (Casey, Payne & Eime, 2012), such as helping the sports clubs increase the number of volunteer coaches (Taylor, 2004), might be important for the establishment of a fitness and recreation logic—thus increasing accessibility for adults.

According to our findings, the organisational frame (especially funding) and the physical frame (such as facilities) are the main barriers to the expansion of sport for adults (Fahlén & Aggestål, 2011). This was the case both when instructors introduced alternative activities to the sports clubs—as SwimF1 and BasketF did—as well as in boxing and karate, in which the participants who were not aiming for future competition were given the opportunity to participate only because they could join the same groups as other beginners. This matches the conclusion of Sjöblom and Fahlén (2010) that Sport for All has become infused with the logic of competition and expansion. Other physical frames that hinder development are the limited number of instructors and, above all, how clubs prioritise their resources, which also resonates with previous research from other contexts (Harris, Mori & Collins, 2009). It is obvious from

the results that sport for adults, as fitness and recreational activities, are offered only as long as the resources for ordinary groups (elite adults, children and youth) are not at risk. Therefore, the fitness and recreational activities function mainly to create complementary groups. We argue that the major obstacle to the evolution of a fitness and recreational logic is the inherent function of sport; if FGs have no function other than to complement other groups, ideas for increasing adult participation in the Swedish Sports Confederation will be difficult to implement. The policy of Sport for All that includes adults engaging in competitive sport for fitness and recreation will then be nothing but a utopian idea in a policy document, or at least not a reality in the sports clubs' regular activities (Karp, Fahlén & Löfgren, 2014). As we see it, policy can be used to support instructors' initiatives, but policy alone is not sufficient, as our results (and those of many other studies) show (Coalter, 2007; Donaldson, Leggett & Finch, 2012; Green, 2006; Stenling & Fahlén, 2009). Understanding Sport for All as a heterogeneous concept (Green, 2006; Skille, 2011), we acknowledge the logic of enabling as part of that concept, facilitating access for adults. However, looking at the patterns in our study, this logic is not primarily used to provide accessibility for new groups of adults, which is one of the Swedish Sports Confederation's main policy goals (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2015).

Finally, we argue that applying an actor's perspective by communicating with instructors has yielded a rich understanding of these instructors' significance as intermediaries and as initiators of new activities for adults. The instructors are revealed to be agents of change, the significance of which is not due to policy alone. However, as also indicated in this study, instructors' latitude to engage in the making of sport for adults is limited by frames. Future research activities should take into consideration how instructors engage in Sport for All; such research will probably contribute to a deeper understanding and a more nuanced picture of implementation and change in local sports systems—as other scholars have also argued (Donaldson et al., 2012; Fahlén, 2015; Harris, Mori & Collins, 2009; Haudenhuyse et al., 2014).

Regardless, further empirical studies are needed to provide greater sample sizes from a wider variety of sports and to elaborate upon the logic of enabling and the study's other findings. In this research, it would be of interest to show how the ongoing processes at the local level unfold because this could provide answers to the question of whether a new sport programme for adults will ever become a reality.

We suggest using frame factor theory in future studies. This can contribute to a broader and deeper understanding of sports practice in relation to historical evolution and structural factors; but more importantly, it provides tools for analysing both the activity and the actors' perspective, thus helping researchers to find important enabling and hindering factors at the local level. Frame factor theory is thus an important complement to organisational theories when studying inertia, change and policy implementation in the sports system.

Acknowledgement

This study was supported by the Swedish Research Council for Sport Science (P2012-0080).

References

- Bernstein, B. (1971). On Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge. In *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for Sociology of Education*, ed. M. F. D. Young, 47–69. London, England: Macmillan.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4.th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bäck, T. (2010). *Från student till yrkesverksam polis - Mental träning i polisutbildningen och polisyrket: Polisstudenters och yrkesverksamma polisers upplevda kompetens i mental träning*. [From student to police officer: Mental training in the police academy and police work]. Umeå: Umeå University.
- Casey, M., Payne, W., & Eime, R. (2012). Organisational readiness and capacity building strategies of sporting organisations to promote health. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 109–124.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage
- Coalter, F. (2007). Sport Clubs, Social Capital and Social Regeneration: 'ill-defined interventions with hard to follow outcomes'? *Sport in Society*, 10(4), 537–559.
- Dahllöf, U. (1967). *Skoldifferentiering och undervisningsförlopp*. [School Differentiation and Teaching Processes]. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Dahllöf, U. (1969). *Ability grouping, content validity and curriculum process analysis*. Göteborg: Institute of Education, University of Göteborg.
- Dahllöf, U. (1978) *Curriculum evaluation, frame factors and teaching for mastery: reprints of three articles*. Uppsala: Uppsala University, Department of Education.

- Donaldson, A., Legget, S., & Finch, C.F. (2012). Sport policy development and implementation in context: Researching and understanding the perceptions of community end-users. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 47(6), 743-760.
- European Commission (2008). *The White Paper on Sport*. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:s2007DC0391>
- European Commission (2011). *Developing the European dimension in sport*. Available: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52011SC0066>
- European Commission (2014). Special Eurobarometer 412. *Sport and physical activity*. Available: http://ec.europa.eu/health/nutrition_physical_activity/eurobarometers/index_en.htm
- European Council (1975). *European Sport for All charter. Principles for a policy of Sport for All* [online]. Brussels, European Council. Available: <https://www.europa.clio-online.de/quelle/id/artikel-3932>
- Fahlén, J. (2013). *Utom tävlan: En studie av föreningsorganiserad spontanidrott*. [Without competition: A study of spontaneous sport organized by sports clubs]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet
- Fahlén, J. (2015). The corporal dimension of sports-based interventions: understanding the role of embedded expectations and embodied knowledge in sport policy implementation. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 1-21. DOI: 10.1177/1012690215607083
- Fahlén, J. & Aggestål, A. (2011). Ambitioner mot traditioner: Föreningsidrottens vidgade ansvar. [Ambitions against traditions: Widening the responsibilities for organized sport]. *Svensk Idrottsforskning*, 20(1), 24-28.
- Fahlén, J., Eliasson, I., & Wickman, K. (2015). Resisting self-regulation: An analysis of sport policy programme making and implementation in Sweden. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 7(3), 391-406.
- Fahlén, J. & Karp, S. (2010). Access denied: The new 'Sports for all'-programme in Sweden and the reinforcement of the sports performance logic. *Sport & EU Review*, 2(1), 3-22.
- Friedland, R. & Alford, R.R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices and institutional contradictions. In *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, eds. W. W. Powel & P.J. Di Maggio, 232-267. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Green, M. (2006). From 'Sport for All' to Not About 'Sport at All'? *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(3), 217-238.
- Harris, S., Mori, K., & Collins, M. (2009). Great expectations: Voluntary sports clubs and their role in delivering national policy for English sports. *Voluntas*, 20(4), 405-423.
- Haudenhuyse, R., Theebom, M., Nols, Z., & Coussée, F. (2014). Socially vulnerable young people in Flemish sports clubs. Investigating youth experiences. *European Physical Education Review*, 20(2), 179-198.
- Karp, S., Fahlén, J., & Löfgren, K. (2014). More of the same instead of qualitative leaps: A study of inertia in the Swedish sports system. *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 11(3), 301-320.

- Karp, S., & Stenmark, H. (2011). Learning to be a police officer: Tradition and change in the training and professional lives of police officers. *Police Practice & Research*, 12(1), 4-15.
- Kvale, S. (1997). *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*. [Qualitative interviewing]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Lindblad, S., Linde, G., & Naeslund, L. (1999). Ramfaktorteori och praktiskt förnuft. [Frame factor theory and practical sense.]. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 4(4), 93-110.
- Lundgren, U. P. 1972. *Frame Factors and the Teaching Process. A Contribution to Curriculum Theory and Theory on Teaching*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Lundgren, U. P. (1979). *Att organisera omvärlden: En introduktion till läroplansteori*. [To organize the outside world: An introduction to curriculum theory]. Stockholm: Liber förlag, Publica.
- Lundvall, S., & Meckbach, J. (2008). Mind the gap: Physical education and health and the frame factor theory as a tool for analysing educational settings. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(4), 345-364.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage
- Nilsson, P. (1988). *Tävlingsidrotten som uppfostringsmiljö*. [Competitive sports as fostering arena]. Stockholm: HLS, Institutionen för Pedagogik, Rapport 1/1988.
- Norberg, J. R. (2011). *Uppföljning av statens stöd till idrotten* [A follow-up of the governmental support for sport]. (Report no. 1). Stockholm: Centrum för idrottsforskning.
- O'Brien, D., & Slack, T. (2003). An analysis of change in an organizational field: The professionalization of English Rugby Union. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(4), 417-448.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. London: Sage
- Phillipots, L., Grix, J., & Quarmby, T. (2011). Centralized Grassroots Sport Policy and 'New Governance': A Case Study of County Sports Partnerships in the UK – Unpacking the Paradox. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 46(3), 265-281.
- Riksidrottsförbundet. (2008). *Idrott hela livet: En strategisk plan för idrottsrörelsens folkhälsoarbete*. [Lifelong sport: The Swedish sports movement's strategy for public health]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet.
- Riksidrottsförbundet (2009). *Idrotten Vill*. [What sports want]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet.
- Riksidrottsförbundet (2015). *Verksamhetsinriktning med ekonomiska planer 2016-2017* [The SSC Declaration of Strategy including economic plans 2016-2017]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet.
- Riksidrottsförbundet (2016). *Idrotten i siffror 2016*. [Swedish sports statistics 2016]. Stockholm, Riksidrottsförbundet.
- Sjöblom, P., & Fahlén, J. (2010). The Survival of the Fittest: Intensification, Totalization and Homogenization in Swedish Competitive Sport. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 13(4), 704-717.

- Skille, E.Å. (2008). Understanding Sport Clubs as Sport Policy Implementers. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 43(2), 181-200.
- Skille, E.Å. (2010). Competitiveness and health. The work of Sport Clubs as Seen by Sport Clubs Representatives – a Norwegian Case Study. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45(1), 73-85.
- Skille, E.Å. (2011). Sport for all in Scandinavia: sport policy and participation in Norway, Sweden and Denmark. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 3(3), 327-339.
- SoU 2008:59. *Föreningsfostran och tävlingsfostran En utvärdering av statens stöd till idrotten* [Democratic fostering and competition fostering. An evaluation of the government support to sport]. Betänkande från Idrottsstödsutredningen. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Spaaij, R. (2009). Sport as a vehicle for social mobility and regulation of disadvantaged urban youth. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 44(2-3), 247-264.
- Stenling, C. (2013). The introduction of drive-in sport in community sport organizations as an example of organizational non-change. *Journal of Sport Management*, 27(6), 497-509.
- Stenling, C. & Fahlén, J. (2009). The Order of Logics in Swedish Sport. *European Journal for Sport and Society* 6(2), 29-42.
- Stenling, C., & Fahlén, J. (2016). Same same, but different? Exploring the organizational identities of Swedish voluntary sports: Possible implications of sports clubs' self-identification for their role as implementers of policy objectives. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 51(7), 867-883.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research, Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. London: Sage
- Strittmatter, A. M., & Skille, E.Å. (2017). Boosting Youth Sport? Implementation of Norwegian Youth Sport Policy through the 2016 Lillehammer Winter Youth Olympic Games. *Sport in Society*, 20(1), 144-160.
- Taylor, P. (2004). Driving up participation: Sport and volunteering. In *Driving up participation: The challenge for sport*. England: Sport England 2004.
- Vetenskapsrådet (2011/2017). *Good Research Practice*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council.
- Westerbeek, H. (2009). International perspectives on sport and health. In *Using sport to advance community health: an international perspective*, Ed. H. Westerbeek, 175-208. Nieuwegein: Arko Sports Media.
- Young, B., & Callary, B. (2017). Doing 'more for adult sport': Promotional and programmatic efforts to offset adults' psychosocial obstacles. In *Sport and Physical Activity across the Lifespan: Critical Perspectives*, Eds. R.A. Dionigi & M. Gard, 263-281. UK: Palgrave Macmillian.

