


Please cite the Published Version

Viollet, Bastien, Scelles, Nicolas  and Ferrand, Alain (2020) The engagement of actors during the formulation of a national federation sport policy: an analysis within the French Rugby Union. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 12 (1). pp. 49-71. ISSN 1940-6940

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2019.1634621>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis (Routledge)

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/623087/>

Usage rights:  In Copyright

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of a paper accepted for publication by Taylor & Francis in *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

**The engagement of actors during the formulation of a national federation sport policy:
an analysis within the French Rugby Union.**

Bastien Viollet, Nicolas Scelles and Alain Ferrand

Corresponding author:

Bastien Viollet
Faculty of Sport Sciences
Centre for Research in Management, Cerege
University of Poitiers
8 Allée Jean Monnet
86000 Poitiers
FRANCE
T: +33(0) 6 79 40 24 17
E: bastien.viollet@univ-poitiers.fr

**The engagement of actors during the formulation of a national federation sport policy:
An analysis within the French Rugby Union.**

Abstract:

The purpose of this research is to explore the process of engagement of actors initiated by the headquarters of a national sport federation during the formulation of its sport policy. The Actor-Network Theory and its four phases (problematization, incentive, enrolment and mobilisation of allies) are used to understand the dynamics of actors during the process, with an emphasis on the constitution, expansion and stabilization of the actors' network. As part of an intervention research within the French Rugby Union over the 2013-2016 period, three series of semi-structured interviews (58) were conducted with both national and regional actors with various statuses. The French case is of interest beyond France because the organisational configuration of the national federations has specific characteristics that are common to different countries: pyramid structure, state intervention (both financial and human) and relationships between volunteers and employees. The results of this study demonstrate that the process of designing a sport policy is not linear. In addition, some elements that are favourable for the engagement of actors are highlighted, such as having a defined scope of the sport policy to be designed and designating key actors regarding the formulation of the sport policy. These actors should be able to act as spokespersons in front of other actors in the network. The innovative methodology used in our research is relevant to policy makers because it helps them engage other actors during a concrete transformation project, namely, the formulation of a policy.

Keywords:

Sport policy, engagement of actors, national sport federation, Actor-Network Theory, French Rugby Union

Introduction

For any organisation involved in the promotion or development of sport, the definition of its sport policy is of prime importance because it enables the organisation to set targets (Bravo and Silva, 2014; Houlihan and White, 2002), both in terms of qualitative and quantitative development of one or more sporting disciplines (Callède, 2002; Houlihan, 2000, 2011). Thus, the sport policy of a national federation is a key object insofar as its goal is to stimulate and develop the practice of a sport discipline (Nagel et al., 2015).

The formulation of such a policy appears as an innovative approach (Winand et al., 2013) because it implies the establishment of a medium-term vision, including objectives, an action plan and the engagement of resources to achieve the defined objectives (Bayeux, 2013). This process affects several actors participating in the achievement of the objectives (Houlihan, 2000; Viollet et al., 2016; Winand et al., 2013).

Similar to other countries, the case of the French NSFs – of which the French Rugby Union (FFR) was studied in this article – implies the consideration of their pyramid structure (from the headquarters to the clubs through both regional and departmental committees) and the variety of actors involved in such a process (political leaders, other volunteers, sport and technical employees, civil servants).

In particular, an NSF sport policy is relevant if the regional entities may have the possibility to implement it, while taking into account their degree of autonomy (Shilbury and Ferkins, 2015). To do so, it seems necessary to involve both national (headquarters) and regional actors (Fahrner and Klenk, 2018; Skille, 2008) from the beginning of the formulation process, which will enable consideration of the diversity of perceptions regarding such a policy (Delenbos and Klijn, 2006; Donaldson et al., 2011).

The purpose of this research is to explore the process of engagement of actors initiated by the headquarters of a national sport federation during the formulation of its sport policy.

An issue to avoid is a lack of engagement of several actors (e.g., regional ones), which may result in a limited impact on such a sport policy (Viollet et al., 2016). With this in mind, it is relevant to examine the relationship between sport policy makers, regarding their perceptions and interests (Sam and Jackson, 2004). Furthermore, it is important to comprehend the levers, obstacles or difficulties related to the process of engagement of actors with different statuses and fields of action.

Despite this conceptual relevance, the process of engagement of actors is rarely the focus of empirical research in the context of an NSF, especially its sport policy (Scheerder et al., 2017). Such a focus is needed to examine the ability of national actors (headquarters), initiating such a policy, to engage other actors. This focus should ensure a consistent sport policy and better implementation throughout the country (Pearce et al., 2000).

In the case of sport policies, Giband and Holz (2007, p. 83) highlight *‘the need for a theoretical framework enabling at least to summarise the configuration of the actors and their actions’*. Consistent with this statement, our research relies on the Actor-Network Theory (ANT) (Akrich et al., 2006; Callon, 1984) applied to an NSF. The ANT provides a framework for analysing the constitution, expansion and stabilization of a network of actors.

Using a qualitative case study approach related to the French Rugby Union over the 2013-2016 period, we explore the process of engagement of actors with different statuses (political leaders, sport managers/technicians and administrative managers), both at national and regional levels, to design a relevant sport policy. More specifically, two research questions are posed: which form is taken for a process of engagement of actors during the formulation of a national federation sport policy? What drives engagement for actors in the formulation of a national sport federation policy?

The main originality of this article is to explore a network of actors by using an innovative theoretical framework in the field of sport (Darnell et al., 2018) applied to an NSF.

The structure of the article is as follows. First, the conceptual foundation of the research is developed, followed by the presentation of the case studied (FFR). Then, the foundation of the research and the methodology used are presented. The results are then highlighted according to the proposed conceptual framework, before being summarised. Finally, conceptual and theoretical as well as managerial implications are discussed before providing some limitations and perspectives for future research.

Conceptual foundation

Conceptualisation of a national federation sport policy: elements to be considered

The starting point for conceptualising an NSF sport policy is to examine the main characteristics of a sport policy in general. Bloyce and Smith (2010, p.13) provide the following elements:

‘All policies can be viewed as involving the following overlapping and interrelated features: human action aimed at achieving certain objectives; [...] at resolving, or at least ameliorating, an identified “problem”; and [...] at maintaining or modifying relationships within an existing organization, between different organizations, or a human figuration of some other kind’.

Additionally, Bayeux (2013) identifies three levels that are peculiar to the formulation of a sport policy: a political level (defining ideological values, aims), a strategic level (plan of actions), and a tactical level (allocation of resources, means and management methods). Another level can be added, namely, the operational level, related to the practical implementation of the sport policy.

To clarify the difference between the notions of policy and strategy, we first note that a policy used in the context of the present study necessarily involves a strategic dimension (Shilbury and Ferkins, 2015). Strategy, in contrast, is considered subsequent to the policy and, as such, follows the latter (Robinson and Minikin, 2011). Thus, a sport policy for the present context is

understood as a set of aims and objectives, while a strategy corresponds to the actions chosen to reach these aims and objectives (plan of actions).

These elements are relevant for an NSF sport policy as it integrates several actors operating in different organisations at different levels. Given the characteristics of an NSF, the types and levels of intervention of these actors can be understood through three dimensions:

1. The network is constituted by organisations located in different levels: headquarters or national level, affiliated associations, or regional level and clubs or the community level.
2. These organisations that are part of an NSF internal network are composed of political actors, volunteers, sport technicians and administrative staff. All of them can be involved in and/or affected by the NSF sport policy (Houlihan, 2005, 2011).
3. Actors may take part at different levels during the formulation of the NSF sport policy (planning phase): some of them are involved in the formulation of the sport policy, others organise the conditions to achieve the objectives, while others take responsibility for implementing these objectives through actions ‘on the field’. Skille (2008) calls them the *implementers*. There is a need for a collaboration between these actors involved in different phases and tasks.

Therefore, during the formulation stage, it is important that the “designers” of the sport policy are representative of this wide range of actors. The NSF sport policy also presents some elements in terms of ‘content’. Besides, it has a managerial dimension because actors are interdependent and influence each other. Consequently, it may be beneficial to understand how the NSF sport policy is conceived, not from a methodological perspective (‘step by step’) but through an understanding of the dynamics of the relationships between the actors.

National federation sport policy: a management tool to implement

Based on the previous elements highlighting the importance of a dynamic perspective, an NSF sport policy is understood as a process, from its definition to its implementation, including several actors operating in a network (Viollet et al., 2016). This policy has a double dimension. On the one hand, it has an intra-organisational dimension, as it is initiated by the headquarters. On the other hand, it has an inter-organisational dimension, as an NSF is supported by local entities (clubs) but also intermediary ones (Nagel et al., 2015).

In France, in particular, each NSF is organised with regional and departmental committees (Scelles, 2017). The stake of an NSF sport policy is to give sense to these different levels, a factor identified as key in organisations (Weick, 1995). At the headquarters, this is accomplished by the definition of an overall sport policy; at the regional level, it is done by implementing the NSF sport policy while taking into consideration regional characteristics (cultural, historical, demographic); at the local level, it is important for the actors on the ground to know the national objectives and have the feeling that they are participating in the achievement of these objectives (Skille, 2015). The latter can be various: increase in the number of members, coaches, female players, detection of young talents, etc. Through a general framework for action (Callède, 2002) based on a content, measurable indicators and the definition of the roles of the actors, each entity has to be incentivised to contribute to the shared objectives. Thus, an NSF sport policy can be considered, for a federation, as a key management tool (Viollet et al., 2016): a management tool since it articulates the three heterogeneous elements identified by Hatchuel and Weil (1992) as characterising such a tool, that is, a formal substrate (content, including objectives, sporting projects and measurable indicators), a managerial philosophy (sense for the activity of the actors) and a simplified representation of the roles of the actors; a key management tool since it has an impact on the development of a sporting discipline and a national network of structures and actors.

For the national actors (from the headquarters) initiating the sport policy, the issue is to collaborate with other actors to design it and make its national implementation possible. The rationale for this collaboration is two-fold. First, it is about involving several actors to collect their perceptions on the sport policy content as well as the organization required for this process. Second, it is about engaging regional actors to get them motivated during the implementation phase. In this context, the collaboration can be considered as a co-construction that includes several actors who work at different levels.

Consistent with this and the need to comprehend the ‘local-regional-national issues’, Ferkins and Shilbury (2010) insist on the strategic capability of the headquarters. They argue that the strategic role of the national actors is impacted by their inter-organisational relationships. Therefore, it seems necessary to generate a more collaborative partnership with the regional associations by introducing a power-sharing approach (Nagel et al., 2015). Thus, if the policy formulation is often seen as the responsibility of the top level management, the structure of the sport federations makes them think differently, with the association of different actors operating at different levels.

Consequently, it is necessary to understand how actors, whether they are national or regional, manage their relationships to co-construct an NSF sport policy¹. These actors ‘negotiate’ on several dimensions (managerial, organisational and strategic) about the sport policy to be constructed.

The Actor-Network Theory as a way to comprehend the engagement of actors

To study the social construct (Grimand, 2006) described above, the Actor-Network Theory (ANT, or sociology of translation) has been used (Akrich et al., 2006; Callon, 1984). The ANT

¹ The FFR opted for this logic, given its regional inequalities (see below, figure 4.).

is one of the few approaches that enables the comprehension of management tools and in particular the network of actors building around them. Aiming at empirical application, this theory appears to be a methodology of intervention as well as an analytical theory that is suitable to comprehend *ex post* a process of engagement of actors. In fact, the ANT project is to ‘follow’ the identified (group of) actors, during an emerging process (Darnell et al., 2018; Latour, 1987). Its main goal is to understand the conditions from which actors are going to converge around a project.

With regards to an NSF sport policy, the network of actors to engage has a heterogeneous nature. This network includes political leaders and employees (administrative or sport managers) who are working at national or regional levels and must collaborate.

The network of actors involved in the design process is not given; it has to be built. The stabilisation of this network implies that each actor involved should be in a position to express her/his own translation of the sport policy. An actor’s translation always includes three elements (Drevet, 2011): her/his vision about the goal(s) of the tool, her/his own role and others’ role. When the translations are expressed, the network is configured, and its place within the organisation materialises. Thus, this translation approach enables examination of the underlying organisational relationships in the formulation of an NSF sport policy.

Moreover, the ANT supports that the process of network formation necessarily entails four phases: problematisation, incentive (or interessement; Callon, 1984), enrolment and mobilisation of allies.

First, problematisation takes shape when a problem is formulated by a small group of actors (called primary actors), who then suggest a solution that requires a convergence between several actors. This phase also consists of moving actors from an isolated to a cooperative position and requires the identification of the key actors who will co-construct the tool.

Second, the incentive is *‘the group of actions by which an entity [...] attempts to impose and stabilise the identity of the other actors it defines through its problematisation’* (Callon, 1984, pp. 207-208). The actors of whom participation has been identified as necessary for the success of the tool conception must be “interested” (Drevet, 2011), which means that they must formulate their own translation; *‘as the primary actor works to build the network, negotiations will take place with other actors regarding the roles they may play within the network’* (O’Connell et al., 2014, p.5).

Third, enrolment is successful when the roles are stabilized and jointly defined: actors accept the roles they have been given and enroll in the network so that their roles remain stable (Oiry, 2012). Enrolment corresponds to strengthening of the links between actors with regards to the tool in construction. Additionally, the definition of the tool is universally accepted.

Finally, the mobilisation of allies consists of the enlargement of the network, with other actors moving to support the tool and participate in its design. This enlargement takes shape due to the action of representatives (or spokespersons). In the case of large networks, with several actors and structures, the appointment of representatives permits the coordination in the network. The latter then enjoys a durable consensus of interests.

In summary, Oiry (2012) affirms that these four phases progress thanks to the actors’ translations, as the tool and network are built and become increasingly robust through the integration of the actors’ translations and the acceptance of their respective roles.

Subsequently, the engagement of actors is understood as a process during which everyone 1) becomes aware of a problem to be solved, 2) admits that she/he can play a role in solving this problem and finally 3) stabilises her/his role with regard to other actors. Therefore, this process aims to design the sport policy and transform the organisation with regard to it.

Figure 1 illustrates the four moments of the ANT and the link between actors and the sport policy when this framework is used.

Figure 1

Case study: the French Rugby Union

Presentation

The FFR is the governing body for rugby in France and represents one of the most important NSFs in France as it claims to be supported by approximately 438 000 members², deployed within more than 1800 clubs, 34 regional and 102 departmental committees. Thus, the FFR has a pyramid-shaped hierarchical structure operating from the headquarters to the clubs through both regional and departmental committees (Figure 2).

Figure 2

Founded in 1919 as an association under the French law of 1901, the goal of the FFR is, according to its statutes, *‘to stimulate and develop the practice of rugby in all its forms (traditional practice, seven...) in applying the rules of the game settled by the International Rugby Board³, to guide and regulate rugby and to defend its interests’* (translation of the Title 1, Article 1).

The FFR is a non-profit organisation with a complex governing structure: first, an ‘executive committee’ (governing board), updated every four years and composed of 37 elected members; second, a steering committee with 16 political leaders (also part of the executive committee); finally, at the administrative level of the headquarters, the FFR is made up of six departments, under the authority of an executive management (Figure 3).

² Data from April, 2016. Rugby is the seventh sport for the number of licensees in France.

³ Now “World Rugby”.

Figure 3

Despite its associative statutes, the FFR appears as a corporate company, with the management of more than 140 employees at the headquarters. Moreover, the FFR has a working relationship with the Ministry of Sport, which is realised, on the human resources level, by the secondment of sport technical advisers (Article L. 131-12 of the French Code of Sport) and materialized through a convention of objectives. These advisers are, at the national level, members of the National Technical Direction (NTD), under the authority of a National Technical Director. As in numerous French NFSs, the NTD is part of the sporting project department.

The variety of the actors involved is symptomatic of the three logics related to an NSF, as identified by Bayle (2010): associative (with volunteers, political leaders), public utility (civil servants, sport technicians) and commercial (administrative managers and employees). Most of the elected members are assigned to a department to collaborate with employees, and some of them are also the President of a regional committee⁴.

Context

Over the past 10 years, rugby has seen an accelerated development in France, with a strong increase in the number of members (from 282 000 in 2007 to 415 000 in 2017). The discipline has moved from a restricted sport to a progressive democratisation. France has also followed the international professionalisation of this practice with a top-level professional league, the 'Top 14'. More generally, the FFR has enjoyed the professionalization of its activities, individuals, structures and processes (Nagel et al., 2015). From then on, the FFR faces

⁴ For example, one actor interviewed was a FFR Vice-president, in charge of the development of rugby sevens (thus, he worked in collaboration with the sporting project department), and also President of the Ile-de-France Regional Committee.

complexity given its dual agendas (elite and participation sport), state financial dependency, and exposure to different pressures coming from several stakeholders (sponsors, medias, institutional partners, etc.), similar to other NSFs (Shilbury and Ferkins, 2011).

The practice of rugby in France is very different from one part of the country to another. For example, in some regions of the southwest, the percentage of the population playing rugby can reach 4%, while in the northeast regions, the average is 4‰. (Figure 4).

Figure 4

Consequently, the specificities of this case are both structural and organisational, with three dimensions – entrepreneurial/professionalisation, “co-management” with the State and NTD – taken into account in this investigation. With regards to the sport policy, it is interesting to read a Ministerial Directive (2006) specifying the following:

‘The State is responsible for the management of the sport policies in France. It delegates to the national federations the power to organise and promote the practice of their sporting disciplines and it supports them by means of conventions of objectives and the secondment of sport technicians’ (Instruction n°06-169 JS of the 11th of October, 2006).

As such, it is key to consider the position of the NTD actors into the network that takes shape during the formulation process of the FFR sport policy.

With regards to the context, another important element is to explain why a change in the approach applied by the FFR to formulate its sport policy took place at the time that it did and in the form that it took (Houlihan, 2005; Peng et al., 2019).

During 2014, two contextual elements pushed the FFR to commit to a reflection on its sport policy. The first was the anticipated arrival (because of retirement), in October, of a new National Technical Director. The second was the wish for the implementation of a financing

model providing funding on the basis of strategic regional projects, rather than numerical data (number of clubs, teams and members in the region), as was the case in the past⁵.

Foundations of the research and methodology

Foundations of the research

As mentioned in the introduction and consistent with its conceptual and contextual framework, two research questions are posed: which form is taken for a process of engagement of actors during the formulation of a national federation sport policy? What drives engagement for actors in the formulation of a national sport federation policy? As argued by Wacheux (1996, p. 75), the study of a process requires the need to ‘*build a representation of the reality through an in-depth observation of the context over a quite long period*’⁶. Our analysis examines the evolution of a process over time. It is therefore both longitudinal and exploratory research. The challenge is to identify and analyse the elements that provide substance, form and character to this evolution (Van de Ven and Huber, 1990). This research takes the shape of an intervention research over three years within the FFR headquarters. This mode of research is part of the method and was desired by the FFR. The interest is “to help, on the ground, to design and implement adequate management models, tools and processes, based on a project of transformation more or less fully defined” (David, 2000, p. 210). The intervention research enables a coproduction of knowledge inside the organisation. For the researcher, it requires a position as close as possible to the actors and the issues encountered. As such, a double authority has been in place: functional (human resources department) and research (research department

⁵ During the closing speech of the FFR President at the 2014 general meeting (21/11/2014), he stated that: “*The federation can no longer take the liberty of subsidising, without knowing what it is used for and for what purpose. This is why we will establish agreements on targets with our regional committees.*”

⁶ Translated from French.

of the sporting direction). Concretely, a mission of researcher has been conducted over three years, based on a research contract.

Thus, it seems relevant to rely on the perspective ‘constructivism’ rather than ‘objectivism’ (Grix, 2002) since it places the researcher in an ontological position of reality co-construction with professionals. Such an ontological position considers the reality as ‘socially constructed’ since it *‘asserts that social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors. It implies that social phenomena and categories are not only produced through social interaction but that they are in a constant state of revision’* (Bryman, 2012, p. 33).

The specificity of this research also lies in the fact that our subject (a national federation sport policy) and our theoretical framework are consistent with the perspective ‘constructivism’; our ontological position corresponds to the way our subject is apprehended, in this case, a social construction.

The objective is to explore how the actors are engaged and engage others to gain a stable network. These elements refer to the concept of ‘social capital’, which has come to refer to the by-product of trust relations between people (Grix, 2002). As underlined by Grix (2002), active involvement and interest by actors generate a collective good that facilitates collaborative action for all.

More precisely, it is worth emphasising that our approach follows that of Guba and Lincoln (1998), called ‘pragmatic’, which lends importance to interpretative postures. The interpretation is useful to obtain a better understanding of a social phenomenon (Croom, 1999). Concretely, this position makes possible the analysis of the different social facts, events, and dynamics of actors resulting based on their interactions. It enables us to grasp the subjective meaning of social action (Bryman, 2012).

Data collection

Based on a strong proximity with the national actors and as such facilitated access to the ground (both the headquarters and regional committees), this research used a triangulation based on three methods of data collection: documentary resources, participant observation, and semi-structured interviews with both regional (board members and sport technicians) and national actors (board members, sport technicians and administrative managers). This triangulation favours a fine interpretation of the data and enables recounting of the complexity of the relations between actors.

Documentary resources used are annual activity reports (x3) with key numbers for each sporting season, organigrams, general assembly speeches (x6), and any other files presenting the different sporting projects. The main objective is to place in perspective the projects communicated and the evolution of the FFR situation (number of licensees, national teams' performance, financial situation) with the different actors' speeches.

The participant observation refers to regular participation at meetings and events. We observed political leaders (e.g., during general assemblies, x6), sport technicians/advisers and administrative managers (e.g., during seminars organised by the sporting project department (x3) and meetings concerning the implementation of a financing model between the headquarters and the committees (x9)). This observation enabled the identification of informal elements, such as which actors are close to each other or discrepancies between information communicated externally and actual thoughts.

Additionally, the position of intervention researcher is consistent with the framework provided in this research and the methodological ambition to "follow the actors". It also enabled the facilitation of the organisation during the design process of a management tool. With this in

mind, the approach is exploratory. The dynamics of the actors are studied longitudinally and analysed from a temporal perspective, retrospectively.

Given the need to deeply describe a phenomenon involving actors, this research relies on a qualitative approach (Rubin and Rubin, 2005). Qualitative techniques are useful for exploring and describing elements of a problem in depth and detail, by examining situations with characteristics that may not be easily represented in numerical format (Leedy and Ormrod, 2010; Patton, 2012). A case study approach was conducted with the FFR to comprehend the phenomenon as a whole and to detect dynamics that a survey could not identify. Such an approach is recommended when some evolution within the organisation occurs, and furthermore when exploring a phenomenon that has not been covered thus far (Yin, 2003). This case study is considered as unique (Stake, 1995); the headquarters and the regional organisations that make up the FFR are understood to include a network organisation (an ‘actor-network’).

Three series of semi-structured interviews were conducted with both regional and national actors (Appendix 1) during the years 2014 (from May to July), 2015 (January and February), and then 2016 (from February to June). These periods were determined in advance at the start of the intervention research to proceed at three times: a first phase aimed at understanding the problem and contextualising it; a second phase aimed at understanding the initial evolution following the change of NTD; and a third phase aimed at analysing the actors’ network that eventually formed and the sport policy co-constructed.

Interviews were conducted with actors with various statutes (16 board members, 16 sport technicians and 13 administrative managers), with the objective of achieving a balance between these different ‘types’ of actors. The interviews were audio recorded. In this paper, quotations used from the interviews have been coded with the letters A (for administrative managers), P

(political leaders) or S (sport managers), followed by a number to differentiate interviewees from the same group.

These actors were chosen due to their level of responsibility and their potential involvement in the formulation of the FFR sport policy. This variety of actors enables consideration simultaneously of the political vision, the sporting technical knowledge and the administrative support underlying the establishment of such a sport policy. In short, it ensures a formulation that takes into account the three levels identified by Bayeux (2013). Besides, there was a need for a balanced geographical representation including representative actors from the north/south and east/west of France, given the above-expressed heterogeneity.

The aim of the semi-structured interviews was to collect the viewpoints, thoughts and observations of some persons with special knowledge about a subject, a special status and/or information about which the researcher cannot have any access by other means. Semi-structured interviewing enabled the researcher to follow leads, ask additional probing questions, and allow the interview to proceed (Pomeranz, Needham, and Kruger, 2015). Given the use of the ANT, the interviews were crucial as they enabled to bring to the foreground the actors' perceptions and translations. To achieve this goal, an interview guide was structured following the three dimensions of a translation (Appendix 2). Given our qualitative approach and the researchers' potential influence, specific attention was paid to guarantee intersubjective comprehensibility. All the interviews ended when no new information emerged (i.e., a 'saturation' point was reached).

Data analysis

The data analysis implied the standardisation of information from three different sources and was conducted in two stages:

- a thematic analysis was performed by transcribing each interview. This thematic analysis followed the management tool framework (Hatchuel and Weil, 1992). This first stage allowed the coding of items corresponding to the three dimensions of the sport policy;
- a contextualisation of the representations, events, links between actors according to the ANT framework (Akrich et al., 2006; Callon, 1984).

Due to the peculiar nature of the phenomenon studied (a process), the data analysis focused on the construction of a network of actors. To do so, the aim was to assess the collective (network) progress and the individual perceptions related to the sport policy-making process. Thus, individual and collective analyses were required. On the one hand, the actors' translations were collected, and analysed using 'actors' files', as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Collection of actors' translations using 'actors' files'

On the other hand, a collective analysis is necessary, consisting of identifying the actions taken (e.g., meetings), documents produced and other speeches delivered. These two levels of analysis are linked: the actors are mobilised through both emerging relationships and elements related to the content of the sport policy that are expressed. Hence, they are analysed together. In addition, the implementation of semi-structured interviews and participant observation makes it possible to report the relationships between the actors studied. Thus, without the use of any specific network analysis technique, the system of interdependence between actors can be highlighted. We followed the chronology of the facts, analysed through the ANT. The aim was to access the levels of problematisation, incentive, enrolment, and then mobilisation and make an accurate analysis for each of these phases in relation to the actors and group of actors.

Results

To describe the engagement process, results are presented based on the theoretical framework, with a description of each ANT phase. It is worth noting that from the beginning of the intervention research (and thus the beginning of the engagement process of both national and regional actors), a group of actors was identified at the headquarters. The group included one political leader (Vice-president⁷, supported by the President), two NTD members and three administrative managers (from the sporting project and the human resources departments). This small ‘steering group’, also including the intervention researcher, wished that the first interviews would bring a first problematisation to the foreground.

A two-step problematisation

In the first part of the first phase of interviews conducted in 2014 (subsequently the first set of interviews), the actors agreed on the weak visibility of the FFR sport policy, from the perspective of either the headquarters or regional committees. The perceived content was biased, with many actions simultaneously developed for specific areas, such as rugby development. Thus, the process started with the wish for a problematisation based on an evaluative logic. In fact, the main idea of the ‘steering group’ was to organise an evaluation of the current sporting projects, with the aim to achieve a better estimation of their efficiency and to be able to draw some conclusions with regards to the sport policy to be formulated. In other words, the idea was to make a common evaluation, that is, a shared one⁸.

⁷ Also President of a Regional Committee.

⁸ The first two quotes in Table 2 illustrate this first problematisation.

Following the first set of interviews, all the actors shared the need to establish an evaluation tool to obtain greater efficiency regarding the sporting projects and plans. Nevertheless, they were not able to identify the actors that should evaluate the sport policy. Beyond this difficulty, the key issue was the absence of a FFR sport policy itself.

Subsequently, a new problematisation agreed by the 7 ‘steering group’ actors emerged to be in tune with the reality of the different actors.

This second problematisation was related to the FFR sport policy itself and its making process. It was necessary to define the FFR sport policy for its common representations. With a problematisation focused on the need to build a sport policy, the issue was more generally to achieve simplified and common representations to obtain a consensus and common points of reference. Table 2 presents the key milestones and quotes illustrating this two-step problematisation.

Table 2. From the wish to evaluate the sporting projects to the definition of the FFR sport policy, a two-steps problematisation

An engaged incentive process

Once this problematisation stabilised, some elements related to the idea of incentive appeared, especially during the second set of interviews (second part of the first phase of interviews). All relevant actors expressed their ‘translations’ regarding this problematisation; they were interested in the approach of building the FFR sport policy, and they all succeeded in finding their role in this design process. Indeed, some actors, even groups of actors, were identified as key with regard to the formulation of the FFR sport policy. The first two quotes in Table 3 illustrate this phenomenon.

Eventually, a dense actors' network was identified, with five groups representing more than 150 actors who had to collaborate and be coordinated.

This dense actors' network was required to be representative of the different French territories characterised by differing specificities, as underlined by the last quote in Table 3 presenting the key milestones and quotes illustrating the incentive process.

Table 3. An incentive process engaged, with some actors identified as key in the process

A new problematisation, due to a controversy around the scope of a sport policy

At the instigation of the new National Technical Director, all the sport managers gathered (in April 2015) to reflect on the FFR sport policy, with the aim to apply the state sport policy (from the French Ministry of Sport). At that time, a question appeared during a steering group meeting: is the FFR sport policy reduced to the state sport policy? The actors around the table answered the following question among themselves: what is the scope of the FFR sport policy? This was consistent with a controversy around this scope that appeared in the second phase of interviews.

In the latter, the actors were indeed in disagreement concerning the scope of intervention of the FFR sport policy. Most of the sport managers were in favour of a wide sport policy. As an illustration, in their opinion, the FFR sport policy should include projects such as the "FFR Grand Stade"⁹, as the sport policy can be more ambitious when it includes such an economic project. This perception was controversial for other key actors, in particular some members of the FFR steering committee and administrative managers, for whom such a project could affect but was not part of the sport policy, as illustrated by the first quote in Table 4.

⁹ Project of a 'national rugby stadium' with 82,000 seats, boosted in 2010 by the former FFR President, Pierre Camou. It was cancelled in 2017 by Bernard Laporte, new FFR President since December 2016.

Thus, a new problematisation had to be specified, with the need to define a national federation sport policy and its scope to determine the objectives to be integrated. Indeed, the sport policy can be reduced to quantitative objectives (e.g., number of licensees, national teams' performance) or qualitative objectives (e.g., health).

In collaboration with the 'steering group', we suggested a framing of the notion of sport policy to help actors assume a position in the formulation of the FFR sport policy. Thus, this third problematisation, which enabled easier answering of the second, was resolved in a restricted committee.

Table 4 presents the milestones and quotes illustrating this third problematisation.

Table 4. A new problematisation, due to a controversy around the scope of a sport policy

Limited enrolment of actors

Once a definition and the scope of the sport policy were communicated and validated by the FFR President, some roles were allocated to the restricted pool of actors, again at the instigation of the FFR President. The latter missioned the National Technical Director and the Sporting Project Director to formalise their role and that of other actors for formulation of the sport policy.

Thus, from September 2015, some actors had a clear role related to the design process of the FFR sport policy: six political leaders, the National Technical Director and the Sporting Project Director. Only eight national actors (including one who was also President of a Regional Committee) had a specific role regarding formulation of the sport policy. Thus, some relationships were formally established between these actors, gathered under the form of a "Committee for the Steering of the Sporting Direction".

The following internal document, reported to the FFR headquarters and regional committees, expressed the roles held by the eight ‘enrolled’ actors (Figure 5, September 2015).

Figure 5

Consequently, 31 political leaders (including the FFR President), the national sport managers (excluding the National Technical Director) and the administrative managers (excluding the Sporting Project Director) did not have a formal role in this process. Thus, the actors’ network was far from what was initially anticipated, that is, a large consultation. In other words, several actors were not legitimised / made legitimate by the President or the members of the “Committee for the Steering of the Sporting Direction” to participate in the formulation of the FFR sport policy. Thus, some actors did not obtain the role they expected to play or imagined for them, which was the case, in particular, for most political leaders (a validation role) and the national sport managers (an expert role), who were expected to play a specific role regarding the design process of the FFR sport policy.

In addition, our presence on the ground allowed us to observe that these actors were “removed”, such that the roles they play were not attempted in the reflections, and individually, actions in this direction were not launched. Additionally, while the two phases of interviews conducted in 2014 and 2015 stressed the importance to associate a range of actors, no collective approach (meetings, seminars, etc.) was implemented by these removed actors to provide their viewpoints on the sport policy. Eventually, the enrolment of eight actors under the form of a “Committee for the Steering of the Sporting Direction” generated a split with actors who were external to this group, although they were also supposed to hold a role.

Table 5 presents key quotes and dates, at the beginning of 2016, illustrating the limited enrolment of both sport and administrative actors.

Table 5. A limited enrolment of actors

A mobilisation involving the sport managers... only!

With regards to the mobilisation phase, it is worth noting the important activity of the National Technical Director, who played a key role. Indeed, he gathered over several days both national and regional sport managers to formulate national directives (guidelines), introduced from 2016. The latter are structured around three areas of action: quantitative development, performance (detection and preparation of elite players) and protection of players. These guidelines highlighted a number of objectives related to the sport policy. They were intended to provide a framework for the activity of the sport managers in the field, in particular within the clubs. Thus, they constituted the heart of the FFR sport policy, although they were limited to a ‘ministerial’ view. Indeed, actors aligned these directives to the axes of the national sport policy: the directives established were especially intended to "match" the ministerial sport policy and thus to ensure its missions of public utility. Eventually, sport managers defined their “scope” of the FFR sport policy and were the only actors to answer the third problematization. Despite the limited enrolment, the network of actors increased since two other groups of actors (national and regional sport managers) were mobilized and played a representative role. Through his action, the National Technical Director succeeded in mobilising all 84 sport managers who, finally, played a strong role. Consequently, the activity of the National Technical Director enabled enlargement of the network of actors taking part in the formulation of the FFR sport policy and to take into account some viewpoints from the ground (integration of the regional sport managers).

The other actors initially enrolled (elected members belonging to the Sporting Direction and Sporting Project Director) did not achieve to play this role towards the other groups that they could have represented (federation elected members and administrative managers). In addition, based on our last phase of interviews, we could observe that the federation elected members (except those belonging to the Sporting Direction) and the administrative managers remained – again – passive, this time towards the formulation of the national sporting directives. The latter did not include these actors who were thus neither solicited by the actors enrolled, nor looking for a “role” within the network.

Table 6 gathers the key milestones and quotes summarising this limited mobilisation.

Table 6. A mobilisation involving only sport technicians

Summary of results

Following this process-based analysis, a main finding is that the final network of actors does not conform to what was initially anticipated, with actors enjoying more power than expected while others have been excluded. This gap highlights the complexity of this process related to the formulation of a sport policy. Another important dimension is that the process was also long, lasting more than two years between 2014 and 2016.

When we look back at the process, it appears that the reflections of many actors evolved, particularly with regards to the problematisation, and therefore the managerial problem to be solved around the FFR sport policy. The first set of interviews provided a diagnosis, which clarified the need for the FFR to have a formalised policy. Thus, this second problematisation highlighted the shared willingness to involve several actors in the formalisation process. As such, a very dense network of actors likely to enroll in the process was identified, providing a

strong ambition for the federation, which wanted to set up a collective and participatory approach.

Following the first two problematizations, the actors re-problematized by identifying the need to define what is represented by a sport policy, particularly with regards to the scope of action, to be able to formulate common (types of) sport policy objectives. These different problematisations slowed down the engagement process, justifying why we were asked to "answer" this third problematisation with a few actors.

Then, at the instigation of the FFR President, a few actors were identified with a specific role. Thus, the enrolment phase excluded some actors and strengthened others. In addition, the National Technical Director assumed a decisive role in terms of mobilisation since he brought all the sport managers together with the aim of formalising the sport policy in the form of national guidelines. Besides, the few political actors previously identified as key did not assume a direct role in the formalisation of these directives, but they intervened later for the (political) validation.

At the end of the process, a move in the strengths of the different (groups of) actors occurred, with all the sport managers finally playing a crucial role regarding the FFR sport policy. By creating directives (and thus, sporting objectives), they participated in the strategic dimension of the FFR sport policy while ensuring the implementation of these objectives by all regional committees. Thus, they benefited from the technical legitimacy given to them.

Eventually, the engagement of actors in the formulation of a national federation sport policy has taken the form of a non-linear process, during which the roles of the actors have evolved. Figure 6 sums up this non-linear process, showing the construction of the network of actors who contributed to the formulation of some elements of the sport policy. The times in the construction are presented, with reference to the problematisation, incentive, enrolment and mobilisation phases.

Figure 6

Our study also highlights some factors that favour the involvement of different actors during this process. Mainly, we can identify the following elements:

- a defined perimeter (scope of action) of the sport policy, especially with regard to the federation's activities;
- designated actors (roles and responsibilities assigned) for the formulation of the sport policy;
- 'designers' actors that are able to act as spokespersons in front of other actors;
- establishment of work discussion spaces that enable other actors to be included in the process.

Discussion

The research purpose was to explore the process of engagement of actors initiated by the headquarters of a national sport federation during the formulation of its sport policy.

Our answers to our research questions, summarised at the end of the previous section, open the door to conceptual and theoretical implications, as well as managerial implications.

Conceptual and theoretical implications

Our research shows that an analysis of a large network of actors cannot be performed without examining the evolution in the content of the sport policy that they developed. This evolution observed during the formalisation process was impacted by three different problematisations.

These problematisations highlight the complexity of addressing the notion of sport policy in the context of a national sport federation. The search for the right scope to define (third problematisation) is also symptomatic of the multidimensional nature of a sport policy. Thus, our research is in line with Bergsgard et al. (2007) and Bloyce and Smith's (2010) findings as they note this multidimensional nature. Consistently, King (2009) mentions that a sport policy takes into account both sporting and non-sporting objectives. This plurality of objectives linked to a sport policy raises the question of its scope of action. This complexity of an NSF for the actors was confirmed in our research.

Our research also raises two major points of discussion related to the use of the ANT. First, the multi-actors engagement process is not a linear construction, in which actors "join" one after the other to form an increasing network. The case study shows that the "interested" network is not necessarily the final network. The same applies to the formalization of the sport policy. Akrich et al. (1988, 2006) stress the risk of considering such a process as linear. Akrich et al. (1988, p. 5) indicate that such a process requires "interactions, constant back and forth, negotiations of all sorts that allow for rapid adjustment". Our results are in alignment with this, insofar as the reflections of the actors advance or reverse the process as long as they are shared, as was the case with the problematizations. More generally, both the sport policy and the network of actors evolved depending on the challenges they face (see Figure 6), representing a so-called "circular process" (Akrich et al., 1988).

Second, our study highlights the importance of having spokespersons who are able to mobilise and represent different groups of actors, as the National Technical Director did with his sport managers. Thus, our analysis fits with Callon (1984), who underlines that the action of spokespersons allows an extension of the network. However, in such a dense network (within an NSF), the challenge related to enrolment is not quantitative (to give roles to interested actors) but qualitative, that is, to give roles to actors who are able to become spokespersons and

represent the different groups identified as important for the process (cf.: incentive phase). The National Technical Director played the role of representative for sport managers, a role that the Sporting Project Director was not able to play for the administrative directors. The same applied to the elected representatives for the FFR Steering Committee and the regional committees. Thus, the limited enrolment of actors is not necessarily a problem, this is rather the inability of enrolled actors to mobilise other actors (here, political and administrative actors) that can be missing in the process. Our analysis therefore extends further than those of Callon (1984), Akrich and al. (2006) and Oiry (2012), who find that an enrolment is successful when the roles are stabilised and jointly defined. Indeed, according to our results, an enrolment is successful if the actors who have specific roles (recruited actors) play this role as spokespersons to mobilise a whole group of actors.

Beyond confirming and extending the results from previous research using the ANT, our study raises the importance of leadership (or lack of) in a sport policy process (Peng et al., 2019), as demonstrated by the role played by the National Technical Director. The finding that only the sport managers were eventually mobilised also suggests a lack (and the importance) of ‘shared leadership’ (Shilbury and Ferkins, 2011), that is, the ability to take into account the responsibilities and/or fields of expertise of each other to engage collectively. This finding may indicate a lack (and the importance) of legitimacy/legitimation of other spokespersons. Legitimacy/legitimation is also a factor explaining why some actors went through the process while others did not, underlining the relevance of applying to actors a concept that is usually applied to organisations (Read et al., 2018; Strittmatter et al., 2018).

Managerial implications

In terms of managerial implications, our research highlights that, before considering the involvement of several actors in a sport policy, it is necessary to define what a sport policy represents and its scope. This definition of scope is what the ANT identifies as an "obligatory passage point", so that actors are able to fully understand the framework within which they have to define objectives. As a result, actors are more willing to engage as long as a collective definition of what a policy is and what it entails (scope) is proposed to them. This definition should take into account that a sport policy is cross-cutting and requires three levels of formulation: political, strategic and tactical (Bayeux, 2013). It therefore requires the integration of actors who are able to have a political vision, with other experts in different fields (strategy, organization, resources, etc.). Thus, the sport policy should be aligned across the different levels.

Our results also stress that spokespersons are important to ensure a 'one size fits all' approach that allows a degree of regional involvement (Viollet et al., 2016). Indeed, while the process had taken a top-down approach through the distribution of roles to eight national actors by the President, the National Technical Director's action has made possible a bottom-up perspective by associating regional executives.

However, a point of attention related to the exclusive participation of sport managers in the process initiated by the National Technical Director concerns the nature of the sport policy they have formalised, called the "national guidelines". If the latter guarantee that the logic of public service intrinsic to the federation is taken into account (the defined objectives ensure its mission of public utility), this does not apply to its associative and commercial logics (Bayle, 2010). Thus, a risk related to the lack of mobilisation from one of the three types of actors (political leaders, sport technicians, administrative staff) is the potential failure to take into account the three logics of an NSF. This potential failure can ultimately lead to an NSF sport policy with a narrow scope, which is unable to fulfil the various missions of an NSF. In other words, the sport

policy must be designed with the integration of the three logics specific to an NSF. In addition, favouring one logic over the others can create some tensions between actors who have different sensitivities regarding these logics.

To face these issues, a direction would be to constitute a restricted steering group at the national level, involving several political leaders (including the NSF President and one representative of the regional committees), the National Technical Director, as well as some sport and administrative managers with legitimacy to play a representative role. These elements were satisfied in the FFR case and enabled garnering the interest of all the actors targeted. Nevertheless, to gain a large consultation and to mobilise actors, the representatives must be able to provide perceptions on behalf of the groups they represent, which implies boosting collective discussions.

In line with this finding, a further recommendation refers to the creation of ‘work discussion spaces’, which favour interactions between actors. Detchessahar (2013, p. 59) defines the discussion space as ‘*a designing space through the dialogue of solutions or building of collective action between interdependent actors*’. Within the FFR case, only the sport managers succeeded in gaining a ‘work discussion space’. Thus, it is suggested that the political leaders and the administrative directors also follow this approach.

Limitations and future research

Based on the elements developed previously, future research of this type (intervention research) could encourage the implementation, from a methodological perspective, of such discussion spaces. This would lead the recruited actors to play their role as spokespersons by setting up discussion spaces that bring together several actors. These events would ensure the involvement of a whole range of actors, with several groups being invited to participate in such a process.

In the case of the FFR, the involvement of several actors, with different statuses (political leaders, sport and administrative managers) and levels (national, regional), was desired and validated when we conducted our first interviews. However, we have underlined that this process is long and difficult and that it involves both different dynamics specific to different groups of actors and a transformation of the sport policy, ultimately reduced to national guidelines in our case. Therefore, future research questions arise, for example, to what extent the involvement of the different groups of actors enables the formulation of a sport policy with a balance between the three logics specific to an NSF.

With this idea in mind, it would also be relevant to consider the link between such a (collective) process of formalisation and the subsequent implementation of a sport policy. Does a weak engagement impact the process of implementation? On the other hand, does the engagement of a plurality of actors guarantee the success of the implementation? These types of research are stimulating because they enable a twofold analysis, both in terms of the actors' network (during the formulation and then the implementation) and effectiveness of the sport policy (link between the objectives set and the achievement of these objectives).

We acknowledge that our research has a number of limitations. The first limitation is inherent to the case study. Indeed, our results are highly dependent on the context of the study, which may limit their transposition. For example, in our case, it occurred in the context of the planned arrival of a new National Technical Director. This actor may have been very active in influencing the sport policy from the very first months of his mandate. Nevertheless, most of our results may still be generalizable because any NSF has several structural levels and different profiles of actors (political leaders, sport managers and administrative staff). Thus, if a collective approach is desired, the study of actors' engagement can rely on an approach similar to that used in this paper.

Despite the use of the ANT, it remains difficult, in this context with many actors, to report any informal or even hidden roles of some actors; for example, the ways in which unengaged actors can potentially slow down such a process. In this context, the use of the ANT must be complemented by solid data collection enabling the capture of some information that is not explicitly expected while applying the ANT framework. In our case, the three series of interviews were important to ensure a robust analysis over time.

Another limitation is related to the actors studied; we only considered actors internal to the federation. However, other stakeholders (e.g., the international federation, sponsors, the media) can influence, directly or indirectly, the actors in their representations, choices and degrees of freedom with regard to the process of formulating a sport policy. These relationships between internal actors and other stakeholders could be explored in further research.

A final limitation refers to the intervention research design. Some key moments in the process are the result of the researcher's intervention. This high involvement of the researcher, which is sometimes important to boost the engagement process, reduces the objectivity and the critical distance required (David, 2000). Thus, the researcher analyses data that he has sometimes co-produced. This methodology therefore requires scientific rigor, which we have attempted to implement, in particular through data analysis in two stages.

Finally, the innovative methodology used in our research is relevant to policy makers because it helps them engage other actors during a concrete transformation project, namely, the formulation of a policy. For future research aimed at addressing the conditions under which some actors are involved in such a process, action research could be considered, which could rely on our conceptual and methodological framework based on an engagement process following the ANT stages and focus on the factors favouring the engagement identified in our research.

References:

Akrich M., Callon M., and Latour, B., 1988. A quoi tient le succès des innovations ? [What are the keys to success in innovation?] *Gérer et comprendre*, 11, 4-17.

Akrich, M., Callon, M., and Latour, B., 2006. *Sociologie de la traduction : Textes fondateurs* [Sociology of translation: Founding texts]. Paris: Presses des Mines de Paris.

Bayeux, P., 2013. *Le sport et les collectivités territoriales* [Sport and regional authorities] (5th edition). Paris : Presses Universitaires de France (« Que sais-je ? »).

Bayle, E., 2010. La gouvernance des fédérations chargées d'une mission de service public : le cas des fédérations sportives françaises [Governance of non profit governing bodies in charge of public mission service. The case of french sport governing bodies]. *Politiques et Management Public*, 27 (1), 11-32.

Bergsgrad, N.A., Houlihan, B., Mangset, P., Nedland, S.I., and Rommetvedt, H., 2007. *Sport policy: A comparative analysis of stability and change*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Berry, F.S. and Berry, W.D., 1999. Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research. In P.A. Sabatier (ed.) *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 169-200). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bloyce, D., and Smith, A., 2010. *Sport policy and development: An introduction*. London: Routledge.

Bravo, G., and Silva, J., 2014. Sport policy in Chile. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 6 (1), 129-142.

Bryman, A., 2012. *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Callède, J-P., 2002. Les politiques du sport [The policies of sport]. *L'Année Sociologique*, 52 (2), 437-457.

Callon, M., 1984. Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. *The Sociological Review*, 32 (1), 196–233.

Croom S., 1999. Research Methodology in operation management. *Eden Seminar*, Brussels, February.

Darnell, S., Giulianotti, R., Howe, D., and Collison, H., 2018. Re-assembling Sport for Development and Peace through Actor Network Theory: Insights from Kingston, Jamaica. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, [35](#) (2), 89-97.

David, A., 2000. La recherche intervention, cadre général pour la recherche en management ? [The intervention-research, general framework for the research in management?] In A. David, A. Hatchuel et R. Laufer, *Les nouvelles fondations des sciences de gestion* [New foundations of management sciences] (pp. 193-202). Paris : Vuibert.

Delenbos, J., and Klijn, E-H., 2006. Managing Stakeholder Involvement in Decision Making: A Comparative Analysis of Six Interactive Processes in the Netherlands. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16 (3), 417-446.

Detchessahar M., 2013. Faire face aux risques psycho-sociaux : quelques éléments d'un management par la discussion [Facing psychosocial risks: elements for a management through discussion]. *Négociations*, 19 (1), 57-80.

Donaldson, A., Leggett, S., and Finch, C., 2011. Sports 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.

Drevet, B., 2011. Construire un outil de contrôle au sein des organisations publiques : Une opportunité au développement d'un nouveau mode d'action [Building a monitoring tool within public organisations: An opportunity for the development of a new mode of action]. *Management International*, 15 (4), 11-24.

Fahrner, M., and Klenk, C., 2018. Multilevel policy implementation: exploring organisational coordination – the case of the German Swimming Federation's national training framework implementation, *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, DOI: 10.1080/19406940.2018.1447499

Ferkins, L., and Shilbury, D., 2010. Developing board strategic capability in sport organisations: The national–regional governing relationship. *Sport Management Review*, 13, 235–254.

Ferkins, L., and Shilbury, D., 2012. Good boards are strategic: What does that mean for sport governance? *Journal of Sport Management*, 26, 67–80.

Giband D., and Holz J.-M. (Eds.), 2007. *Les territoires du sport entre politiques et pratiques* [Territories of sport between policies and practices]. Perpignan, France : Presses Universitaires de Perpignan.

Grimand, A., 2006. *L'appropriation des outils de gestion : Vers de nouvelles perspectives théoriques ?* [The appropriation of management tools: Towards new theoretical perspectives?] Saint-Etienne, France: Presses Universitaires de Saint-Etienne.

Grix, J., 2002. Introducing Students to the Generic Terminology of Social Research. *Politics*, 22 (3), 175-186.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S., 1998. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y (Eds) *The landscape of qualitative research*. London: Sage, pp. 195-220.

Houlihan, B., 2000. Politics and sport. In Dunning, E. and Coakley, J. (Eds), *Handbook of Sport and Sociology*, Sage, pp. 213-227.

Houlihan, B., 2005. Public sector sport policy: Developing a framework for analysis. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 40 (2), 163–185.

Houlihan, B., 2011. *Defining Sports Development*. Sportdevelopment.info: <http://www.sportdevelopment.info/index.php/rgsd/265-definition>

Houlihan, B., and White, A., 2002. *The politics of sport development: Development of sport or development through sport?* London: Routledge.

King, C., 2009. *Sport policy and governance: Local perspectives*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Latour, B., 1987. *Science in action. How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Leedy, J., and Ormrod, P., 2010. *Practical research: Planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nagel S., Schlesinger T., Bayle E., and Giauque D., 2015. Professionalisation of sport federations: A multi-level framework for analysing forms, causes and consequences. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15 (4), 407-433.

O'Connell, B., Ciccotosto, S., and De Lange, P., 2014. Understanding the application of Actor-Network Theory in the process of accounting change. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting Conference*, 7.07.2014 – 9.07.2014, Toronto.

Oiry, E., 2012. La formulation des instrumentations de gestion RH : L'apport du concept de rapport de prescription [The design process of a HR management tool: The contribution of the concept of prescriptive relation]. *@GRH*, 5, 11-44.

Patton, M., 2002. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pearce, J.A., Robinson, R.B., and Subramanian, R., 2000. *Strategic management: Formulation, Implementation and Control*. Columbus, OH: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

Peng, Q., Skinner, J., and Houlihan, B., 2019. An analysis of the Chinese Football Reform of 2015: Why then and not earlier? *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 11 (1), 1-18.

Pomeranz, E., Needham, M., and Kruger, L., 2015. Perceptions of stakeholders regarding wilderness and best management practices in an Alaska recreation area. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 20 (1), 36-55.

Read, D., Skinner, J., Lock, D., and Houlihan, B., 2018. Legitimacy driven change at the World Anti-Doping Agency. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, DOI: [10.1080/19406940.2018.1544580](https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2018.1544580).

Robinson, L., and Minikin, B., 2011. Developing strategic capacity in Olympic sport organisations. *Sport, Business and Management: An International Journal*, 1 (3), 219-233.

Rubin, H., and Rubin, I., 2005. *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sam, M., and Jackson, S., 2004. Sport policy development in New Zealand: Paradoxes of an integrative paradigm. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 39 (2), 205-222.

Scheerder, J., Willem, A., and Claes, E., 2017. *Sport policy systems and sport federations: A cross-national perspective*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Scelles, N., 2017. Organisation of sport and policy towards sport federations in France. In J. Scheerder, A. Willem and E. Claes (Eds.). *Sport policy systems and sport federations: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 135-155). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Shilbury, D. and Ferkins, L., 2011. Professionalisation, sport governance and strategic capability. *Managing Leisure*, 16, 108-127.

Shilbury, D. and Ferkins, L., 2015. Exploring the utility of collaborative governance in a national sport organization. *Journal of sport management*, 29 (4), 380–397.

Skille, E.A., 2008. Understanding sport clubs as sport policy implementers: A theoretical framework for the analysis of the implementation of central sport policy through local and voluntary sport organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 43, 181-200.

Skille, E.A., 2015. Community and sport in Norway: Between state sport policy and local sport clubs. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 7 (4), 505-518.

Stake, R. E., 1995. *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Strittmatter, A-M., Stenling, C., Fahlén, J., and Skille, E., 2018. Sport policy analysis revisited: The sport policy process as an interlinked chain of legitimating acts. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 10 (4), 621-635.

Van de Ven, A-H., and Huber, G-P., 1990. Longitudinal field research methods for studying processes of organizational change. *Organization Science*, 1 (3), 213-219.

Viollet, B., Minikin, B., Scelles, N., and Ferrand, A., 2016. The co-construction of a national federation sport policy: Perceptions of key actors and stakes raised: The case of the French Rugby Union. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 21 (5), 317-338.

Wacheux, F., 1996. *Méthodes qualitatives et recherche en gestion* [Qualitative methods and management research]. Paris: Economica.

Weick, K.E., 1995. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Winand, M., Qualizza, D., Vos, S., Scheerder, J., and Zintz, T., 2013. Fédérations sportives innovantes : Attitude, perceptions et champions de l'innovation [Innovative sport federations:

Attitude, perceptions and innovation champions]. *Revue Interdisciplinaire Management, Homme & Entreprise*, 6 (2), 5-20.

Yin, R.K., 2003. *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix 1. List of actors interviewed.

Pseudonym – Respondent code number	Interview length	Typology - Role
P1	1 hour 8 minutes	Board member
P2	40 minutes	Board member & President of a Regional Committee
P3	41 minutes	Board member
P4	1 hour	Board member
P5	56 minutes	Board member
P6	36 minutes	Board member
P7	54 minutes	Board member
P8	1 hour 32 minutes	Board member & President of a Regional Committee
P9	1 hour 8 minutes	Board member & President of a Regional Committee
P10	45 minutes	Board member & President of a Regional Committee
P11	52 minutes	President of a Regional Committee
P12	29 minutes	Board member & President of a Regional Committee
P13	1 hour 12 minutes (in pairs with S12)	Vice-president of a Regional Committee
P14	1 hour 1 minute	President of a Regional Committee
P15	1 hour 8 minutes	President of a Regional Committee
P16	42 minutes	Board member
S1	45 minutes	Regional sport technician
S2	1 hour 19 minutes	Regional sport technician
S3	1 hour 23 minutes	Regional sport technician
S4	1 hour 25 minutes	Regional sport technician
S5	1 hour 7 minutes	National sport technician
S6	1 hour 5 minutes	National sport technician
S7	1 hour 20 minutes	National sport technician
S8	1 hour 1 minute	National sport technician
S9	56 minutes	National sport technician
S10	58 minutes	Regional sport technician
S11	1 hour 20 minutes	Regional sport technician
S12	1 hour 12 minutes (in pairs with P13)	Regional sport technician
S13	39 minutes	Regional sport technician
S14	53 minutes	National sport technician
S15	55 minutes	National sport technician
S16	53 minutes	National sport technician
A1	58 minutes	Administrative manager
A2	1 hour 2 minutes	Administrative manager
A3	1 hour 16 minutes	Administrative manager
A4	49 minutes	Administrative manager
A5	1 hour 10 minutes	Administrative manager
A6	1 hour 11 minutes	Administrative manager
A7	59 minutes	Administrative assistant – Sport Dpt
A8	1 hour 45 minutes	Administrative assistant – Sport Dpt
A9	56 minutes	Administrative assistant – Sport Dpt
A10	1 hour 8 minutes	Administrative manager
A11	54 minutes	Administrative manager
A12	56 minutes	Administrative manager
A13	1 hour 14 minutes	Administrative manager

Appendix 2. Interview guide

1st part: context – general framework

Themes	Elements tackled
1. Introduction: Presentation of the research and objectives of the interview <i>5 - 10'</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Explanation of the intervention research- Objectives of the interview
2. The FFR sport policy <i>5-8'</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Representations and perceptions about an NSF sport policy- Objectives given to the FFR sport policy- Missions, activities or tasks related to the FFR sport policy
3. Actors' roles regarding the FFR sport policy <i>10 - 12'</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Perceived role for the success of the FFR sport policy- Roles assigned to other actors

2nd part: questions regarding the FFR sport policy formulation process

Themes	Elements tackled
4. Content of the FFR sport policy <i>15 - 20'</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Envisaged content and means- Perceived methods of management and evaluation
5. Perceived benefits and inconveniences regarding the sport policy process <i>10 - 15'</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Perceived benefits around the FFR sport policy- Possible disadvantages- Actors involved
6. Conclusion: success or failure <i>5'</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Other factors contributing to the success or failure of the FFR sport policy

Figures

Figure 1. Using the Actor-Network Theory to study the engagement of actors during a sport policy implementation




Figure 2. The French Rugby Union; a pyramid shaped hierarchical structure




Figure 3. The FFR headquarters internal organization: elected members and employees




Figure 4. Implementation of rugby in France: a heterogeneous density¹⁰



Figure 5. Some roles identified, for only eight actors (*FFR internal document, translated from French version, September, 2015*)

Missions	Political leaders (assigned to FFR sports project)	National Technical Director	Sports Project Director
Definition of the FFR sport policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Suggest the sport policy to the executive committee- Construct and validate its implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Suggest the content: operational objectives, action plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Guarantee the consistency (organisation, means)

Figure 6. The engagement of actors during the formulation of the FFR sport policy: an analysis throughout the Actor-Network Theory from 2014 to 2016

¹⁰ Licenses rate for 10,000 inhabitants (source: National Atlas of Sport Federations, French Ministry of Youth and Sport).

Problematisation 1



Problematisation 2



Incentive



Problematisation 3



Enrolment



Mobilisation of allies

