The Drive for Change
Putting the means and ends of sport at stake in the organizing of Swedish voluntary sport

Cecilia Stenling

Till mamma och pappa

Table of Contents

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to create knowledge on processes of change in the contemporary organizing of Swedish voluntary sport and the systems of meaning at work in these processes. The thesis proceeds from the assumption that the contemporary public sport policy climate is characterized by a pressure on organized sport to change in order for sport to better serve as an implementer of non-sport goals. In attempting to capture the possible ramifications of this pressure on the organizing of voluntary sport, the thesis work relies on the argument that processes of change are best captured in instances where new and established ideas are confronted with one another. Following this argument and drawing upon the concept of theorization, the first research question treated in the thesis concerns how legitimacy is established for a new practice (reported in Article 1). The second research question addressed is how, why, and with what consequences new ideas on organizing are implemented in sport organizations (reported in Article 2 & 3). In relation to this question, the concepts of translation and organizational identity are mobilized in the analysis. Empirically, these two questions are addressed using data from 29 interviews covering the emergence and organizing of organized spontaneous sport, so-called Drive in sport, in four Swedish municipalities. The analysis relating to these two questions shows that the same systems of meaning invoked to legitimize and specify Drive-in sport as a practice that has the potential to remedy problems being faced by both the Swedish society and the Swedish sports movement, also made Drive-in sport an unlikely developmental direction for the majority of implementing sport clubs. This process is understood with reference to a mismatch between the organizational identity of the clubs and the cultural material of the idea of Drive-in sport. This insight is brought into the formulation of the third research question treated in the thesis, which is concerned with sport clubs' readiness, willingness, and ability to respond to policy changes (reported in Article 4). Building on data from short, qualitative interviews with representatives from 218 randomly selected sport clubs, 10 organizational identity categories are constructed. Between these categories, there is a variety of clubs' core purposes, practices, and logics of action. The implications of this heterogeneity, in terms of sport clubs' role as policy implementers, are discussed with reference to what clubs in each category might "imagine doing." The analysis provided in the thesis as a whole suggests that at stake in processes of change in the contemporary organizing of Swedish voluntary sport, is the very definition and meaning of sport.

List of Included Articles

This thesis is built on the following four articles.

Article 1
Stenling, C. (2014). The emergence of a new logic? The theorizing of a new practice in the highly institutionalized context of Swedish voluntary sport. *Sport Management Review, 17,* 507–519.

Article 2
Stenling, C. (2014). Sport programme implementation as translation and organizational identity reconstruction: The implementation of Drive-in sport in Swedish sports as an illustration. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 6*, 55–69.

Article 3
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*, 497–509.

Article 4
Stenling, C., & Fahlén, J. (2014). Same same, but different? Exploring the organizational identities of Swedish voluntary sports: Possible implications of sports clubs' self-identification for their role as implementers in various policy objectives. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1177/1012690214557103

1. Introduction

Development, evolvement, progress, and advancement. These terms and their synonyms all signify the same thing: Change. Notwithstanding that change is the most unchanging aspect of social life, this thesis deals with processes of change characteristic of our present time. In particular, the thesis explores processes of change in the organizing of Swedish voluntary sport, i.e., the sport activities provided by organizations that are federated to the Swedish Sports Confederation (SSC). By extension, the thesis is concerned with producing knowledge on the ideas, norms, and values regarding Swedish voluntary sport, the shaping of the Swedish population, Swedish society, and organized sport's role in said society. Such knowledge is important given the magnitude of the Swedish sports movement and of the commitment, trust, belief, and private and public resources that are bestowed upon organized sport in its presumed capacity as a contributor to wider societal aims.

A basic point of departure for the thesis is that contemporary processes of change in the organizing of voluntary sport must be understood in the light of the neo-liberalization that Sweden has gone through during the past decades (e.g., Harvey, 2007; Larsson, Letell, & Thörn, 2012). With regard to public sport policy, this process has involved a new mode of governing in which general support systems have been supplemented by large-scale sport development programs and where key performance indicators (KPIs) have replaced sport-internal evaluations of the sports movement's usage of tax funds. Another important part of this development is the state's increasing pressure on the sports movement to fulfill the long-standing sport-for-all ideal. Intimately connected to this is the increasing emphasis placed on sport's ability to contribute to sport-external aims such as civic education, social integration, public health, economic development, etc. (Norberg, 2011; Österlind & Wright, 2014). The thesis proceeds from the assumption that this development, in tandem with "alarm reports" on declining membership and participation rates (e.g., Centrum för Idrottsforskning [CIF], 2014a), has produced a sport policy climate in which the *need for change* is perceived as increasingly acute. I argue that at the very core of this pressure for change is an expectation on organized sport to *do* other things and to *be* something else.[1] The focus of the thesis is what, if any, expressions this expectation takes in the contemporary organizing of sport.

---

[1] This will be elaborated considerably in Chapter 2 and conceptualized theoretically in Chapter 3.

Drawing on a set of concepts from organizational institutionalism (e.g., Greenwoood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008), organizing is here conceived of as processes wherein systems of meaning regarding sport's means and ends are expressed, created, reproduced, and changed. In the sense that questions are "asked" and "answered" in them, the very definition and meaning of sport, as well as sport's societal role, is at the stake in such processes. Examples of such questions are: What should sport be? Who should sport be for? What should sport achieve and what should be achieved through sport? What are the appropriate means to achieve these aims? Who has the authority to prescribe the orientation and organization of sport? Aside from being meaning-making processes, organizing is also a *practice*[2] and, as such, has consequences beyond sport. Thus, when means-end relationships are formed, certain aims and goals and ways to attain them are given priority over others, funding streams are channeled in one way rather than the other, and, on account of conceived characteristics, needs, and wants, certain groups are made the target for diverse versions of "sport."

In attempting to capture processes of change, I have relied on Czarniawska and Sevón's (1996a) argument that processes of change in organizing are best studied in instances where established ideas and practices are confronted with new ones. This is because such instances reveal both the "new" and the "old." Needless to say, the difficulty in this approach lies in the *a priori* identification of such instances since it requires, on the one hand, a knowledge of the current state of affairs—"the old"—and, on the other, a notion of emergent ideas and practices—"the new." Regarding the subject of this thesis, there is a scarcity of knowledge on the organizing of Swedish voluntary sport, particularly concerning the club level, as indicated by Sjöblom's (2011) review of Swedish research on sport. However, from the documents produced by the sports movement itself, it is possible to discern three principles, according to which the organizing of Swedish club sport can be described. First, activities are arranged *by* and *for* the members of voluntary sport clubs. Indeed, membership is often described as holding the sports movement together (Pallin, 2004). Second, with voluntary associations as the sole legal form in Swedish voluntary sport, and with approximately 600,000 volunteers organizing and leading sport activities, volunteerism is both a foundation and a linchpin of the entire sport system (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2014). Third, the core activities of sport clubs are

---

[2] I use the term "practice" to denote that, in addition to their ideographic aspect, processes of organizing have a very concrete and "real" side wherein systems of meaning are externalized. Thus, although there are some similarities, the usage of the term should not be interpreted as an application of practice theory (e.g., Schatzki, Knorr Cetina, & von Savigny, 2001) or the theory of community of practice (e.g., Lave & Wenger, 1991), for example.

often described as preparation for and participation in the institutionalized competitive sport system. At a more general level, the notion of sport-for-all is promulgated in the sports movement's overarching policy document, *What Sport Want*s (Idrotten Vill) (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2009a).

With this knowledge of "the old" at hand, the introduction of so-called Drive-in sport activities in Swedish sport most definitely signified something "new." As will be visible later on in the thesis, there is a variation in how and by whom Drive-in sport was initiated locally (Stenling, 2013, 2014b). In spite of this, the activities under consideration in this thesis share the label Drive-in sport. This label refers to a template or a model according to which Drive-in sport represents the sport club-provision of spontaneous sport activities to the so-called un-associated youth. The activities, which require neither membership nor regular participation, are to be "non-competitive," focus on the intrinsic and "fun" value of sport, and be based on the needs and wishes of participants. In addition, the recruitment of remunerated leaders is put forth as a key to ensure the success of the activities. A typical Drive-in sport session takes place in a pre-booked sports hall during a weekend evening. During the session, youth are allowed to come and go as they wish and participate in, for example, soccer. In many ways, Drive-in sport activities bear a resemblance to, for example, activities that were provided in the Sports City Program in Norway (Skille, 2004, 2009; Skille & Waddington, 2006).

Viewed from the conceptual framework of the thesis, a comparison between the "old" and the "new" makes visible a paradox of organizing that prompts a number of interesting questions that have processes of change as a common denominator. For example, How come the idea of Drive-in sport emerged at this particular point in time, and what arguments and rationales are used to legitimize and detail the implementation of such a distinctly different idea? Why do sport clubs engage in the organizing of Drive-in sport and what happens to them when they do? The emergence of Drive-in sport also brings about the following broader question: Among sport clubs as a group, what is the general readiness, willingness, and ability to provide new and 'alternative' activities? While the theoretical concepts applied in the thesis, as well as the rationales for their use, are fully outlined in Chapter 3, the following section foreshadows the significance these concepts have had when I have rephrased these questions into subjects of scientific inquiry.

Aim and scope
The overall aim of the thesis is to create knowledge on processes of change in the contemporary organizing of Swedish voluntary sport and the systems of meaning expressed, created, reproduced, and changed in these processes.

By extension, the thesis is concerned with producing knowledge on how the organizing of sport contributes to the shaping of the Swedish population, Swedish society, and organized sport's role in said society. Three research questions (RQs) are treated in the thesis in order to create such knowledge:

1. How is legitimacy established for Drive-in sport?

The rationale behind this RQ is the argument that new and "different" ideas, such as Drive-in sport, do not emerge out of a socio-historical vacuum. Especially in highly institutionalized contexts like Swedish voluntary sport, the introduction of a new idea requires interpretive work by its proponents. Such interpretive work—*theorization*—legitimizes the new idea by framing problems and by detailing and justifying the new practice as a solution to these problems (Strang & Meyer, 1993; Tolbert & Zucker, 1999). This research question is treated in Article 1 (Stenling, 2014a).

2. How, why, and with what consequences, in terms of organizational change, is Drive-in sport implemented in Swedish sport clubs?

This RQ departs from the assumption that the legitimization of an idea *as such* needs to be kept analytically distinct from the adoption of that idea within an organization (Nielsen, Mathiassen, & Newell, 2014). The analytical focus of the question is, therefore, the processes connected to the point at which Drive-in sport is brought over the organizational threshold of implementing sport clubs and the consequences of these processes in terms of organizational identity (re)construction (i.e., organizational change). Theoretically, I conceptualize the manner in which sport clubs approach Drive-in sport as dependent on the clubs' organizational identities, i.e., the way in which the question of "who are we as an organization?" is answered within the club (Glynn, 2008). Article 2 (Stenling, 2014b) treats this research question conceptually by proposing a theoretical framework comprised of the translation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996b) and organizational identity (Glynn, 2008) perspectives. In Article 3 (Stenling, 2013), this framework is put to work in relation to the data on clubs that implement Drive-in sport.

3. What is the propensity among sport clubs as a group to act as policy-implementers of wider societal goals?

While RQ 2 takes Drive-in sport as a point of departure, asking what effect the clubs' self-identification has on the way in which they interpret and act upon Drive-in sport and, in the prolongation, whether the confrontation with Drive-in sport produces organizational change, RQ 3 reverses this strategy. Accordingly, this question reflects the aim to identify what types of self-identifications exist among Swedish sport clubs as a group, and to what extent these resonate with various prevailing and possible future policy

objectives. In that sense, RQ 3 is not concerned with club-level processes of change but with clubs' readiness, willingness, and ability to respond to policy changes. This RQ is addressed in Article 4 (Stenling & Fahlén, 2014).

Disposition of the thesis

The thesis is constituted by four published peer-reviewed articles as well as these introductory chapters, referred to as the "capstone." The purpose of the capstone is to provide an introduction to the topic of the study, its conceptual framing, and the methods used in the empirical inquiry. In the capstone, I also discuss the findings of each article as well as attempt to indicate how they contribute to the knowledge produced in the thesis as a whole. Accordingly, in Chapter 2, I provide an interpretation of the wider organizational context and the contemporary sport policy climate within which the study is situated. The chapter is structured to convey and support the argument that the emergence and organizing of Drive-in sport must be understood in relation to the contemporary Swedish public sport policy climate. While it is common to present a review of previous research in a separate chapter, I have chosen to interweave a literature review with the outline of the conceptual framework applied in the study, and this is done in Chapter 3. This form of presentation is underpinned by the argument that the analysis provided by previous research forms the rationale for the theoretical concepts mobilized in the thesis. Chapter 4 provides an account of my approach to data collection, processing, and analyzing as it follows from the conceptual framework. The chapter also puts forth the principles for good research that guide my study. Following this, the key empirical insights emanating from the individual articles are summarized in Chapter 5. In the closing Chapter 6, these findings are discussed, and concluding remarks and implications for practice are provided. The chapter ends with a section in which I provide reflections on the methodology used, outline the thesis' conceptual and methodological contributions, and offer notes on limitations and suggestions for future research.

2. Setting the Stage for Something "New" in Swedish Sport

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an interpretation of the wider organizational context and contemporary sport policy climate within which Drive-in sport has emerged and is being organized. In pursuit of this aim, the chapter begins with an outline of the emergence, expansion, and organizational characteristics of the Swedish voluntary sport system. Following this, I provide a historical account of the welfare state's role in facilitating the expansion of club sport. Thereafter, I offer a description of how the neo-liberalization of the Swedish state has produced changes to the state-sport relationship. In the final section of the chapter, I suggest that these changes have, in turn, produced a sport policy climate in which the sports movement's ability to deliver sport-for-all is increasingly questioned and which, therefore, asks the sports movement to *develop* in order to remedy this threat to its continued survival and legitimacy. Arguably, the emergence of "new" ideas and practices, such as Drive-in sport, must be understood in relation to this contemporary notion of a *need for change*.

The Swedish sports movement and Drive-in sport

Originating in British competitive sport, the expansion of Swedish voluntary sport—the sports movement—during the previous century is quite extensive. In 1903, the would-be umbrella organization, the SSC, was founded, and it federated merely 35 sport clubs and approximately 2,000 primarily male, bourgeois members at the time. Today, 3 million Swedes, a third of the population, are members of one or several of the some 20,000 sport clubs that constitute the base of Swedish voluntary sport (CIF, 2014a; Norberg, 2002). Organized sport is a feature of social life throughout all geographical areas of Sweden, and although a socioeconomic bias remains in recruitment (CIF, 2014a), there has been a considerable widening of the social background, gender, and age of members of sport clubs. Despite this expansion, the basic architecture of the Swedish sports movement has remained virtually intact since the inception of the SSC in 1903. This architecture entails a horizontal division with 70 national sport organizations (NSOs, e.g., the Swedish Football Association) and their regional extensions, district sport organizations, acting as the authority of each individual sport and a vertical division, with 21 regional sport federations (RSFs) acting as the regional extension of the SSC. In broad terms, the SSC and its regional extensions have a two-fold role. First, the organizations are to cater for the needs and wishes of their member organizations by providing them service and support. Second, the SSC and

RSFs are to act as the representatives of the sports movement in relation to public authorities and political representatives. This involves highlighting the societal benefits produced by the sports movement and the positive values represented by sport (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2010). Historically, a main strategy of the sports movement has been to incorporate new sports into the SSC complex (Norberg, 2002). Therefore, the number of NSOs has steadily grown from 11 in 1904 to 70 in 2014, with the Swedish Skateboard Association as the latest addition to the "sport family" (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2013a). Importantly, this strategy has facilitated the sports movement, headed by the SSC, to occupy the position as *the* provider of non-commercial and non-governmental sport activities in Sweden (Bergsgard & Norberg, 2010).

In addition to the basic horizontal and vertical division of the sports movement described in the preceding paragraph, three characteristics of Swedish voluntary sport form an important background ("the old") to the subsequent analysis of the emergence and organizing of Drive-in sport ("the new"). First, as alluded to in the introduction, a main component of the template of Drive-in sport is the provision of activities to *non-members*. Drive-in sport, therefore, constitutes an important break with the *principle of membership* in Swedish voluntary sport. Crucially, the sports movement is, on all levels, comprised of voluntary associations connected through membership; the individual's in the club and the club's in one or several of the 70 NSO together forming the SSC. The membership grants individuals and organizations access to and participation in the representative democracy through which the entire system is governed. At the club level, this principle is embodied in the election of a board at the annual meeting. At an inter-organizational level, the club's affiliation to one or several NSOs makes club representatives eligible candidates to the boards of district sport organizations and RSFs, and, by extension, the boards of NSOs and the SSC, elected at the biannual SSC general assembly. The membership, therefore, does not merely represent a financial exchange in which the membership fee constitutes a payment for services provided by the club. It signifies the individual's (and organization's) ticket of entrance to the representative democracy of voluntary sport and to the possibility of influencing the orientation and organization of club sport (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2010). Since the SSC's rules and regulations prohibit members from participating in rival activities, the membership also constitutes the individual's sole entrance to the institutionalized competitive system (Lindholm, 2014).

Second, in contrast to the "non-competitive" focus that is inherent in the overall idea of Drive-in sport, *competitive* sport has always been and continue to be the hallmark of the SSC and its constituent NSOs. The SSC

has, however, always had the ambition to represent voluntary sport in all its forms (Norberg, 2002). The very broad definition of sport, provided in the sports movement's overarching policy document, *What Sport Wants,* is a contemporary expression of this ambition: "Sport is a physical activity that we perform for the fun of it, for our well-being and to improve our performance. Sport comprises practices and play, competitions and performances" (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2009a, p. 11).[3] Club sport is, however, commonly assumed to comprise the preparation for and the participation in the institutionalized competitive sport system, i.e., leagues and tournaments sanctioned by the NSO in question.

Third, the principle of the remuneration of leaders, put forth as a key aspect of Drive-in sport, is in contrast with the idea of voluntary work as a critical linchpin of the entire Swedish sport system. Over 600,000 Swedes organize, lead, and represent voluntary organized sport, the majority without any financial compensation. The voluntary work carried out within the sports movement is estimated to correspond to 70,000 full-time jobs. Volunteers are, therefore, often considered organized sport's "most important sponsors" (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2014). However, while Swedish voluntary sport is self-financed to a considerable degree, a third of the average sport club's income is comprised of public support in various forms. Thus, Swedish voluntary sport is, to a relatively large extent, dependent on public funding. Currently, the central and regional state support to sport amounts to SEK 1.8 billion in yearly funding (CIF, 2014a). The largest contribution is, however, provided by local authorities, together allocating ca SEK 4.8 billion in direct and indirect support (SOU 2008:59). A very recent example of local authorities' role in creating the conditions for organized sport is the allocation of SEK 1 billion in additional funding to the construction of sports facilities proposed by the local government of Sweden's capital Stockholm in their budget for the coming four-year term of office (Stockholms stad, 2014).

The following section will be devoted to an account of the historical role of the state-sport relationship in the expansion of Swedish voluntary sport and in the formation of club sport as activities that are membership-based, volunteer-led, and–presumably–competitive in character. Swedish public sport policy is a rather small research field. Thus, the section is based primarily on the works of historians Johan Norberg, Paul Sjöblom, and Jan Lindroth, who are the foreground figures in research on the state-sport relationship in Sweden.

---

[3] This and all of the subsequent quotes with sources written in Swedish are translated by the author.

The welfare state's role in the expansion of club sport

State support to sport dates back to the formation of the sports movement itself. One-off grants were provided by the central state already during the 1870s, and a permanent, annual, SEK 100,000 grant was introduced in 1913. In 1934, Svenska Spel, a state-controlled gambling institution, was established in order to tackle illegal gambling. Due to the decision to allocate the entire surplus to organized sport, public support to sport multiplied many times over. As an illustration, the total central state support to sport during 1913–1934 was ca SEK 2.2 million. Over the four-year period, 1935–1939, the support allocated by the central government amounted to ca SEK 23 million (Norberg, 2004). At the local level, public support can be traced back to the period around the turn of the 20th century, when a few local authorities in densely populated areas issued grants to larger sport clubs. This support was mainly provided in the form of free access to public land and minor financial contributions for the construction of sports facilities (Sjöblom, 2006).

In 1932, the Social Democratic Labour Party took national office and, over a short period of time, a number of large-scale infrastructural projects in housing, electrification, and roads, as well as socio-political reforms, were implemented and financed by increased taxes. Examples of such reforms are unemployment benefits, national retirement pensions, public housing loans, maternity benefits, and a number of reforms in nursing, dental, and health care (Norborg, 1993). With the end of World War II, a long period of strong economic growth followed, thus facilitating the continued establishment of a new political and financial model: The Swedish welfare state. At the core of this model was the idea of a system of socially engineered welfare aimed at reducing social inequalities and individual risk, a system in which welfare-benefits are not means-tested but general and attached to citizenship (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Larsson, Letell, & Törn, 2012).

Parallel to the emerging welfare state, central state support to sport increased significantly during the subsequent decades. In the fiscal year 1969/1970 the regular, annual grant reached SEK 33 million (Norberg, 2004). In addition, other policy areas, for example youth issues, proved very rewarding for organized sport during this period. Therefore, by the end of the 1960s, central state support to organized sport amounted to SEK 90 million in total. The expansion culminated with the instantiation of the public policy, *Sport for All,* in the early 1970s (SOU 1969:29; prop. 1970/79). Following the new policy, central state funding almost quadrupled during the 1970s (Norberg, 2002). The unprecedented increase of public support was clearly visible at the local level as well. Local authorities not only assumed responsibility for existing sports facilities but also for supplying the

ever-expanding sports movement with new ones. As a result, the number of sports facilities increased from 2,400 in 1946 to 8,200 in 1968, with more than 95% of these being publicly owned and maintained. Furthermore, a number of block-funding support systems were put into place. As an effect, local authorities' net costs for sport and outdoor life increased from ca SEK 55 million in 1952 to ca SEK 410 million in 1968. Counting inflation, this represents a 550% increase (Sjöblom, 2006).

But *why* did the state at the national and local level support organized sport and what has characterized the *mode of governing*, i.e., the relationship between the state and organized sport? As shown by Norberg (2004) and Sjöblom (2006), covering national and local state involvement respectively, these questions are intimately connected. Concerning the latter question, both authors claim that the state-sport relationship in Sweden, as in Norway and Denmark (Klausen & Selle, 1996; Selle, 1995), has taken the form of a corporative arrangement. Characteristic of this arrangement has been the privileging of the sports movement, represented nationally by the SSC and locally by the SSC-affiliated sport clubs, as *the* partner in formulating and implementing public sport policy. Nationally, this is best exemplified by the SSC acting as a government authority in the distribution of public grants, which is a principle that dates back to the 1920s but was formally ratified in the early 1970s (Norberg, 2004). Locally, Sjöblom (2006) argues, strong and well-organized sport clubs with personal contacts in the corridors of power were able to exercise considerable influence on the allocation of public resources. As an effect of this privileging, the sports movement gained a monopolistic position as the sole supplier of organized voluntary sport in Sweden. Since competitive sport is the hallmark of the SSC, the state at the national and local level has furthered the development of competitive sport at the expense of other forms of physical activity. Importantly, another key characteristic of the corporative arrangement has been the lack of explicit targets and monitoring of public support (Norberg, 2004; Sjöblom, 2006). This is not to infer that public sport policy has not been scrutinized. During the past 100 years, no less than five public inquiries have been appointed, often due to perceived problems in organized sport. Despite this starting point, however, these inquiries have resulted in increased public funding to sport. In that sense, the state-sport relationship, for much of the 20th century, was characterized by extensive support combined with far-reaching autonomy on behalf of the sports movement. What, one might ask, made this arrangement possible?

In attempting to answer this question, Norberg (2004) and Sjöblom (2006) point to the ideological overlap between the state at the national and local level on the one hand and the sports movement on the other in regard to the

societal benefits of organized sport. This does not mean, however, that the rationales used to legitimize public funding—by both parties—have remained the same over time. On the contrary, as particularly evident in studies concerned with the national level, the societal benefits associated with organized sport have shifted with the societal climate and development (Lindroth, 2002; Österlind & Wright, 2014). Thus, reflecting the nationalistic and patriotic climate of the first decades of the 20th century, participation in organized sport during this period was associated with physical and moral character-building, sobriety, defense capabilities, and national unity. A speech given in 1911 by one of the founders of the SSC, Viktor Balck, tellingly illustrates this:

> The ultimate purpose of sport is to foster a viable, work-able, strong-willed, and dutiful youth with a Swedish mind-set, for the benefit and protection of the fatherland. It is a call for national unity. It is a celebration of the idea of the fatherland. It is not only for himself that the individual, through sport participation, seeks to gain health and strength, it is to seek gain and strength for the nation. The more sport participation gains ground, and the deeper it penetrates the people, the more strength our nation will gain. If every Swedish man were to be a good sportsman, and if the entire population was to be penetrated by sporting spirit, this would be an immeasurable contribution to the strength of our nation. (Lindroth, 1974, p. 191)

However, parallel to the launch and expansion of the welfare state, the proclaimed benefit of organized sport to the "fatherland" was replaced by arguments framed in much broader and collective terms (Österlind & Wright, 2014). Due to labor-market legislation, the Swedish people now had an increasing amount of leisure time on their hands. The social democratic ideology stipulated that this time should not be wasted on consumption or loitering. Instead, leisure time was to be filled with an *activity* that furthered the fostering of "good" and democratic citizens; citizens that, by extension, contributed to the creation of what was conceived to be a better society (Ekström von Essen, 2003). In line with this, sport participation was made to represent a *meaningful* leisure activity that prevented youth crime and delinquency, while simultaneously producing conscientious, healthy, and productive citizens (Lindroth, 2002; Norberg, 2004; Österlind & Wright, 2014). Crucially, similar to other leisure activities (e.g., the Scouts), the delivery of sport activities by a democratic and self-governed popular movement, comprised of voluntary associations, also prompted the idea of club sport as a "school of democracy" wherein participants acquire the necessary skills to be responsible citizens. An important facet of this development was the launch of the vision of sport-for-all, i.e., the pursuit of enabling all citizens' access to sport by way of general support systems; in itself a clear reflection of the universal and egalitarian principles of the expanding social democratic welfare state (Bergsgard & Norberg, 2010).

According to Norberg (2004), despite the importance of the ideological overlap between the state and the sports movement for the expansion of public support, the close relationship between the two parties has presented them both with a dilemma that, in turn, explains the lack of explicit steering of public grants. When seeking an alliance with the state, the democratic and self-governed sports movement has undoubtedly run the risk of decreasing its autonomy. This risk has arguably not decreased as public support has increased. In constructing a relationship with an organization that, notwithstanding its social and geographical distribution, represents a special interest, the state, for its part, has been presented with a classic democratic dilemma: The need to control the use of public funds while not circumscribing an autonomous movement's right to determine the orientation of its activities, which is a right guaranteed in Swedish legislation.

Norberg (2004) argues that this two-way dilemma has been resolved by the establishment of an *implicit contract* with rights as well as responsibilities for both parties. According to this "contract," the state assumes the overarching responsibility for the sports movement's development and conditions of existence. This responsibility is based on the assumption that the sports movement makes a societal contribution and that neither the voluntary associations' own efforts nor the market can guarantee the continued expansion and sound development of the sports movement. In that sense, the state has sought to support the sports movement in its capacity *as an autonomous voluntary organized popular movement*. Thus, paradoxically, a main aim of public support has been to promote the sports movement's autonomy by safe-guarding it from infringement from the market and the processes of commercialization and professionalization that are believed to follow the commercial involvement in sport. Balancing this responsibility, the state has reserved the right to final authority in decisions regarding the purpose, size, and structure of public grants. For the sports movement, the implicit contract has meant the right to public support, combined with a relatively far-reaching autonomy. This right is based on the assumption that the sports movement has a utilitarian, but nonetheless *non-governmental*, function. Accompanying this right has been the sports movement's responsibility to continue to strive, on its own accord, to remain *utilitarian* and *voluntary*. The regulation of the state-sport relationship through this implicit contract has enabled the replacement of explicit governing mechanisms with more or less clear *expectations*. These expectations have been met in the benefits of organized sport that are proclaimed, for example, in the sports movement's overarching policy document, *What Sport Wants* (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2009a), which states that:

Everybody has a right to participate. Everybody's right to participate means that anyone who wants to participate shall be able to do so according to their pre-conditions. Anyone who wants to, regardless of nationality, ethnicity, religion, age, gender or sexual orientation, physical or mental pre-conditions, shall be allowed to participate in club sport. (p. 12)

In return for the sports movement's endeavor to remain utilitarian and voluntary, the state has refrained from formulating explicit targets for the grant and from monitoring the sports movement's achievement of the overarching purpose of the grant. Beginning in the 1990s, however, there are indications that the state is gradually abandoning the implicit contract in favor of "a new, result-oriented and more formalized cooperation agreement" (Norberg, 2011, p. 323). In the two following final sections of the chapter, I will describe this development and make the case that it has produced a sport policy climate that increasingly articulates a *need for change.*

Sport and the neo-liberal state

Starting in the last decades of the 20th century, Sweden, once again, went through a rapid transformation. Recurrent financial crises led to a deterioration of state finances, and the welfare state's capacity to address the challenges now faced was increasingly questioned. The welfare state in its current form, it was argued, is economically inefficient and reduces citizens' freedom of choice. This framing of the problems at hand paved the way for the introduction of new public management (NPM) principles in both national and local authorities (Montin & Granberg, 2013; Rothstein & Blomqvist, 2008). The consequences of this restructuring of the welfare state have been most visible in core welfare areas such as the school system and health and elderly care (Blomqvist, 2004). However, studies covering the state-civil society relation show that the introduction of NPM principles has had impact on this relation as well. This effect is often described as a move from a system with general, relatively unconditioned grants to one in which voluntary associations are increasingly compensated—and made accountable—for performed duties (Johansson, 2005; Lundström & Wijkström, 1995 in Wijkström & Einarsson, 2011; Wikström & Lundström, 2002). This development, visible in many other westernized countries (e.g., Coalter, 2007; Green, 2007; Houlihan, 2005; Ibsen, 2002; Sam, 2009; Skille, 2009) has produced three distinct marks in the realm of sport policy.

First, regarding the goals of public sport policy, the state has put increasing pressure on the sports movement to realize the sport-for-all ideal. In relation to this, the state has urged the sports movement to work actively to increase participation by including underrepresented groups in sport. The unequal distribution of tax-funds among various groups of the population has thus

come to the fore. Furthermore, organized sport's societal value, previously an underlying assumption, has been transformed into explicit goals of public sport policy (cf., Norberg, 2011; SOU 1998:76). In that sense, the current emphasis is on "making the sports movement produce welfare in various forms" (Norberg, 2011, p. 323), such as public health, democracy, and equal opportunity. As an illustration, in a report produced by one of the former ruling parties, The Moderate Coalition Party, it is proposed that sport clubs, in return for national and local state support, should be required to contribute to a widened recruitment to organized sport; for example by offering non-competitive sport activities (The Moderate Coalition Party, 2013). The report also constituted the basis for a debate article titled "Demand More From Sport Clubs" [Kräv mer av idrottsföreningarna] (Reinfeldt & Persson, March 12, 2013), which was published in one of the major Swedish daily newspapers, *Svenska Dagbladet*.

Intimately connected to the development described in the above paragraph is, second, the introduction of clearer monitoring and auditing principles. This strand of development clearly marks the public inquiry *Sport and Exercise for Life* (SOU 1998:76), submitted in the late 90s. A basic *point of departure* for the commission was that the performance management principles that were in place in the government machinery had to be applied in relation to the state's resource allocation to voluntary associations as well. In the light of the administrative changes made in the state's administration, it was argued, the objectives of public support decided upon in the 1970s are "vague and general" (SOU 1998:76, p. 197) and, therefore, not possible to subject to performance measures. A passage from the commission's terms of reference is worth citing, at some length, as an illustration of this:

> The commission shall, based on the evaluation of the current state support to sport, suggest clearer objectives for this support. Therewith, an adjustment to changes to the budget processes as well as other relevant changes, shall be set in place (...) The commission shall also suggest a model for how the effects and efficiency of the support may be monitored and evaluated and how the grants shall be administrated and reported back. In its proposal, the commission shall take its point of departure in the demand for high efficiency and the ensuring of transparency and control regarding the distribution of the grant. The commission shall, herein, examine the possibility and suitability of a more detailed steering of the orientation of the grant by the government and the parliament. (Dir. 1996:84, p. 1)

Following the commission report, a series of reforms were set in place, thus adapting sport policy to the result-oriented administrative principles already established within the state bureaucracy (Norberg, 2011). Following the latest public inquiry, *Democratic and Competitive Fostering* (SOU 2008:59), child- and youth-sport activities that receive public funding are required to meet the UN convention on the rights of the child. In addition,

an elite-sport goal was included in public sport policy. The funds attached to this goal were, however, small, temporary, and to be allocated to NSOs and not to sport clubs. Furthermore, a new set of KPIs was introduced, and the responsibility for monitoring these was assigned to the state's sectorial research organ, the Swedish National Centre for Research in Sports (SNCRS). Beyond monitoring and analyzing the KPIs, the SNCRS conducts an annual in-depth analysis of a particular area of public sport policy selected by the government.[4] Given these changes, Norberg (2010) argues that the implicit contract is becoming increasingly *explicit* and contractual.

A third important component of the current development is the changes to public funding structures that have occurred over the past decades. At the local level, these changes are marked by an increase of ear-marked resources for particular target groups, activities, or activity forms (Sjöblom, 2006). At the national level, the lion's share of public funds is still distributed through block funding. However, the main funding trend includes large-scale, time-limited, and project-based developmental programs, with approximately one third of the funds currently being distributed in this way. During the 2000s, two such programs have been launched, often described as social experiments unprecedented in Swedish public sport policy. In the first of these, "The Handshake With Sport," the state allocated SEK 1 billion over a four-year period (2003–2007) under the condition that the sports movement undertook to: Open the doors to sport for more children and youth, reduce participation fees, invest in girls' sport activities, participate in the battle against drugs, and intensify the cooperation with schools (Riksidrottsförbundet, n.d.). In 2007, The Handshake's successor, "The Lift for Sport," was introduced. The program, which also ran over a four-year period (2007–2010), comprised SEK 2 billion in additional funding.[5] While The Handshake was clear in regard to the objectives of the program, The Lift for Sport is interesting insofar as its guidelines stipulate that the funds are to be considered an incentive for the sports movement to *develop its activities* in order to recruit and retain children and youth (Nordström, 2012). Notwithstanding that the guidelines of The Lift for Sport omit a specification of how or in what direction this development should take place, it is clear

---

[4] The most recent area to be subject to in-depth analysis identified by the government is how the sports movement contributes to the Swedish population's democratic schooling (Kulturdepartementet, 2014). Also, just recently (Wikström & Carlsson, April 15, 2015), the current minister responsible for central state sport policy announced the allocation of SEK 224 million to the sports movement. These funds are to be used to intensify the sports movement's work with the integration of newly arrived immigrants. Notably, this further illustrates the argument that recent changes in public sport policy have included an increased instrumentalization of organized sport.

[5] The Lift for Sport was launched as a four-year project, but the development program has continued to run after 2010 with SEK 500 million in public funding allocated each year. Arguably, this indicates the institutionalization of a funding structure that is project-based to a large extent.

that the state expected and sought to induce some sort of *change* in the name of the sport-for-all ideal.

Something "new" needs to be done! The contemporary notion of a need for change

No doubt, the developments described in the previous section have put organized sport in the spotlight in a way that it has not previously been. The data and analysis produced by the SNCRS in its yearly KPI reports and in-depth analyses, as well as in research and evaluations covering The Handshake and The Lift for Sport, have provided a base for identifying the discrepancies between the shared ideas and ideologies of the state and the SSC and the subsequent implementation of those ideas in the lower levels of the sport system. This has, in turn, produced a sport policy climate in which the need for development within the sports movement is perceived as increasingly acute. The emergence of "new" ideas and practices, such as Drive-in sport, I argue, must be understood in relation to this contemporary notion of a *need for change*.

In my interpretation, the two most pressing "problems" that have been put forth in the contemporary sport policy debate are, first, the continued bias in various groups' access to organized sport where participation increases with the level of education, family income, and job market position; and second, a decline in participation rates, particularly high among youths in their upper teens (CIF, 2014a). Given that two major sport-for-all programs have run during the 2000s, these figures could be interpreted as disturbing for the legitimacy of the sports movement as well as for public support to sport. Importantly, in trying to explain *why* organized sport seems further and further away from the state's, as well as its own sport-for-all ideal, analysts have repeatedly made "the inherent logic of sport" the culprit of recruitment and retention problems. The inherent logic of sport is, in these analyses, understood as the prevailing notion of sport's means and ends that govern voluntary sport. At the core of the inherent logic of sports is the competitive element and the focus on systematic training and ranking as a means for improving performance on the sports arena, following from this competitive element.

For example, analysts of the effects of The Handshake and The Lift for Sport argue that, despite the developmental intention, it is "business as usual" (Nordström, 2012, p. 28) within the sports movement. That is, these programs have resulted in "more of the same" (Engström, 2008, p. 48), i.e., an expansion and development of competitive sport. In interpreting this lack of development and its role in the sports movement's recruitment and retention problems, Fahlén and Karp (2010) argue that "The traditional

values of competition, carried by normative forces, which form the historical basis for the organization's whole existence appear to be much stronger than the relatively newer values of sports for all" (p. 14). In a similar vein, Thedin Jakobsson, in the 2013 in-depth analysis accompanying the SNCRS' KPI-report, claim that her study of the determinants of drop-out and continuance in sport participation indicates that:

> Prerequisites for continued sport participation as a teenager are an early sport debut, a willingness to train/practice and compete a whole lot. My interpretation is that sport clubs offer competitive sport with a focus on achievement. Organized sport do not, however, seem to be adapted to youths with other levels of ambition. Additionally, organized sport give little room for flexibility and spontaneity in relation to youths' goals and wishes on how it should be carried out. To be able to continue, you need to enjoy, appreciate, feel joy, and be able to handle a competitively oriented activity even though you do not have the ambition to compete. Organized sport seem to include young people that adapt to explicit and inexplicit demands, appreciate, and can handle and understand competitive sport. Those who cannot handle or do not embrace prevailing norms and values by doing what sport demands them to do choose to leave, sometimes voluntarily, at times reluctantly. (CIF, 2013, p. 78)

As noted by Hjelm (2013), the yearly KPI reports produced by the SNCRS and the in-depth analysis accompanying these reports, have reached a status that make them stir up discussions in the sports movement, as well as among politicians. An excerpt from a speech given by the former minister of culture and sport at the opening ceremony of the 2013 SSC general assembly provides an illustrative example of the latter:

> A discussion necessary to have is how sport clubs can make themselves attractive to everybody who wants to play sport, for those who do not want to compete too. It is clear in the yearly evaluation performed by the SNCRS that the sports movement is poor at meeting this group's interest in sport. Perhaps that's why we've seen a drop in membership rates during the past 10 years? How can we make 13 to 20 year olds and girls retain within the sports movement? Because these are the two groups where we see the greatest drop in participation. Do drop-outs feel that there are arenas that can better channel their interests than sport clubs? For me, the most important thing is that we exercise, build muscle strength and mobility, and I'd like that to take place within organized sport, but it doesn't have to. (...) Don't get me wrong, I'm concerned that Swedish voluntary sport is losing members, because I know your importance. It is time to intensify the discussion regarding what the sports movement can do to remain a natural rallying point for people interested in sport, regardless of age. (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2013a, Appendix B)

Unsurprisingly, the "alarm reports" regarding participation decline in the face of two major state-initiated and defined development programs, and the tendency to attribute this decline to the competitive component of club sport, have forced the SSC to "act." An apt example of this is the decision at the 2013 SSC general assembly to initiate a wide-ranging strategic work entitled "The Future Sport Club". In a report providing the basis for this

decision (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2013b), it is concluded that: "The sports movement is losing members and is being questioned, and the more members it loses the more it will be questioned, and the more it is questioned, the more members it will lose. Unless we do something" (p. 19). In order to be able to provide "Sport-for-all–for real" (p. 20), it is argued that the sports movement "need to develop activities aimed at youths and adults that are devoid of the competitive element and demands on performance. If we are serious about living up to our ideological document, What Sport Wants, this development is necessary. (p. 20).

The purpose of providing the above examples has been to tap into a contemporary sport policy debate wherein the sports movement's ability to deliver sport-for-all is increasingly questioned. In this debate, the arguably ubiquitous presence of the competitive element of sport activities is put forth as both the reason for declines in participation and the key developmental aspect in relation to recruitment and retention. Therefore, from my point of view, this debate, insofar as it questions the means and ends of activities currently provided within the sports movement, concerns the very definition and meaning of "sport." Following my view of the organizing of sport as processes wherein systems of meaning regarding sport's means and ends are expressed, created, reproduced, and changed, this is important because it implies that the emergence of "new" ideas and practices, such as Drive-in sport, must be understood in relation to this contemporary notion of a *need for change*. In the next chapter, I will outline the conceptual framework I have used to analyze the emergence and organization of Drive-in sport against the background of this climate of change.

3. Conceptual Framework

As put forth in the introduction, my analysis of the emergence and organizing of Drive-in sport utilizes a set of concepts from organizational institutionalism. Organizational institutionalism is best characterized as an umbrella perspective distinguished by its understanding of organizational processes as a product of and producing shared systems of meaning concerning the appropriate means and ends of organizing. The usage of the perspective, therefore, provides me with a tool to analyze organizing of voluntary sport *as* processes wherein systems of meaning regarding sport's means and ends are expressed, created, reproduced, and changed. Organizational institutionalism harbors a wide variety of concepts, I will, therefore, suffice with an account of the meaning and application of concepts used in the subsequent analysis. Accordingly, the chapter contains, first, a general introduction to organizational institutionalism and its philosophical roots in the works of Berger and Luckmann (1966) and Schütz (1967). This is followed by an account of the "crisis" that organizational institutionalism went through, starting in the late 1980s, which prompted conceptual development. One of the concepts put forth during this period was institutional logics (e.g., Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012), described in the third section as a theoretical understanding of the development described in the previous chapter. In particular, with reference to the current sport policy climate and its articulated need for change, I conceptualize sport as being organized in an institutional context that prescribes a change in the prevailing institutional logic. Fourth, the concept of theorization (Strang & Meyer, 1993; Tolbert & Zucker, 1999) is presented as a tool that helps me place analytical focus on how Drive-in sport is legitimized in Swedish voluntary sport (RQ 1). The fifth section relates the theorization concept to extant studies of shifts in logics, within a sport-related context. This is followed by a section that explicates the insights of extant research on sport organizations' implementation of new ideas on organizing and the conceptual implications of these insights. In the two subsequent sections, the concepts of translation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996b) and organizational identity (Glynn, 2008) are put forth as tools that serve the conceptual need made visible in the extant research. In particular, these concepts constitute my tool for understanding how, why, and with what consequences—in terms of organizational identity reconstruction–Drive-in sport is interpreted and acted upon by implementing sport clubs (RQ 2). Organizational identity also serves as a theoretical point of departure in my analysis of the propensity among sport clubs as a group to act as policy-implementers of wider societal goals (RQ 3).

The chapter ends with a summary of the theoretical concepts used and their relation to the addressed RQs.

Organizational institutionalism as an umbrella perspective

Beginning with Meyer and Rowan's (1977) paper "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony," six texts laying the groundwork for the establishment and proliferation of a new theoretical perspective in organization theory were published 1977-83 (Zucker, 1977; Meyer & Rowan, 1983; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983; Meyer & Scott, 1983). At the time of the publication of Meyer and Rowan's (1977) article, organizational research was dominated by theoretical perspectives viewing organizations as goal-rational systems that strategically responded to situational circumstances in order to ensure "fit" with their environment (Greenwood et al., 2008). Meyer and Rowan (1977) contrasted this view by positing that organizations structurally reflect a socially constructed reality. Meyer and Rowan based their argumentation on Berger and Luckmann (1966), who in turn derived much of their analysis from Schütz. These works constitute both the philosophical underpinnings of the thesis, the methodological implications of which will be described in the next chapter, as well as the core assumptions underlying the specific concepts used. As noted by Meyer (2008), Schütz's (e.g., 1967) main objective was to give Weber's interpretive sociology a phenomenological grounding. Schütz agreed that the goal of sociology was to understand action from the subjective meaning of the actor, but claimed that Weber had failed to specify the concept of meaning as it relates to action. In attempting to remedy this, Schütz proposed that in their everyday life, individuals work with *typifications* that link actors, actions, and situations. Such typifications are available in the *social stock of knowledge* that is built up from the experiences and actions of previous generations. Crucially, acting subjects draw upon this social stock of knowledge in constituting subjective meaning. For Schütz, then, human beings are born into and act in a pre-interpreted, meaningful, and *inter*subjective social world that scripts both actors and actions. Drawing extensively on Schütz's notion of typifications, Berger and Luckmann (1966, p. 73) proposed that:

> *Institutionalization occurs whenever there is a reciprocal typification of habitualized actions by types of actors. Put differently, any such typification is an institution. What must be stressed is the reciprocity of institutional typifications and the typicality of not only the actions but also the actors in institutions. The typifications of habitualized actions that constitute institutions are always shared ones. They are available to all members of the particular social group in question, and the institution itself typifies individual actors as well as individual actions. The institution posits that actions of the type X will be performed by actors of type X.*

Berger and Luckmann (1966) subsequently posited that as typfications are enacted (i.e., externalized), they obtain a factual character. Through this process, the social world—by necessity a human product—comes to be subjectively experienced as objective. Inherent in Berger and Luckmann's understanding is a view of institutions as exerting control through their production of the social world as objective. Institutions, they posit:

> By the very fact of their existence, control human conduct by setting up predefined patterns of conduct, which channel it in one direction as against the many other directions that would be theoretically possible. It is important to stress that this controlling character is inherent in institutionalization as such, prior to or apart from any mechanisms of sanctions specifically set up to support an institution. (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 72)

Nonetheless, Berger and Luckmann (1966) also emphasize that such social control is dependent on the continued enactment of institutions. In that sense, social order and the shaping of human conduct inherent in it, "exist only and insofar as human activity continues to produce it" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 70). The only ontological status of the social order is thus one of an ongoing human production.

Returning to the development of organizational institutionalism, Meyer and Rowan (1977) built upon Berger and Luckmann (1966) in proposing that the institutional context of organizations harbors rationalized myths that define what it means to be rational and, thereby, what are socially approved structural arrangements. Conformity with such institutionalized rules yields legitimacy to the organization and increases its chances of survival. As noted by Greenwood et al. (2008), Meyer and Rowan (1977) omitted a clear definition of the concept of *institutions*, leaving the reader to "assume that institutions are taken-for-granted rationalized myths" (Greenwood et al., 2008, p. 4). However, clearly reflecting Berger and Luckmann's influence, they referred to institutionalized rules as "classifications built into society as reciprocated typifications or interpretations" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977, p. 341).

To date, there is a lack of agreement on the concept of institutions among students of organizational institutionalism. Greenwood et al. (2008) argue that by the 90s, the definitional problem was more or less put aside: "Much like the early days of organization theory, when a tacit agreement occurred to stop attempting to define 'organization,' there emerged an unwritten assumption that we intuitively know what we mean by institution and thus have no further need to define it" (Greenwood et al., 2008, p. 14–15). Nonetheless, clearly resonating with Berger and Luckmann (1966) and Schütz (1967), most usages of the term invoke an understanding of

institutions as shared systems of meaning, coupled with associated, prescribed patterns of action.

Aside from not providing a precise definition of institutions, Meyer and Rowan (1977) also failed to specify what was meant by "institutional context" and the meaning of the term remained opaque (Greenwood et al., 2008), until the publication of DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) influential article "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." Building on Meyer and Rowan (1977), DiMaggio and Powell set out to propose a theoretical explanation for why there is such a "startling homogeneity of organizational forms and practices" (p. 147). Discharging both competition in the marketplace and the need for efficiency as sources of such homogenization, the authors suggested that similarity among organizational forms and practices can be explained with reference to the structuration (Giddens, 1979) of organizational fields and the subsequent workings of coercive, normative, and mimetic processes. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) defined coercive processes as formal and informal pressure emanating mainly from state or regulatory agencies. Normative processes were associated with the rise of professions and the need for members of a working group to define the conditions and methods of work. Lastly, mimetic processes alluded to organizations' tendency to model other—seemingly successful—organizations during periods of uncertainty. Key to DiMaggio and Powell's line of argumentation was the location of these processes in an organizational field, succinctly defined as "those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148). Once a field has formed, they argued, coercive, normative, and mimetic processes lead to similarity among organizations in that field. The theoretical proposition that organizational change occurs by way of coercive, normative, and mimetic processes and that the outcome of such processes is field-level homogeneity set the stage for an immense stream of research in a wide variety of empirical settings (for an overview, see Mizruchi & Fein, 1999).

Actors, agency, and interests: Missing in action in organizational institutionalism?

Despite the proliferation of organizational institutionalism as an empirical program, "ambiguities in the institutional story were becoming apparent" by the end of the 1980s (Greenwood et al., 2008, p. 11). This was due, not least, to institutional analysts' treatment of institutions as the "default option," i.e., the tendency to interpret the diffusion of a practice as an effect of institutional pressure, without investigating the underlying motivations for

adoption (Greenwood et al., 2008). This mode of analysis can, in turn, be explained with reference to the preference among (North American) institutional scholars for large-scale, quantitative studies (Zilber, 2008; Hinings & Tolbert, 2008). By this time, then, theoretical ideas in which the ideational and symbolic aspects of organizational practices are emphasized had, paradoxically, been explored using methodologies that, compared to qualitative approaches, fall short in exploring such aspects. As a result of this mismatch, the most central ambiguity of the institutional story at this time was organizational institutionalism's focus on institutions' capacity to control and delineate by defining legitimate behavior. By not clarifying the role of agency and interests in institutional processes, critics argued, the actor is portrayed as a "cultural dope," and homogenization and stability are overemphasized (Christensen, Karnoe, Strandgaard Pederson, & Dobbin, 1997; Hirsch, 1997; Hirsch & Lounsbury, 1997; Hasselbladh & Kallinikos, 2000). The state of affairs for organizational institutionalisms at this point was summarized by DiMaggio and Powell (1991, p. 27-28) themselves in the following way:

> *Up until now, it is fair to say the new institutionalism has been most attentive to processes of legitimation and social reproduction. We have emphasized that organizational environments are composed of cultural elements, that is, taken-for-granted beliefs and widely promulgated rules that serve as templates for organizing. Institutional reproduction has been associated with the demands of powerful central actors, such as the state, the professions, or the dominant agents within organizational fields. This emphasis has highlighted the constraints imposed by institutions and stressed the ubiquity of rules that guide behavior.*

To "restore the actor" and thereby remedy organizational institutionalism's inability to explain change, several "actor-centered" concepts, such as institutional work (Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2009) and institutional entrepreneurs (DiMaggio, 1988; Hardy & Maguire, 2008), have been introduced during the past decades. However, as argued by Cooper, Ezzamel, and Willmott (2008), among others (e.g., Willmott, 2011), in offering these concepts to correct the previous versions of the theory's emphasis on structure, proponents are engaging in a structure–agency flip-flopping that ignores one of the key tenets of institutional theory: the "existence" of actors (e.g., "individuals" or "organizations") as well as their characteristics, interests, and agency as products of institutionalization processes (Meyer & Jepperson, 2000). In other words, such concepts build on an "institution-free," individualistic conceptualization of "actors," as well as their "agency" and "interests," that is somewhat incompatible with the key tenets of institutional theory (c.f., Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Schütz, 1967). As bluntly put by Cooper et al. (2008), in such formulations, "there is a lurch to methodological individualism where institutional entrepreneurs somehow evade or 'escape the rules, routines, and norms of institutional fields'" (p.

687), and where agency is conceived of as external to and operating outside of institutionalization processes.

Quite different from the remedies to institutional theory's "missing-actor" problem provided by the concepts of institutional entrepreneurship and institutional work, Friedland and Alford proposed the concept institutional logics in 1991. Since then, the concept has expanded into a whole new approach to institutional analysis (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). Within the institutional logics perspective, organizing is understood as situated in a societal—not field—context. Therefore, bringing this concept into my analysis provides me with a way to conceptualize the organizing of sport as located within a societal context. This will be expanded upon in the following.

Institutional logics

In their seminal essay, "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions," Friedland and Alford (1991) suggested that the main problem of institutional analysis is that it is devoid of an understanding of the *content* of institutions. Accordingly, they suggested that each institution has a central logic—"a set of material practices and symbolic constructions—which constitutes its organizing principles" (p. 248). Rejecting both individualistic, rational choice theories and functionalistic macro perspectives, Friedland and Alford reconnected with the perspective's philosophical roots by arguing that institutional logics provide actors with means and ends as well as vocabularies of motives and senses of self (i.e., identity). Thus, behavior is always mindful, intentional, and rational, but the *meaning of rationality* varies within the inter-institutional system. Importantly, Friedland and Alford (1991) also claimed that "it is not possible to understand individual or organizational behavior without locating it in a societal context" (p. 232). In that sense, organizational behavior is not to be understood, as previously, as anchored in organizational fields, but in a much broader societal context. Following this, I use the institutional logics concept in order to draw attention to the societal anchorage of the systems of meaning regarding sport's means and ends that are expressed, created, reproduced, and changed in the organizing of voluntary sport. From this perspective, then, the "inherent logic of sport," commonly understood to permeate club sport, is conceptualized as a historically and societally anchored and sanctioned conception of the appropriate means and ends of sport, i.e., a widespread understanding of what sport "is." In the organizing of club sport, this logic could be interpreted as materially and symbolically instantiated and maintained in the institutionalized competitive sport system and the pursuit of improved performance via specialization, extensive training, talent development programs, ranking, and elimination

following from this. Consequently, I conceive of the contemporary sport policy climate described at the end of the previous chapter as characterized by a *de-legitimization* and demand for a shift in the institutional logic permeating club sport. Given this, there is a need to conceptualize how shifts in institutional logics take place. In order to satisfy this need, I rely on Thornton et al. (2012), who argue that new practices, in this case Drive-in sport, "play a key role as exemplars in creating, reproducing and transforming institutional logics" (p. 129).

Theorization

Notwithstanding the importance of new practices as exemplars in transforming institutional logics, a new practice does not emerge out of a socio-historical vacuum, nor does it suddenly make sense as a great idea. Instead, the successful introduction of a new practice relies on the framing of one or, better yet, several problems and the justification of the practice as a solution to this problem/these problems (Strang & Meyer, 1993). This is particularly pertinent in settings that are "highly institutionalized" (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002), i.e., in contexts permeated by a historically and societally anchored, widespread understanding of the appropriateness of a particular set of means and ends. Arguably, given the longevity of the basic architecture of the Swedish sports movement, and of the principles characterizing Swedish club sport (described in Chapter 2), Swedish voluntary sport constitutes such a highly institutionalized setting. Accordingly, this makes the need to legitimize such a distinctly "different" idea as Drive-in sport especially acute.

In order to conceptualize the process by which Drive-in sport is legitimized (RQ 1), I rely on the concept of theorization (Strang & Meyer, 1993; Tolbert & Zucker, 1999), previously applied as a theoretical tool in studies of institutional change in general (Greenwood et al., 2002; Lounsbury & Crumley, 2007; Munir, 2005) as well as of the emergence and change in institutional logics, in particular (Ezzamel, Robson, & Stapleton, 2012; Nigam & Ocasio, 2010). Contrary to the common institutional argument that legitimacy is an *effect of* a practice's diffusion, an important point of departure of the theorization perspective is that a new practice needs to be conferred with legitimacy in order to even become a candidate for diffusion and—in the prolongation—a new institutional logic. This necessity for new practices to be theorized *in order to* spread is linked to the simple fact that practices *per se* cannot travel from one locale to another, only theorized models, i.e., systems of meaning can (Strang & Meyer, 1993). In the present context, this implies that symbolic constructions of the *idea* Drive-in sport are a prerequisite for an increasing incidence of the *practice* Drive-in sport.

The theorization process is commonly specified as constituted by the performance of two "tasks": 1) the construction and legitimization of a problem to which the new practice can be a solution and 2) the elaboration and justification of the new practice (Greenwood et al., 2002; Strang & Meyer, 1993; Tolbert & Zucker, 1999). As a legitimizer of institutional change (Dacin, Goodstein, & Scott, 2002), theorization is geared toward creating new, or changing old, institutions. However, for practices to become legitimate, they need to be "couched in such a way that they are perceived to be consistent with prevailing values" (Greenwood et al., 2002, p. 75). Thus, the interpretive work connected to the performance of the two tasks of the theorization processes invokes both preexisting and emerging systems of meaning.

In my work, the above outline of the theorization of a new practice is used as a conceptual tool in formulating and addressing RQ 1: How is legitimacy established for Drive-in sport? In detailing this question in Article 1, I ask: What problems are constructed to legitimize Drive-in sport? How is Drive-in sport elaborated and justified as a solution to these problems? Arguably, the theorization perspective's association with the institutional logics framework and its explicit concern with the influence of societal systems of meaning on organizing processes allows me to shed light on the ways in which the theorization of Drive-in sport is grounded in preexisting and emerging systems of meaning concerning the Swedish population, Swedish society, and organized sport's role in this society.

Theorization and shifts in sport-related logics

As detailed in Article 1, by applying the theorization concept in connection to investigating shifts in logics, I take a somewhat different approach compared to previous studies concerned with this topic (Cousens & Slack, 2005; O'Brien & Slack, 2003, 2004; Paramio-Salcines & Kitchin, 2013; Skirstad & Chelladurai, 2011). These studies focused on evidencing that a shift in logic has indeed taken place. Accordingly, they employed wide-scale (longitudinal) research designs that enabled the study of the macro-dynamics connected to changes in logics. For example, O'Brien and Slack (2003, 2004) were concerned with understanding the shift from an amateur to a professional logic in the field of English rugby, following the 1999 abolishment of amateur requirements. In "measuring" such a change, they used four signposts: communities of actors, exchange processes, forms of capital, and regulatory structures. In a similar manner, but writing from a North American perspective, Cousens and Slack (2005) were interested in understanding a shift from a sport-specific to an entertainment logic in major league professional sport following the emergence of an entertainment economy. Applying Scott, Rueff, Mendel, and Caronna's framework (2000), Cousens

and Slack (2005) measured changes in the field's communities of actors, exchange processes, governance mechanisms, and institutional logics of action. Undoubtedly, the advantage of this approach to the study of shifts in logics is the possibility of showing that a shift in logics has actually occurred. However, when it comes to interpreting the workings of this shift, the usage of signposts leads these studies to explain shifts in logics with references to changes in other examined dimensions. O'Brien and Slack (2003), for example, demonstrated that the shift from an amateur to a professional logic in the field of English rugby "prompted, and indeed was prompted by, widespread change in its other components; communities of actors, exchange processes, forms of capital, and regulatory structures" (p. 443). In a similar manner, Cousens and Slack (2005) claimed that the shift from a sport-specific to an entertainment logic was both "reflective of and a reaction to the changes in [the] other dimensions'" (p. 34). While I acknowledge the validity and importance of these studies, the application of the theorization concept allows me to place analytical focus on the social constructionist micro processes that—by necessity—are the nuts and bolts of the broader change processes documented in previous studies of shifts in institutional logics. As noted earlier, the application of the theorization concept simultaneously enables me to shed light on the societal locus of the systems of meaning at work in these processes.

While the theorization concept is used as a tool to address how legitimacy is established for Drive-in sport, my second RQ is concerned with the process related to the point at which, figuratively speaking, Drive-in sport is brought over the organizational threshold. This question, therefore, requires additional theoretical tools. Prior to presenting the concepts of translation and organizational identity as such tools, the following section reviews extant research on the topic. Importantly, the findings of these studies constitute my rationale for mobilizing the translation and the organizational identity concepts.

Sport organizations' implementation of new ideas on organizing

As previously noted, Sweden is not the only country that has witnessed increased public sector intervention in sport during the past decades. Similar developments have been noted in many other westernized countries (e.g., Coalter, 2007; Green, 2008; Houlihan, 2005; Ibsen, 2002; Sam, 2009; Skille, 2009). As in Sweden, an important part of this development has been the attempt by governments to intensify the societal contributions of organized sport through large-scale development programs, such as The Handshake and The Lift for Sport. Reflecting the government in question's current priorities, the aims of these programs are quite diverse, ranging from

international sporting success to community inclusion. Nonetheless, extant research concerned with change processes related to the adoption of new ideas into organizations is largely based on data drawn from studies of such programs.

The most well-known, well-described, and earliest example of such research is Slack and colleagues' stream of studies covering the implementation of the Canadian government's Quadrennial Planning Program (QPP). With the ultimate aim to produce Olympic medals, the QPP was designed to "professionalize" NSOs, with a particular focus on transferring tasks and organizational influence on decision-making from volunteers to hired staff. As an incitement to these changes, a substantial increase of public funds was channeled through the semi-governmental body Sport Canada. The research covering the QPP show that it caused Canadian NSOs to move toward a more professional and bureaucratic organizational form (Slack & Hinings, 1992, 1994; Stevens & Slack, 1998). However—and important for the present argument—these changes were not uniform. In particular, notwithstanding the QPP's main focus on the transference of organizational influence on decision making from volunteers to professional staff, volunteer governance and control displayed considerable continuity.

Examples from a European context can be provided as well. Garret (2004), for instance, analyzed sport clubs' responses to the funding conditions of Sport England's Lottery Fund. These conditions were set to promote development in the operation and structures of sport clubs, in order to increase participation—a prominent goal of the then-UK government's policy statement *A Sporting Future for All* (DCMS, 2000). Interestingly, and adding further support to the present argument, is Garret's (2004, p. 22) finding that despite having made a "deliberate and conscious decision to request external funding," some of the sport clubs in his sample "managed to evade complying completely with their funding conditions" demanding that the sport clubs change their operations and structures.

Another example is provided by O'Gorman's (2011) investigation of the implementation of the English FA's Charter Standard Scheme, a nationally led quality accreditation program for English grassroots football that took place within the context of New Labour's modernization agenda. O'Gorman showed that several of the accreditation criteria had "mutated" during the implementation process. Thus, while the Charter Standard had been implemented, it had not been "as described by the FA's documentation," and it varied "considerably between clubs" (O'Gorman, 2011, p. 103). Furthermore, as noted in Chapter 2, research covering the implementation of The Handshake and The Lift for Sport show that despite the Swedish

government's explicit request that the funds attached to the programs be used to develop new forms and structures of sport activities, the result of these programs was "more of the same" (Engström, 2008; Fahlén & Karp, 2010; Fahlén, Eliasson, & Wickman, 2014; Nordström, 2012).

Collectively, the results of these studies indicate the need for a concept that allows an understanding of ideas on organizing, such as Drive-in sport, as open to reconstruction when they are adopted into an organization, in this case the sport clubs implementing Drive-in sport. However, the insight that "great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland" (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1974) is not new. More significant, in this context, is the way the above mentioned studies explain how and why ideas on organizing are transformed when they are brought over the organizational threshold. Notably, in all of these studies, as well as others not detailed above, the character of the adopting organizing is put forth as the "explanatory variable." Thus, Garrett (2004) turns to the *interests* and *values*; Harris, Mori, and Collins (2009) to the *objectives*; and Skille (2010, 2011a) to the guiding *convention* and *focus* of sport clubs as affecting the adoption of the ideas inherent in sport policies. Sport clubs' *structures* and, in particular, the level of *formalization* is another explanatory model employed by, for example, May, Harris, and Collins (2013) and Nichols, Padmore, Taylor, and Barrett (2012). It is worth noting that the majority of these studies are set within an implementation research—not organization theory—paradigm. Therefore, they provide an elaborated understanding of implementation as a political process that is carried out in a multilevel system. However, the studies scarcely draw on the conceptualizations and insights regarding organizations and organizational change provided in research within the organization theory paradigm. The designation of the adopting organization's character as a determinant for the way in which the implementation process proceeds is therefore, to a large extent, an empirical finding and not a theoretical point of departure. In other words, in my view, studies concerned with the implementation of sport policies and programs that asks implementing sport organizations to change in one way or another have not engaged extensively in the literature covering change processes in a sport context (see Skille, 2008, for an exception that provides an important ground for the present work).

On the other hand, studies covering change processes connected to the QPP have not been situated within an implementation research paradigm, despite clearly being concerned with cases of sport policy implementation. These studies do, however, have a much more elaborated and continuously used conceptualization of the adopting organization. In particular, Kikulis, Slack, and Hinings (1992, 1995) and Slack and Hinings (1994) argue that the

continuance of volunteer governance and control, despite the high pressure for professionalization embedded in the QPP, can be explained with the aid of Hinings and Greenwood's (1988) concept design archetypes, i.e., the prevailing set of mutually supporting relationships among values and structures in an organization. While the notion of design archetypes involves a holistic view of organizations, Hinings and Greenwood argue that some organizational elements—so-called high impact systems—underpin prevailing ideas of purpose and organizational character to a much greater extent than others. Following this, Slack and Hinings (1994) and Kikulis et al. (1992, 1995) propose that volunteer governance and control are such high-impact systems. Therefore, they constrain the choices that organizational members make in response to the pressures exerted by the Canadian government, in the shape of the QPP and the funding attached to the program. In that sense, Kikulis et al. (1995) claimed, high-impact systems are simultaneously most resistant to change *and* a key accelerator in processes of change. This is evidenced by the fact that the few NSOs that managed to reorient themselves into the prescribed design archetype exhibited change in the high-impact systems early on in the change process.

Notwithstanding the fruitful application of the design archetype concept in both sport- and non-sport-related research, the concept promotes the study of structures, taking them as "proxies of meaning" (Zilber, 2008, p. 153). In addition, the concept is situated within a tradition that emphasizes structural *homogeneity* within organizational *fields*. The concept, therefore, does not fully serve me as a conceptualization of how and why ideas on organizing are transformed when they are brought over the organizational threshold, nor of the consequences produced by the confrontation between new and established ideas and practices. Instead, a concept is needed that allows an analysis to proceed from the perspective of the actor (i.e., implementing sport clubs, c.f., Skille, 2008) but that does not resort to an "institution-free" conception of organizations. In the two following sections, the concepts of translation and organizational identity are put forth as tools serving this need.

Translation of ideas

To recap, the claim that it is necessary to distinguish between the interpretive work connected to the emergence of a new idea on organizing (i.e., theorization) and the adoption of that idea *into* organizations (Nielsen et al., 2014), presupposes a theoretical position that accounts for the possibility of ideas on organizing being reformulated as they are brought over the organizational threshold. In this thesis, the translation perspective, previously proposed and applied by Skille (2008, 2011b) in a sport context, represents this position. According to this perspective, new ideas on

organizing have no intrinsic energy and no own capacity to move in time and space. In that sense, "ideas or practices do not force themselves on organizations which then have to adopt them" (Sevón, 1996, p. 51–52). Instead, the adoption of new ideas into organizations is dependent on *thinking* and *acting* people. In order to illustrate this position, the translation perspective borrows from Latour (1986, p. 2), who argues that "the spread in time and place of anything—claims, orders, artefacts, goods— is in the hands of people; each of these people may act in many different ways, letting the token drop, or modifying it, or deflecting it, or betraying it, or adding to it, or appropriating it." The performative—as opposed to ostensive—character of ideas implies that when they are brought over the organizational threshold, they may be reformulated—translated—to fit the organizational practice and the purpose of the focal organization. Undoubtedly, a perspective that focuses on how ideas are adopted into organizations behooves a conceptualization of the adopting organization. This is important, not least considering the argument that translation is not a "creative and open-ended" process, but one "characterized by social control, conformism and traditionalism" (Sahlin-Andersson, 1996, p. 69). In my work, organizational identity provides this conceptualization.

Organizational identity

Organizational identity is one among many concepts (including knowledge, learning, and memory) stemming from what is colloquially thought of as a micro-level notion that have been applied to organization-level study (Gioia, Patvardhan, Hamilton, & Corley, 2013). The usage of the concept in organization-level theorizing originates from Albert and Whetten's (1985) definition of organizational identity as the way in which the question "Who are we as an organization?" is answered within an organization. In their original formulation, the answer to this question was proposed to refer to what is central, distinctive, and enduring in an organizing.[6] Since Albert and Whetten's initial proposition, organizational identity has developed into a multifaceted field of research with very diverse approaches to organizational identity (see Gioia et al. 2013 for an overview). In keeping with the overall framing of this thesis, I rely on an institutional take on organizational identity. In particular, based on the analysis provided in extant research on the topic, I use a definition of organizational identity as the notion of "who we are and what we *do*", i.e., the understanding of the core purpose and

---

[6] Using this understanding, Skille (2011c) explored whether the identity of The SSC's Norwegian counterpart, The Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports, was aligned with the political expectation on organized sport to provide activities that are sought after and used by Norwegian youth.

practices prevailing within the organization (Glynn & Watkiss, 2012; Navis & Glynn, 2011; Wry et al., 2011).

Critically, from an institutional perspective, it is meaningful to speak of organizations as having identities due to modern society's treatment of them as "super persons" (c.f., my discussion on p. 23 regarding the critique of the institutional work and institutional entrepreneurship concepts). As argued by Czarniawska–Joerges (1994), organizations are not people at all but sets of actions conducted by people, and "both actions and their meanings are socially constructed in exchanges taking place between people" (p. 194). Nonetheless, much like individual identity, the notion of organizations as "super persons" with a capability to act and to be accountable for its actions is part of a cultural system characteristic of modern society—a system that has emerged over time through processes of institutionalization (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Meyer & Jepperson, 2000). This is visible, not least, in the invention of organizations as legal persons. Thus, over time and through processes of objectification and typification (Berger & Luckmann, 1966), members of organizations, in their natural attitude (Schütz, 1967), interpret and act *as if* organizations have identities.

Accordingly, from an institutional outlook, organizational identity is neither an expression of some essential self nor "an aggregation of perceptions of an organization resting in people's heads" (Hatch & Schultz, 2002, p. 1004); rather, it is an internally defined notion that is continuously constructed and reconstructed by members of an organization (Gioia et al., 2013)—a social process of becoming (c.f., Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). Given institutional theory's view of organizations as highly socialized entities, these processes are conceived of as both productive of and producing the legitimized cultural repertoires of meaning that constitute an organization's institutional context. Such cultural categories of meaning constitute the "raw material" (Glynn, 2008, p. 414) that an organization's members appropriate in the organizational identity construction process. Consequently, the identity-defining question "Who are we as an organization?" is answered in terms of an organization's membership in a social category legitimized by the institutional environment. Reversely, whilst claiming membership in a particular social category, organizations distinguish themselves from other "types" of organizations. Thus, organizational identity construction is a highly relational process that involves comparisons with other organizations. This is because, as argued by Sahlin-Andersson (1996, p. 57), "one cannot make a self-identification, i.e., a social labeling applied to oneself, without reference to others. It is possible only to label oneself in relation to others."

Central to this thesis, and to the argument that organizational identity is a useful point of departure in trying to understand how sport organizations interpret and act upon new ideas on organizing, is the view of action specified by an institutional take on organizational identity. According to this view, organizational action follows a logic of appropriateness. That is, embedded in the institutional anchorage of organizational identities are expectations of legitimized ways of acting in specific situations (Glynn, 2008). March and Olsen (1989, 2004) are oft-cited in this context, but as explicated in the beginning of the chapter, the notion of action as shaped by what is conceived of as socially appropriate is a core assumption of institutional analysis. Recall that Berger and Luckmann (1966) and Schütz (1967) claimed that action cannot precede the institutional order; institutions script actions by linking actors, actions, and situations. By extension, institutions are productive of and produce not only what actors do, but also what they can "imagine doing" (Hall & Taylor, 1996, p. 948).

The institutional view of organizational identities outlined above constitutes my point of departure in conceptualizing how and why organizations translate ideas in certain ways. Specifically, in merging the concepts of translation and organizational identity, the way an organization interprets and acts upon, i.e., translates a new idea on organizing, is understood as based on and part of organizational identity construction processes of the focal organization. This view serves as an analytical point of departure for RQ 2: How, why, and with what consequences is Drive-in sport implemented in Swedish sport clubs? As previously noted, by consequences I mean organizational identity reorientation or, in other words, organizational change. In Article 3, I specify RQ 2 by asking: How and why is Drive-in sport interpreted and acted upon in relation to existing activities? Furthermore, has the sport clubs' organizational identity changed as a result of the adoption of Drive-in sport? In Article 4, the concept of organizational identity is mobilized to address two specific research questions: First, how can Swedish sport clubs' organizational identities be described? Second, what is the distribution of sport clubs across the various organizational identities?

Before summarizing my conceptual framework, I want to link back to some of the thoughts presented earlier in the chapter. As noted by Glynn (2008), despite their shared focus on the role of meaning in processes of organizing, organizational identity has developed quite separately from mainstream organizational institutional research, including conceptual and empirical work on institutional logics. Notwithstanding these separate trajectories of development, recall that Friedland and Alford (1991), already in their groundbreaking text, proposed that institutional logics provide actors with

means and ends, as well as *vocabularies of motives* and *senses of self*. Perhaps due to the institutional logic perspective's character as a meta-theoretical framework, the conceptual connection between institutional logics and organizational identity has not been explored to any great extent. Recently, however, Thornton et al., (2012), in their expansive conceptual development of the institutional logics perspective, advocated for a depiction of organizational identities as the organization-level instantiation of institutional logics. Following this, I find it fruitful to view the de-legitimization of the institutional logic of competitive sport that currently permeates the sport policy climate as a de-legitimization of an organizational identity category in which competitive sport is conceived of as the defining characteristic.

Summary and implications for the study

Together, the concepts outlined in this chapter serve as the interpretive lens for the thesis. Their implications for how I approach and understand my object of study can be summarized as follows:

First, I conceptualize the contemporary sport policy debate described in Chapter 2 as characterized by a *de-legitimization* of the institutional logic of competitive sport. In that sense, the institutional context asks that Swedish sport clubs recast their ends, means, and senses of self—in other words, their organizational identities.

Second, the emergence and diffusion of new practices—exemplars of new institutional logics in the making—are by necessity preceded by a theorization process. Theorization refers to the framing of a problem/problems to which a new practice can be a solution and the explication and elaboration of the new practice's contribution to the solution of that/those problem/s. The theorization concept is used to address RQ 1: How is legitimacy established for Drive-in sport? By applying the theorization concept, I draw attention to the social constructionist micro-processes that are the nuts and bolts of institutional processes, while simultaneously shedding light on the societal origins of the systems of meaning invoked and added to in these processes.

Third, I conceive of the legitimization of a new idea on organizing as potentially distinct from what becomes of the idea as it crosses the organizational threshold of the adopting organization. This is because new ideas on organizing will be interpreted and acted upon, i.e., translated, based on the organizational identity of the adopting organizations. Organizational identities represent the organization-level instantiation of extant institutional logics and, as such, involve both a definition of "who we are"

and "how we should act", i.e., a particular rationale for action that also structures what organizations can "imagine doing." These thoughts are used to address RQ 2: How, why, and with what consequences, in terms of organizational change, is Drive-in sport implemented in Swedish sport clubs? In addition, the organizational identity concept is used as a theoretical point of departure in the design of the study conducted to answer RQ 3: What is the propensity among sport clubs as a group to act as policy-implementers of wider societal goals?

4. Research Approach

The purpose of this chapter is to outline my approach to data collection, processing, and analyzing as it follows from the theoretical framework. The chapter opens with an explication of the positioning of my study within an interpretive approach and the guiding principles of good research ensuing from this positioning. Thereafter, I describe the overall design of the two rounds of data collection that produced the empirical base of the thesis. I also detail the data collection procedures and the considerations these are based on. The chapter ends with a description of the general strategy I used when processing and analyzing the data. Reflections on the methodology employed as well as notes on the study's limitations are provided in the final chapter of the thesis.

An interpretive approach

The preceding chapter's conceptual framework implies an adherence to what Burrell and Morgan (1979) call an interpretive approach to organizational research. I conceive of such an approach as a corollary of organizational institutionalism's rootedness in the works of Schütz (1967) and Berger and Luckmann (1966). However, as previously described (p. 23), mainstream organizational institutionalism have involved large-scale, quantitative studies that focus on structures, using them as proxies of meaning. My aim is to go beyond this by exploring meaning directly (Hinings & Tolbert, 2008; Zilber, 2008). Consequently, my analytical focus is on the ascription of shared meaning to the actions that make up processes of organizing and the "social stock of knowledge" (Schütz, 1967) invoked and added to in such processes. The goal is therefore to understand the processes through which "the social world is ongoingly accomplished" (Prasad & Prasad, 2002, p. 7). Working toward achieving such an understanding, I have employed a research design that is underpinned by an aim to collect and analyze data that explicate the ideographic aspect of organizing processes.

Fundamentally, an interpretive approach means that I view the output of my research as second-order constructs, i.e., constructs of the constructs made by actors on the social scene (Schütz, 1953). This does not imply, however, that I conceive any research account of that social scene as being equally valid (c.f., Howe & Eisenhart, 1990, p. 3). Accordingly, I rely on a set of principles for good research drawn from the interpretive paradigm:

- A strive for *internal* consistency, i.e., a harmony between research questions, theoretical assumptions, and methods of data collection

and analysis. The pursuit of this principle leads me to, for example, focus on qualitative data in order to access the ascription of shared meaning to the actions that make up processes of organizing. It also leads me to be aware *of* and adhere *to* the "rules of thumb" (Howe & Eisenhart, 1990, p. 7) guiding various strategies for collecting and analyzing qualitative data. For example, as described later on in the chapter, I used summaries and follow-ups during my interviews to clarify the meaning of relevant aspects and verify the interpretation of the respondents' answers. This is suggested by Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) as a strategy to ensure quality in interview data.

- A pursuit of knowledge that has a *heuristic* and *pragmatic* value, i.e., the production of an account that enables us to understand the object of study in a new way and therefore informs a discussion about the topic in question (Larsson, 2005; Howe & Eisenhart, 1990). Consequently, inasmuch as it aims to unveil the myths that pervade and uphold social life, my study is positioned within a critical program (c.f., Alvesson, 2003). In addition, my conceptual and analytic focus furthers the notion of organizing as not solely a "frame" within which other processes (e.g., socialization) take place, but as a process worth examining *in its own right* (developed on p. 67). Another illustration of my pursuit of knowledge with a heuristic and pragmatic value is my application of theoretical concepts that, to my knowledge, has not been used before in sport-related research. For example, my employment of the notion of theorization (Strang & Meyer, 1993; Tolbert & Zucker, 1999) introduces a conceptual tool that allows for nuanced analyses of the interpretive work connected to institutional maintenance and change processes (developed on p. 69-70).

- A concern with producing an account that is primarily generalizable through *pattern recognition* and *context similarity* (Larsson, 2009). The former is connected to the pursuit of a heuristic value and refers to the potential of research to inform an interpretation of a situation outside of the one/s studied. An example of this is the insight provided in the thesis of sport organizations' self-identification as a fruitful avenue to understanding how they interpret and approach new ideas on organizing. This, in turn, have implications for sport policy implementation analysis, for example. Context similarity, like Lincoln and Guba's (1999) notion of transferability, relates to the extent to which a study's findings might be transferred to other *empirically* similar settings. Indeed, such transferability rests on a description of the studied phenomena's context. Consequently, all

four included articles contain a contextual background, and for the thesis as a whole, Chapter 2 serves as a description of the wider empirical context in which the organizing of sport takes place. Furthermore, the notion of context similarity is explicitly invoked, for instance, in Article 1, where I argue that the analysis provided can inform studies in contexts that are characterized by a confrontation between an increasing instrumentalization of voluntary sport and the realization of sport-for-all through autonomous, membership-based sport movements.

- A strive for *transparency* throughout the research process, not in the least in the written text as in the final output (e,g., Larsson, 2005; Howe & Eisenhart, 1990). These measures ensure the credibility of the account but, importantly, do not infer that it is the only account possible. This text in its entirety is an attempt to display transparency. In addition, the remaining sections of this chapter are devoted to displaying transparency as it relates to how my conceptual framework and RQs have fed into the specificities of the empirical inquiry and data analysis. For example, Appendices 1 and 2 display the interview questions, and Appendix 3 illustrates the various steps of the coding procedure.

Design of the empirical inquiry

Following an interpretive approach and my attending aim to access the ascription of meaning to actions that make up organizing processes, I have relied solely on qualitative data. The data were gathered in two rounds. The material collected during the first round is used to address RQs 1 and 2, while the data collected during the second round is used to address RQ 3. The rationales for and specificities of the design underpinning the rounds of data collection are detailed below.

First round of data collection

As stated in the introductory chapter, the overall design of the empirical inquiry relating to RQs 1 and 2 is based on Czarniawska and Sevón's (1996a) argument that processes of change are best studied in instances where new and established ideas and practices are confronted with each other because such instances reveal both the "old" and the "new." Following this argument, I set out to find specific localities where Drive-in sport was being implemented using the "follow-the-idea" approach (Lindberg & Erlingsdottir, 2005), meaning that the researcher lets the idea under study (i.e., Drive-in sport) act as a snowball. Using this approach, I identified four municipalities in which Drive-in sport was introduced during the past year. The aim of sampling these four municipalities was to achieve variation in

how and by whom Drive-in sport was initiated. In order to achieve such variation, one of the municipalities was drawn from a national Drive-in sport initiative that was launched by the SSC as part of the Lift for Sport. In this initiative, Drive-in sport was to be carried out in 17 metropolitan areas all over Sweden (Riksidrottsförbundet, 2009b). The remaining three municipalities were identified via communication with the SSC's regional extensions—the RSFs. My subsequent ambition was to come into contact with all of the key actors involved in organizing Drive-in sport in all four municipalities. This was achieved through the use of snowball sampling, starting with my initial contact with the SSC and RSFs. As a result of this process, seven sport clubs,[7] four local authorities, and three RSFs were determined to make up the key actors in organizing Drive-in sport within these municipalities.

I utilized semi-structured interviews to gain access to the ascriptions of meaning that make up processes of organizing (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Other methods, such as document analysis, were excluded early for two main reasons. First, while it is possible to consider documents as sediments or expressions of meaning (e.g., Bacchi, 2009), interviews have the potential to *prompt descriptions* in order to gain access to meaning. Second, much like the rape crisis center in Zilber's (2002) study, Swedish sport organizations, particularly sport clubs, do not produce much documentation and the production is often unevenly distributed among organizations. Another alternative under consideration was observations. However, anyone attempting to study the organizing of sport, particularly at the club level, is faced with the difficulty of grasping processes that do not take place—concretely—on a day-to-day basis, but rather during board meetings and in informal communication between members of the board or between the board and other parts of the organization. This makes observations a challenging data collection method that requires studies to have a very long time span. Further complicating the use of observations is the difficulty in gaining *a priori* knowledge of actions taken by a club board. In other words, any knowledge of a club's engagement in Drive-in sport, for example, *a priori* to any formal decision requires personal access to the club.

Sampling and data collection instrument
The sampling of respondents was purposeful, meaning they were chosen based on their assumed insight into and influence on the topic under study (Bryman, 2008). Each of the organizations identified as key actors in the

---

[7] Due to a printing error, the number of clubs is said to be nine in Article 1 (Stenling, 2014). In addition, due to a shortage of data, one of the clubs was excluded from the analysis in Article 3 (Stenling, 2013).

organizing of Drive-in sport in the four municipalities was approached with the question of who in the organization could give the fullest account of how and why the organization came into contact with, interpreted, and acted in relation to Drive-in sport. Through this procedure, 29 respondents were identified and, subsequently to being informed of the purpose of the study (Vetenskapsrådet, 1996), all agreed to participate in the study. Each respondent's gender, organizational affiliation, and function are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Respondents according to municipality, gender, organizational affiliation, and function (adapted from Stenling, 2014a, p. 6)

Municipality	Gender	Organization	Function
1	Male	SSC	Manager of national Drive-in sport initiative
1 (and 2)	Male	RSF	Administrative manager
1 (and 2)	Female	RSF	Educational consultant
1	Male	SC	Administrator
1	Male	SC	Board representative
1	Male	LA	Administrator
1	Male	LA	Administrative manager
1	Male	LA	Project manager Drive-in sport
2	Female	SC	Project manager Drive-in sport
2	Male	SC	Board representative
2	Male	LA	Administrator
2	Male	LA	Elected representative
3	Female	RSF	Administrative manager
3	Female	RSF	Educational consultant
3	Male	SC	Administrator
3	Male	SC	Administrator
3	Male	SC	Board representative
3	Male	SC	Administrator
3	Female	SC	Board representative
3	Male	LA	Administrator
3	Male	LA	Elected representative
3	Female	LA	Administrator
4	Male	RSF	Administrative manager
4	Male	RSF	Educational consultant
4	Female	RSF	Board representative
4	Male	SC	Administrator/board representative
4	Male	SC	Administrator
4	Male	LA	Administrator
4	Female	LA	Elected representative

Note. SSC = Swedish Sports Confederation; RSF = regional sport federation; SC = sport club; LA = local authority.

The interviews utilized a theoretically driven interview guide to produce data related to the RQs in question. This means that I steered the interviews into pre-determined topics grounded in the various concepts framing the study. However, these concepts are "empty" insofar as they do not contain any pre-determined content regarding, for example, the specificities (i.e., *qualitas*) of

the self-identification of the focal organization. Accordingly, the interview guide was constituted by themes reflecting my interest in how Drive-in sport as a new practice became legitimized (RQ1) and how, why, and with what consequences Drive-in sport was implemented (RQ2). In particular, the following five themes were treated, where the two first relate to RQ1 and the remaining three to RQ2:

1. The interrelation between organized sport and the Swedish society;
2. The constitution of and arguments for Drive-in sport as a practice;
3. The self-identification of the implementing organizations;
4. The initiation and rationalization of Drive-in sport in the organizations; and
5. The integration of Drive-in sport with the organization's regular activities.

Sample interview questions are provided in Article 1, 2, and 3, and Appendix 1 displays the full interview guide for this first round of data collection. Note that the interview guide was somewhat adjusted depending on what organization the respondent represented.

Conducting the interviews
All interviews were performed face-to-face, except for one that had to be rescheduled due to practical reasons and which therefore was conducted by phone. The interviews ranged from 60 to 120 minutes and were all audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim by me, following the respondent's consent. The semi-structured format of the interviews allowed for follow-up questions, elaborations, and returns to a topic, while at the same time ensuring that all topics were covered in all interviews. As previously noted, following Kvale and Brinkmann's (2009) quality criteria for interviews, summaries and follow-ups during the interviews were used to clarify the meaning of relevant aspects and verify the interpretation of the respondents' answers.

Second round of data collection
As noted in the introductory chapter, RQ 3 reflects an aim to identify what "types" of self-identifications exist among sport clubs as a group and the extent to which these various types "resonate" with various prevailing and possible future policy objectives. Following this, the design of the second round of data collection was guided by an ambition to capture the whole variety of self-identifications available in Swedish voluntary sport. This ambition arose from the findings reported in Article 3 (Stenling, 2013) wherein one of the sport clubs that delivered Drive-in sport was considered a

completely different "type" from the remaining ones. This "differentness," in terms of self-identification, was interpreted to have great impact on the way in which the club had approached Drive-in sport. Given this, I wondered: how many other types of self-identifications are there among Swedish sport clubs? What does this mean for sport clubs' role as policy implementers? In addition, I wanted to be able to produce an indication of the distribution of sport clubs across the various organizational identities.

I, together with my co-author, assessed that this twofold ambition required qualitative club-level data and a fairly large sample of clubs. Taking these two requirements into account, we decided on a rather novel design: short qualitative interviews with representatives of clubs randomly sampled from the entire population of sport clubs affiliated with the SSC. While surveys are useful in large-scale studies such as this one, we excluded this option on the basis of a number of considerations, the main one being the difficulty in gaining access to the ideographic aspect of organizing, i.e., to produce qualitative data, through surveys. In essence, we were interested in how sport club representatives describe their organization's self-identification and in how action is rationalized within the club, not in sorting such self-identifications and rationales for actions into pre-determined categories according to, for example, sport/s provided, structural characteristics, geographic location of the club, etc. A subordinate, yet considered, argument was that surveys involving sport clubs are notoriously low in response rate. For example, the response rate of a survey carried out in connection to the most recent government-commissioned evaluation of central state support to Swedish sport was 34% (CIF, 2014b). We wanted to get a hold of the remaining 66% as well and assessed that a direct request would increase our chances of achieving this.

Sampling and data collection instrument
A random sample of 400 sport clubs was drawn from Statistics Sweden's registry of the population of Swedish sport clubs. As detailed in Stenling and Fahlén (2014), the sample size was determined through a careful judgment of the richness of data required at the club level and the number of clubs needed to meet the two-fold ambition of the study. Based on the argument that board members of sport clubs have an overview of and determine the orientation of a club's activities (Hinings et al., 1996), holders of these positions were selected for interview. As in the first round of data collection, the theoretical framework (i.e., organizational identity) of the study was mobilized in the construction of the interview guide. Accordingly, we formulated interview questions intended to prompt descriptions of:

1. The club's core practice;

2. The identity-distinguishing markers of the club, i.e., the aspects used in comparisons with other organizations; and

3. The club's engagement in ancillary activities, i.e., any types of activities that the club pursues beyond its core practices. Our particular concern was with the *rationales* for such engagement.

Appendix 2 displays the full interview guide.

Conducting the interviews

In total, we performed telephone interviews with chairpersons, secretaries, or treasurers of 218 sport clubs. At the beginning of each interview, the respondent was informed that we conducted a study on organizational identities of Swedish voluntary sport clubs, and that their club had been randomly sampled from a register provided by Statistics Sweden (Vetenskapsrådet, 1996). Approximately two thirds of the interviews were conducted by me, and the remaining one third by my co-author. In pursuit of reliability, we maintained communication between us in order to ensure that the interviews were carried out in a similar manner. While telephone interviews are often conceived as an inferior alternative to face-to-face interviews, we considered that they were the best, if not the only feasible option. If we were to be able to carry through with our design, we needed an interview format that allowed the respondents to answer "on the go" and on immediate call. Thus, interviews needed to be relatively short and not require that respondents "check facts," such as member counts.

From the original sample of 400 clubs, 128 were excluded. Out of these, 63 clubs were verified as "paper products," i.e., they had no activity whatsoever. Overall, 65 clubs were confirmed as, in fact, not affiliated with the SSC. Out of the final sample of 272 clubs, only 14 clubs declined to participate in the study. We were unable to reach 40 of the clubs despite intense efforts, such as contacting local authorities, RSFs, district sport federations, etc. for updated contact details. Presumably, a large part of these 40 clubs are paper products as well. In our experience, local authorities are quite familiar with all sport clubs in their jurisdiction, not least considering that they have to register in order to be eligible for financial support from local authorities. Thus, out of the final sample of 272 clubs, the 218 interviews ultimately conducted represent a response rate of 80.1%.[8] Given this, we feel quite confident that we have achieved maximum variation, i.e., that there is no type of self-identification that we have not been able to identify.

---

[8] Due to a calculation error, the size of the final sample and the response rate is incorrect in Stenling and Fahlén (2014).

Each interview lasted 5–30 minutes, depending on the amount of and variety of activities provided by the club. As noted in Stenling and Fahlén (2014), we allowed for follow-up questions and a certain amount of elaboration but made sure that all questions in the interview guide were treated in the same order. As in the first round of data collection, subsequent to getting the consent of the respondents (Vetenskapsrådet, 1996), all interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim, but this time by the aid of a professional transcription company that received anonymized sound files. The company also signed a confidentiality agreement covering the storage and handling of the data. I double-checked the transcripts of roughly 10 interviews in order to ensure that they corresponded to the recordings.

A joint strategy for processing and analyzing the data

At a general level, my most important tools in data collection and analysis are the theoretical concepts outlined in the previous chapter and detailed within each article. However, beyond the application of various theoretical ideas, data processing is also a very practical *doing* in which the analyzer is the prime resource. At the core of this doing is a combination of creativity and systematization. During the course of my work with the thesis, I have come to appreciate a rather clear explication of the workings of this doing, as it aids the assessment of the quality of a qualitative study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Consequently, each article contains a description of the specificities of the data analysis conducted in relation to the particular research questions treated within them. In the following, I present what has been my overall strategy for processing the data.

Throughout the process of making sense of the empirical data, I have relied on what Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 61) term the "accounting-scheme guided" approach, i.e., a mixture of predetermined and emergent codes. This implies the use of theoretically driven themes as a broad analytic frame. Accordingly, subsequent to concentrating the data through the "concentration of meaning" technique, segments of data were sorted according to their relation to each of the themes of the conceptual framework. In relation to RQ 1, for example, I assembled all segments of data relating to the first "task" of the theorization process, i.e., the construction and legitimization of a problem to which a new practice can be a solution. Thereafter, a strategy similar to Miles and Huberman's (1994, p. 254) contrasting/comparing tactic was used to construct emergent codes within each of the *a priori* determined themes. For example, in relation to RQ 3, for each description of the core practices of a club that was deemed to represent something distinctly different from all of the previous data-driven codes, we created a new code within the *a priori* theme "core practices."

With the final aim of producing categories that were internally homogenous and externally heterogeneous (Guba, 1978), this process often involved moving up and down between higher and lower levels of abstraction, i.e., the breaking down and merging of various codes. Appendix 3 provides an illustration of the coding procedure. Importantly, in pursuit of credibility and trustworthiness, the analysis relating to RQ 1 and 2 was continuously discussed with my supervisors. The analysis relating to RQ 3 was conducted almost entirely together with my co-author. In addition, the analytical claims put forth in each article have been discussed and scrutinized in several important arenas, such as my PhD seminar group and the sport research group at the Department of Education, Umeå University. Beyond this, each article has been through a thorough peer-review process.

5. Summary of Articles

My theoretical and empirical interest situates my work at the intersection of three research fields: critical sport management, policy analysis, and sociology of sport. This positioning is also reflected in the journals to which I have chosen to submit my articles; two of which are concerned with sport management, one with sport policy analysis, and one with the sociology of sport in general. In the following, I present the key empirical findings of each article. These findings are discussed extensively in each of the articles as well as in the next chapter.

Article 1
Stenling, C. (2014a). The emergence of a new logic? The theorizing of a new practice in the highly institutionalized context of Swedish voluntary sport. *Sport Management Review, 17*, 507–519.

Article 1 builds on data from all 29 interviews covering the emergence and organizing of Drive-in sport. Grounded in Strang and Meyer's (1993) and Greenwood et al.'s (2002) specification of theorization as involving two tasks, the article addresses two questions: What problems are constructed to legitimize Drive-in sport? How is Drive-in sport elaborated and justified as a solution to these problems?

The analysis shows that two problems were constructed by all types of respondents (i.e., representatives of local authorities as well as the sports movement). These two problems are intimately connected, sharing the interpretation of the fundamental problem being that not all Swedish youth are engaged in organized sport. However, the perceived causes as well as consequences of this problem differ between the two modes of legitimizing Drive-in sport. The first legitimization mode, which I call "Society has a problem—Drive-in sport can solve it," takes its point of departure in the societal costs created by so-called norm-breaking behavior (e.g., drinking and doing drugs, committing assaults, vandalizing, mugging, and burglarizing) displayed by youth. In the framing of this problem, norm-breaking behavior is perceived to be performed by youth not engaged in organized sport, youth who lack "a meaningful activity." Additionally, in the data from two of the municipalities, norm-breaking behavior is attributed to male, immigrant youth. This group is believed to be non-affiliated due to its members' "character," "culture," and lack of knowledge on how "we" organize sport in Sweden. The second mode of legitimizing Drive-in sport, which I term, "There is a problem with organized sport—Drive-in sport can

solve it," shares with the first the conceived fundamental problem, i.e., that not all youth are engaged in organized sport. In this mode, however, the problematizing spotlight is directed toward organized sport itself. Organized sport, the respondents argue, has failed to live up to its own as well as the state's sport-for-all ideal; it does not assume the societal responsibility that it claims to. This failing is interpreted to be caused by three shortcomings of contemporary organized sport: its expensive, over-organized, and performance-focused character.

The findings related to the second question addressed in the article, i.e., How is Drive-in sport elaborated and justified as a solution to these problems?", show that the interpretive work connected to Drive-in sport implicates that the new practice can "do it all" (Strang, 1997). Drive-in sport is perceived as an activity form that can "fix" both norm-breaking, presumably non-affiliated (male, immigrant) youth *and* the sports movement's tarnished reputation. In order for that to be possible, however, the respondents argue that Drive-in sport needs to be organized in a specific way. At a general level, Drive-in sport targets non-affiliated youth; otherwise, the activities will not have the sought-after effect in relation to any of the problems. Beyond this, the activities need to, first, be offered at a time and place where they are needed (i.e., *when* and *where* norm-breaking behavior occurs). Second, the character of the actual activities should be the complete opposite of regular sport activities. That is, free of charge, "undemanding," and "fun," as opposed to expensive, over-organized, and performance-oriented. Third, Drive-in sport activities need to be overseen by a remunerated leader with social as opposed to sport-specific skills, a person that can act as a role-model for non-affiliated, rowdy youth. In the municipalities where the preferred participants are male, immigrant youth, the sought-after leader is one who "matches" the target group.

Article 2
Stenling, C. (2014b). Sport programme implementation as translation and organizational identity construction: The implementation of Drive-in sport in Swedish sports as an illustration. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 6*, 55–69.

The purpose of Article 2 is to outline a theoretical framework than can be used in the analysis of sport policy implementation processes. This article therefore moves on from the treatment of the legitimization of ideas, inherent in, for example, in sport policies and programs to the implementation of such ideas in sport organizations. Reviewing the small but increasing body of research that has taken an explicit interest in implementation of sport programs in sport clubs, I conclude that 1)

programs have a tendency to change as they travel from formulator (i.e., governments or federating organizations) to implementer (i.e., sport clubs) and 2) that the character of the implementing organization is often put forth, yet not theorized, as an explanation for the implementation process and its outcomes. Building on this, I present a theoretical framework constituted by an integration of the translation (Czarniawska & Sevón, 1996b) and organizational identity (Glynn, 2008) perspectives and propose to analyze the actions and interpretations made in relation to a sport program as based on and part of an organizational identity construction process of the involved actors. Crucially, I also argue 1) that depending on the perceived *content* of a sport program, it will be (or not) perceived as appropriate "raw material" for organizational identity (re)construction and 2) that analysts of implementation processes need to "follow the idea" (Lindberg & Erlingsdottir, 2005) and not "skip" any organization in the investigation of an idea's route from initiator to implementer. This last point is especially important in instances where there is a possibility that the various organizations involved may have divergent organizational identities.

The proposed framework is illustrated with data covering the implementation of Drive-in sport within the national Drive-in sport initiative that was part of the Lift for Sport. In particular, eight interviews with representatives of four key actors (the SSC, RSF, LA, and sport club) are mobilized in the illustration. Using this data, I show how the framework helps us to understand how the difference between the organizational identity of the SSC and their extended arm the RSF, on the one hand, and that of the implementing sport club, on the other, resulted in a merely formal connection between Drive-in sport and the implementing sport club. This was an outcome most definitely not intended by the SSC when they designed Drive-in sport as an initiative to develop regular activities of sport clubs. Specifically, I argue that the SSC's and the RSF's two-part self-understanding as both representatives of the sports movement in relation to non-sport actors such as government agencies, politicians, and society in general *and* as service agencies for their member organizations produced the paradoxical result of Drive-in sport becoming activities aimed at crime-prevention, with which the formally implementing sport club should not be bothered—*in practice*. Similarly, the understanding of Drive-in sport as crime-prevention activities for non-members was a complete mismatch with that of the implementing sport club's self-understanding as organizers of competitive sport activities for the club's members. Consequently, the club agreed to participate as implementer only on the condition that it was only a *formal* involvement.

Article 3

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*, 497–509.

While the purpose of Article 2 is to propose a theoretical framework consisting of the translation and organizational identity perspective, Article 3 applies this framework in an analysis of how, why, and with what consequences sport clubs adopt new ideas on organizing. The article draws on data produced in 10 interviews with representatives of six sport clubs implementing Drive-in sport. Two questions are addressed in the article: "How and why is the idea of Drive-in sport interpreted and acted upon?" Of particular interest is how the engagement in Drive-in sport was rationalized in the clubs and how Drive-in sport was integrated with regular club activities; and, "Have the clubs' core purpose and practice, i.e., organizational identity, changed as a result of the introduction of Drive-in sport?"

In relation to the first question addressed, the analysis shows that five of the six clubs had a self-identification that was comprised of a view of the club's core purpose and practice being the organizing of member-directed competitive sport activities. I label these clubs "Competitive Sport Clubs." These clubs rationalized the adoption of Drive-in sport as *instrumental to* their core activities, for example by perceiving Drive-in sport as a talent recruitment pool, or as way to make money to finance core activities. By contrast, in the remaining club, which I label the "Social Sport Club," the core purpose and practices was conceived of as the organizing of social activities aimed at school youth in general. As such, Drive-in sport was rationalized *as a* core activity. This club was also the only one that employed resources of its own to the organizing of Drive-in sport. In all other cases, Drive-in sport was financed by local authorities and/or The Lift for Sport funds. Interestingly, the analysis also reveals that the clubs that were faced with a pre-designed Drive-in sport "package," i.e., quite firm guidelines of what Drive-in sport should be, the activities were decoupled to the greatest extent, seemingly in an attempt to protect core activities from any strain that the engagement in Drive-in sport might create. Table 2 provides an overview of the analysis in relation to the first research question.

Table 2

The initiation, rationalization, and integration of Drive-in sport (adapted from Stenling, 2013, p. 502)

Pattern	SC	OI	Initiation	Rationalization	Integration
1	1, 3-5	Competitive	External	Instrumental	Superficial
2	2	Competitive	Internal	Instrumental	Integrated
3	6	Social	Internal	Non-instrumental	*Is* core activity

Note. SC = sport club; OI = organizational identity.

Following this I propose, in relation to the second question addressed in the article, that none of the clubs' core purpose and practice (i.e., organizational identity) have changed as result of Drive-in sport. Put differently, none of the clubs' interpretations and actions in relation to Drive-in sport deviated from what is conceived as appropriate within the legitimized organizational identity category to which the clubs claim membership.

Article 4

Stenling, C., & Fahlén, J. (2014). 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*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1012690214557103

Building on the insights provided in Article 2 and 3, the purpose of the study reported on in Article 4 is to create knowledge that can inform a discussion on sport clubs' role as implementers of various policy goals. The study design following from this aim is outlined in the previous chapter as well as in the article. The data from the interviews with representatives of 218 sport clubs are mobilized to address two specific questions: 1) How can Swedish sport clubs' organizational identities be described? 2) What is the distribution of sport clubs across the various organizational identities? The key findings are displayed in Table 3. The most interesting point of discussion presented by these findings is the heterogeneity of organizational identities among Swedish sport clubs as a group and the distribution of clubs across the various types. In particular, the logic of action of each organizational identity category provides an important guide in discussions of sport clubs' role as implementers of policy aims.

Table 3

Display of key findings Article 4 (adapted from Stenling & Fahlén, 2014, p. 12–13)

Organizational identity category	Core purpose	Target group	Core practice	Identity defining marker/s	Logic of action
The Sport-Educating Club *n=123*	Educate members about the sport/s provided by the club	Children and youth in general Adults with prior experience of practicing the sport	Preparation for and participation in institutionalized competitive sport systems	Sport-providing *voluntary* organization	Promote/enhance quality of sport-specific education and cohesion among members
The Village-Preservation Club *n=23*	Secure survival and prosperity of the village	All villagers	Variety of sport and non-sport activities	Community-focused, self-sufficient, and strong volunteer commitment	Ensure the club's continuous contribution to the village by adjusting activities according to present needs and wishes
The Non-Competitive Sport Club *n=17*	Widen the range of activities within Swedish voluntary sport	Individuals not attracted to competitive sport	Sport activities without a competitive element	Unique	Nurture the specificity/quality of non-competitive sport activities
The Social Fostering Club *n=14*	Produce democratic, socially integrated citizens	Children and youth	Adult-led, formal club activities (character of sport secondary)	Assuming responsibility for wider societal aims	Contribute to societal development/Altruism
The Lifetime Sport-Provider Club *n=12*	Provide sport for all	All people of all ages	Preparation for and participation in institutionalized competitive sport systems; Keep-fit exercise sessions	Inclusive in terms of age and level of ambition	Widen the club's range of activities/Meet increased heterogeneity in population's demand

The Group-of-Friends Club *n=9*	Provide opportunity for a group of adult friends to spend time together, pursuing a shared interest	Closed recruitment; solely from the social network of the adult team members	*Participation* in low levels of institutionalized competitive sport system	Loosely organized network of friends pursuing a common interest	Reduce activities beyond participation in competitions
The Self-Realization Club *n=7*	Provide avenue to self-fulfillment	Adults seeking to challenge themselves	Coach-led, high-intensity training sessions	Exclusive in terms of age and level of ambition	Increase members' individual resources and secure availability of events
The High-Performance Club *n=6*	Excel on the playing field	Children and youth with ambition to be the best; Adults matching required performance standards	Perfection of sport skills	Bureaucratized and professionalized structures	Enlarge talent pool and promote a professionally run organization
The School Sport Club *n=5*	Enhance image and appeal of the school	Students	Participation in school sport championships	Intermittent activity pattern; "appendix" to schools	Promote school visibility
The Disability Sport Club *n=2*	Secure access to sport as a societal institution	Disabled of all ages	Various competitive as well as non-competitive sport activities	Provides meaningful leisure to marginalized group	Uphold an institutionalized sport system for disabled

6. Discussion

The overall aim of this thesis is to create knowledge on processes of change in the contemporary organizing of Swedish voluntary sport and the systems of meaning expressed, created, reproduced, and changed in these processes. In this concluding chapter, I will discuss the key empirical insights in relation to the RQs constructed in order to create such knowledge. As a reminder, the RQs addressed are: 1) How is legitimacy established for Drive-in sport?, 2) How, why, and with what consequences is Drive-in sport implemented in Swedish sport clubs?, and 3) What is the propensity among sport clubs to act as policy implementers of wider societal goals? Following this discussion, I provide some concluding remarks on the empirical inquiry and some implications for practice. The chapter ends with a section on the thesis' conceptual and methodological contributions to sport-related research, notes on the limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Legitimizing Drive-in sport (RQ 1)

One of the key insights provided in Article 1 is that the theorization of Drive-in sport reflects both the long-standing notion of organized sport as part of a welfare project aimed at reducing social inequalities and individual risk *and* contemporary ideas of organized sport as *solely* a dedicated tool of the state. In that sense, the interpretive work connected to Drive-in sport reflects Greenwood et al.'s (2002) notion of theorization as a process that is both geared toward creating new institutions and grounded in an established institutional order.

In Chapter 2, I describe how the combination of extensive public support and far-reaching autonomy for organized sport has, up until recently, not been a problem for either of the parties of the "state-sport family." Organized sport has grown numerically and diversified socially and geographically. Arguably, the resolution of the problem with, for example, gender and socio-economic bias in recruitment and retention (and the fact that this represents an unequal distribution of public funds to the population) has, therefore, been possible to treat in an "it'll work out in time"-manner. However, in Chapter 2, I also propose that with reports on organized sport actually drawing further and further away from the sport-for-all ideal, the sports movement's legitimacy *as a popular movement* has been put into question. This has, in turn, produced a contemporary notion of a *need for a change* that can repel this legitimacy threat. Arguably, the theorization of Drive-in sport as a practice that will "fill the gap" in organized sport responds to this

pressure on organized sport to *do* other things, to *be* something else. By extension, this could be interpreted as reflecting attempts by the stakeholders of sport to ward off a legitimacy threat that undermines the sports movement's position as *the* partner in formulating and implementing public sport policy. This mode of legitimizing Drive-in sport thereby indicates that the autonomy of the sports movement has always been tenuous, illusionary, and dependent on "all going according to plan" for both the state and the sports movement. While the first mode portrays *organized sport* as needing to change in order to be attractive and accessible to all (i.e., indirect societal benefit), the second reflects the idea that organized sport should seek out, target, and change *those not included* in organized sport, especially those who, presumably, pose a threat to the continued development and prosperity of the Swedish society (i.e., direct social benefit). The second mode, therefore, reflects the tensions inherent in the renegotiation of the "implicit contract" between the sports movement and the state (Norberg, 2004, 2011).

As noted in Article 1, both modes of legitimizing Drive-in sport share the interpretation of the fundamental problem being that not all Swedes (youth) are engaged in organized sport. Before proceeding, I would like to comment on the unique position of organized sport in Swedish society that is indicated by this problem formulation. This position is unique in the sense that, in a Swedish context, it is difficult to imagine any other non-governmental, non-mandatory (leisure) activity for which its stakeholders express the ambition to reach *everyone*. Imagine, for example, that the state would express its concern for churches' inability to reach everyone. Arguably, this unique position rests on the "mythopeic status" (Coalter, 2007, p. 9) of sport, i.e., the very widespread assumption that sport participation is inherently *good* (e.g., Coakley, 2011; Coalter, 2007; Österlind & Wright, 2014). Discussing this in Article 1, I argue that the interpretation of norm-breaking behavior as being performed by un-associated youth reflects the assumption that sport participation has a "fertilizer effect" (Coakley, 2011, p. 308). In other words, proponents of Drive-in sport conceive of sport participation as a "vaccine" against norm-breaking behavior, a vaccine that youth engaging in norm-breaking behavior, presumably, has not been given. Beyond this, by proposing that norm-breaking behavior can be reduced by Drive-in sport, proponents invoke the assumption that sport participation has a "car wash effect" (Coakley, 2011, p. 308). That is, that it can provide an effective "antibiotic treatment" for those who missed out on the "vaccine." While the first problem constructed to legitimize Drive-in sport indicates that the vaccine might need some development in order to include all, the second problem builds on preconceptions concerning the targets of the antibiotic treatment. Clearly, the idea that organized sport should *seek out*, *target*, and

change those not currently included prompts those involved in the organizing of Drive-in sport to try to pin down what members of this group are like, why they are not already involved in organized sport, and what, therefore, might entice them to join. In doing so, the respondents in two of the municipalities invoke gendered and ethnicized stereotypical conceptions of this group (male, immigrant youth), constructing them as the "problematic other" that do not know how "we" in Sweden organize sport. Indeed, this shows that organizing is far from value-neutral—it is a process rife with *meaning*.

My focus on the interpretive work connected to the legitimization of Drive-in sport should not be interpreted as a denial of the "realness" of Drive-in sport activities. Undeniably, the activities do (or at least did) take place in a very concrete manner. Resources have been allocated, sports halls booked, promotion material produced, leaders recruited, etc. Drive-in sport is also stripped of two of the elements said to be the merits of organizing sport in a membership-based popular movement: membership and volunteerism. Focusing on the first of these, I would like to reconnect to Chapter 2 where I propose that in Swedish voluntary sport, the membership does not merely represent a financial exchange in which membership fees constitute the payment for services provided. The membership represents the individual's ticket of entrance to the representative democracy of voluntary sport and, therefore, to the possibility to influence the organizing and orientation of club sport. Drive-in sport, therefore, quite effectively exclude "problematic" youth from the influence over activities of which they are the target[9]. This is not to infer that Drive-in sport is not filled with good intentions or that the activities might have the sought-after effect. Rather, it implies than an idea that appears to be "ideal," in the words of one of the reviewers of one of my articles, may have unintended consequences.

Bringing Drive-in sport over the organizational threshold (RQ 2)

As shown in Article 1, there is a unison support by all actors, including sport club representatives, fo Drive-in sport *as such*. Everyone thinks that it is "simply a great idea." This unison support can be understood through a mobilization of the conceptualization of an organization's interpretation and action toward new ideas on organizing as based on and part of organizational identity (re)construction processes. Regarding the SSC and the RSF, I argue in Article 2 that it lies within the self-identification of these organizations to

---

[9] c.f., Agergaard, Michelsen la Cour, and Treumer Gregersen's (2015) analysis of the Danish DGI Playground intervention, which produced clients rather than members of migrant youth.

represent sport in relation to non-sport actors, such as government agencies and politicians, as well as in relation to "society in general." Because of this, these organizations are "acting within character" when contributing to the legitimization and construction of ideas such as Drive-in sport. It is at the core of what these organizations conceive of themselves to *be* and what they conceive of themselves to *do*. Then again, it is also within the organizational identities of these organizations to provide service and support to their member organizations, that is, to the sport clubs upon which they rely to conduct legitimacy-enhancing activities. Therefore, these organizations are charged with the task of upholding the legitimacy of organized sport without infringing on the representative democracy and the sport system-internal autonomy upon which the entire sport system rests. This is a tricky job to say the least. I believe that the recognition of sport clubs and federating sport organizations and the balancing act required by them, as completely different "types" of organization, provides an important clue to the manner in which processes of sport policy implementation proceed (c.f., Keat & Sam's 2013 analysis of the regional organizations charged with implementing national sport policy).

In line with Nielsen et al.'s (2014) proposition that the legitimization of an idea as such needs to be kept analytically distinct from the adoption of that idea within an organization, a shift in perspective, i.e., asking "Why is it a good idea for you to engage in Drive-in sport?", rather than "Why is Drive-in sport a good idea?", illustrates the above point. At the core of the organizational identity processes of the sport clubs is the prevailing notion of sport's means and ends, embedded in their view of "who we are and what we do." In particular, as shown in Article 3, the prevailing self-identification in what I term the Social Sport Club was a perfect match with the cultural material inscribed in the idea of Drive-in sport. Consequently, this club embraced the idea as if it was "another version of what we are already doing." However, for the remaining five Competitive Sport Clubs, the idea of Drive-in sport as a potential new core practice was utterly unthinkable. In the conceptual apparatus used here, the centrality of the provision of member-directed competitive sport activities to these clubs' self-identification shaped their approach to Drive-in sport as an *instrument* to enhance core activities. Thereby, the clubs engaged in a "cost and benefit" analysis where the efforts put into the activities under no circumstances may exceed the current and/or future gains of the engagement. From these clubs' point of view, it would be *inappropriate* and *illegitimate* to have resources flow from regular activities to Drive-in sport. Acting in any other way than they did would be "acting out of character."

Taking this into account in a combined analysis of RQ 1 (Article 1) and 2 (Article 2 & 3) makes visible the result of the paradox of Drive-in sport being delivered by sport clubs characterized by "the inherent logic of sport." Specifically, the very same ingredients used to justify Drive-in sport as a legitimate solution to the constructed problems made Drive-in sport an unlikely direction of development for the Competitive Sport Clubs. An analogy from outside of sport may aid in the illustration of this analytical point. Recall, again, my argument in the introductory chapter: At the core of the pressure for change on organized sport is an expectation to *do* other things, to *be* something else. Viewed from the perspective of the thesis, a move from *being* a producer of (*doing*) member-directed competitive sport activities to *being* a producer of (*doing*) non-competitive "social" activities consumed by non-members (i.e., Drive-in sport) could be considered as akin to the change required by a car manufacturer that seeks to diversify into the bicycle market. While such a change is not impossible, and I discuss numerous ways by which this might occur in Article 2, 3, and 4, this is quite a big leap. My point here is simply to further the notion of sport clubs' organizational identity as tied to the prevailing notion of sport's means and ends in the club, i.e., the understanding of what sport "is." However, notwithstanding that Drive-in sport is an unlikely direction for identity re-orientation for Competitive Sport Clubs, the activities are quite attractive as an *instrument* to further core activities. Indeed, apart from one, all clubs in the study *do* deliver Drive-in sport activities. Thereby, the Competitive Sport Clubs have taken on a task that runs counter to their self-identification in exchange for financial compensation. Thus, regardless of whether the clubs conceive of themselves as winners in the cost-benefit analysis, they have been *governed* into doing something they would not have done otherwise.

In that sense, the legitimization of Drive-in sport as crime-preventing activities, and the implementation of those activities by sport clubs, furthers the notion of organized sport as a tool whose *sole* purpose is to solve a societal problem. The emergence and organizing of Drive-in sport, therefore, constitutes a club-level example of the renegotiation of the "implicit contract" toward a result-oriented cooperation agreement noted by Norberg (2004, 2011). It also provides a sport related example of processes of change noted as being underway in Swedish local authorities' relationship to the voluntary sector (Johansson, 2005). As recognized throughout the thesis, Sweden is not the first country in which this development has taken place (e.g., Coalter, 2007; Green, 2007; Houlihan, 2005; Ibsen, 2002; Sam, 2009; Skille, 2009).

Sport clubs as policy implementers of wider societal goals (RQ 3)

As previously described, two important insights provided in Article 2 and 3 fed into the design of the study addressing RQ 3. First, sport clubs' self-identification, the conceived character of their core purpose and practice, structures what is conceived of as appropriate action. Second, "the inherent logic of sport" does *not* characterize *all* sport clubs' self-identification. There are other systems of meaning concerning sport's means and ends at work in Swedish voluntary sport. Taking these insights as a point of departure, RQ 3 is not concerned with club-level processes of change, but with clubs' readiness, willingness, and ability to respond to changes in the policy context. The resulting analysis provides us with an overview of the *variety* of self-identifications among Swedish sport clubs.

As proposed in Article 2 and 3, at any given time, the propensity of sport clubs to act as implementers hinges on whether the cultural material of a policy is conceived as appropriate raw material for organizational identity (re)construction. From this perspective, Article 4 provides an overview of the potential "matches" between current and possible future policy goals and the organizational identities of Swedish sport clubs. Following this line of argumentation, we argue that out of the 10 organizational identities constructed in the analysis, three of them (Group-of-Friends Clubs, Self-realization Clubs, and School Sport Clubs), together representing just below a 10th of the sample, are what could be termed *involuntary* voluntary sport clubs. That is, the perceived value of these clubs (as formal organizations) lies in the access gained to the competitive systems monopolized by various NSOs. This is an interesting finding in itself because it speaks to the structuring mechanisms of the overarching architecture of Swedish voluntary sport and the effects of the monopolistic position of the SSC. In more general terms, it reveals the idealization of sport (leisure) activities being provided within formal organizations affiliated with the SSC.

For six of the club types (Village Preservation Clubs, Non-competitive Sport Clubs, Social Fostering Clubs, Lifetime Sport Provider Clubs, High Performance Clubs, and Disability Sport Clubs), we hypothesize that there are potential matches between current and future policy goals and the clubs' self-identification. One should not, however, underestimate the difference between these types. By implication, what might be a "perfect match" for, say, Social Fostering Clubs, whose core purpose is to produce democratic, socially integrated citizens would be outside of what High Performance Clubs might even imagine doing, given that this club type's core purpose is to excel on the playing field. On the other hand, there is a potentially perfect match between the High Performance Clubs and elite sport initiatives that are

conceived to benefit both Sweden's and the club's success on the playing field. The purpose of this explication is not to provide a more precise governing tool, but to convey that perhaps the expectations on sport clubs' role as policy implementers need to be adjusted.

Importantly, the most represented club type in the sample is what we term the Sport Educating Clubs, comparable to the Competitive Sport Club in Article 3. This type signifies what is commonly assumed to characterize sport clubs, i.e., a core purpose oriented toward educating children and youth in the sport/s provided, a core practice that revolves around the preparation for and participation in the institutionalized competitive sport system, as well as a logic of action oriented toward the promotion and enhancement of the quality of the sport-specific education provided in the club and of the cohesion among members. For these clubs, almost any externally formulated policy goal would mismatch their self-identification. This is not to say that this, or any of the other club types for that matter, do not produce negative and/or positive—depending on the outlook—values and effects of various kinds beyond sport (e.g., social, economic, health, etc.). Indeed, and this is where the insights from the discussion relating to RQ 2 proves important, similar to the Competitive Sport Clubs engaged in the organizing of Drive-in sport, these clubs engage in an impressive amount of ancillary activities in order to generate funds to further their core practice, and they are very entrepreneurial in doing so. These clubs might, therefore, very well see potential to create income by adhering to policy initiatives that are linked to increased funding. In other words, they may be very responsive in situations in which the "cost-benefit" analysis works in their favor.

Another key insight provided in Article 4 is the normative function of the Sport Educating Club. This club type is the reference point for many of the other types, where they conceive of themselves as "different from the ordinary sport club." Conversely, representatives of the Sport Educating Clubs conceive of their club as "exactly like every other sport club." Arguably, this reveals that the institutional logic of competitive sport is quite significant in the organizational identity processes of Swedish voluntary sport. In other words, there is an institutionalized understanding of the legitimate means and ends of sport, what "real" sport "is." At the epicenter of this understanding is the institutionalized competitive system and the web of meanings and practices maintaining this system. However, there *are* other variants of understandings of sport's means and ends, efficiently illustrating that sport is not a phenomenon with a fixed, essential character. If we, like Thornton et al. (2012), conceive of organizational identities as the organization-level instantiation of institutional logics, this implies that these variants are instantiations of logics that are anchored in other spheres of the

Swedish society than the institutionalized competitive sport system. I will not explore this issue in depth here, but an illustration can be provided using the School Sport Club. The core purpose of this club is to enhance the image and appeal of the school to which it is affiliated, and its logic of action is to promote school visibility. Arguably, this organizational identity is anchored, not within the sports movement, but within the quasi-markets created subsequent to the decentralization and deregulation of the Swedish school system and the introduction of a voucher system (Blomqvist, 2004; Lund, 2008). Ferry (2014) argued that in this new school context, school sport has emerged as a tool to gain a competitive advantage. This is because a plethora of positive values and effects are ascribed to sport in the Swedish society, making a school sport profile a presumably effective marketing tool for schools in an increasingly competitive market where the go-after is the resources attached to each student the school recruits. In the prolongation, this discussion puts into question the use of the organizational field concept, at least as a theoretical mechanism. This will be developed in the final section of the chapter.

Yet another important insight provided in Article 4 is that, like in the theorization of Drive-in sport, the organizing of "regular" sport is constituted by processes wherein sport itself, as well as its participants, are conferred with meaning. This is evident in how sport clubs' self-identification is comprised by an interweaving of an understanding of conceived characteristics, needs, and wants of certain groups with a particular understanding of what sport 'is'. In other words, in sport clubs' identity formation processes, diverse versions of sport are "packaged" together with target groups. Since organizing is also a practice, this means that Article 4 provides a glimpse into the sports movement's ability to provide sport-for-all, one of the most long-standing and overarching objectives of both the sports movement and the state. In relation to this, I would like to note the opaqueness of the sport-for-all aim. What does it actually mean? Does it apply to Swedish voluntary sport in its entirety or to each and every sport club? As an illustration, a system-level interpretation of sport-for-all, i.e., an understanding of the sports movement as a whole as responsible for mass-participation, provides the opportunity to refer problems of recruitment and retention to "other types" of sport clubs. According to such a rationale, youth and adult beginners, for example, while clearly proscribed as target groups by the self-identification of the Sport Educating Club or High Performance Club, are at the core of the organizational identity of the Lifetime Sport Provider Club. Such a division of responsibility is feasible in theory. However, unfortunately—from a mass-participation perspective—aggregate level measures are nothing but the sum of local activities and sport clubs are distinctly local phenomena. Thus, in practice, whenever the sum of clubs

whose self-identification *pro*scribes the delivery of activities to adult beginners (for example) exceeds the amount of clubs whose self-identification *pre*scribes such activities, there will be a surplus of one type of activities and a deficit of another. This effect is amplified when we take into consideration that the supply of activities in any given geographic area is determined by the club "types" in that area. To be blunt: if there are no clubs in Umeå that provide competitive sport activities to adult female beginners, the adult female beginner living in Umeå is not really aided by the provision of such activities by clubs in Stockholm. My point here is not to provide a solution to any of these problems, but rather to point to my interpretation of the sport-for-all objective as somewhat ambiguous and of the Swedish sport movement as a rather fragile system for the delivery of that aim.

Concluding remarks and implications for practice

In this section, I provide some concluding remarks on the preceding analysis and offer some implications for practice. I will focus the account on two lines of argumentation: 1) organizing as policy implementation and 2) organizing as simultaneously symbolic and material. This is because these themes relate to the thesis as a whole and cut across all three research questions.

Organizing as policy-implementation

A key conclusion emanating from the thesis as a whole is that the organizing of Swedish voluntary sport is always and per definition public sport policy implementation. This is because the development of Swedish voluntary sport has been, and is, heavily dependent on public funding. In turn, the allocation of public funds has been dependent on the legitimacy of the sports movement in the eyes of the state that needs to be able to defend its spending to taxpayers (Norberg, 2004). It is from this outlook that I argue that the legitimization of Drive-in sport, by "citing" the contemporary sport policy climate, reveals the sports movement's recipient responsiveness. This responsiveness, however, pertains mainly to what Fahlén et al. (2014) termed the "surface" level of Swedish voluntary sport: the SSC and its regional extension, the RSFs. For these organizations, the furthering of practices such as Drive-in sport is appropriate *because* they display recipient responsiveness. However, it is beneficial to take into account in any policy implementation analysis that umbrella organizations are distinctly different organizations than their smallest constituent parts—the sport clubs. This recognition provides some further insight into the lack of development noted in evaluations and research covering The Handshake and The Lift for Sport (e.g., Engström, 2008; Fahlén & Karp, 2010; Fahlén et al., 2014). Indeed, as noted in Chapter 2 and 3, it could be argued that these initiatives, as almost any policy or program, ask the implementing organization to develop, i.e., change. Thus, inherent in such initiatives is an assumption that sport clubs

(will) seek to better themselves in the direction sought-after by organizations at the surface level. But, as noted by Fahlén et al., (2014) "central governance issued by the government and mediated by [the SSC] and the NSOs, fails to exert authority over the implementing actors, the sport clubs" (p. 12). I make the case that this is *not* mainly because sport clubs fail to understand what is expected from them, but rather because such initiatives ask them to *be* something else. Arguably, changing an organization's self-identification is much harder than clearly articulating a program and putting force behind it.

However, the picture is more complex than this. Indeed, another main conclusion of the thesis it that there are more than one "type" of sport club in Swedish voluntary sport. This finding is important from a basic research perspective because it prompts us to revise our assumptions of what sport clubs "are". From a policy implementation perspective, this finding means that there is an array of potential responses among sport clubs to current and future policy objectives. Arguably, at any given time, the readiness, willingness, and ability of sport clubs to act as implementers of policy aims depend on *either* the beneficial outcome of a strategically and instrumentally calculated "cost-benefit" analysis conducted by sport clubs *or* a fairly good "match" between the cultural material of an idea (embedded in a program or policy) and the organizational identity of sport clubs. In this latter case, the means and ends would not be conceived of as "external," but in alignment with the *raison d'être* of the club, as with the Social Sport Club's approach to Drive-in sport. An important implication of the former, as with the Competitive Sport Clubs' approach to Drive-in sport, is that clubs lend themselves to aims not formulated by the organization, i.e., a voluntary consignment of autonomy to external stakeholders and resource providers. In a way, as recognized in resource dependence (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), all resources linked to any type of aim and content will have this effect. Due to ongoing organizational identity dynamics, these processes might very well lead to organizational identity re-orientations.

The preceding analysis brings to attention several important questions that I believe need to be kept in mind when policies and programs are constructed *and* responded to. For example, in what way and with what effects are umbrella organizations, such as the SSC and the RSF, negotiating the means and ends of sport as they manage the inherent tensions in the performance of potentially conflicting aspects of their identities? Are sport clubs willing to engage in any kind of activities, given that the cost-benefit analysis works in their favor? What are the long-term implications of sport clubs lending themselves to externally formulated objectives? And, profoundly, *should* sport clubs be ready, willing, and able to act as implementers of externally

formulated policy objectives? Arguably, these are important points of discussion for any actor involved in the governance and provision of voluntary sport. A governance mode which increasingly specifies various policy aims and targets designated implementers puts the sports movement's integrity and the viability of the interventionist state to the test. This is because, I propose, at stake in processes where funding is tied to designated means and ends is the very definition and meaning of club sport. In the prolongation, these questions concern an even broader issue implicitly treated in the thesis: the role of popular movements, or, in contemporary terms (Reuter, Wijkström, & Meyer, 2014), civil society, in Swedish society.

Organizing as simultaneously symbolic and material
By placing analytic focus on organizations or, more precisely, organizing, the thesis has furthered the notion of organizing as a process worth examining *in its own right*. Organizing, from this perspective, is not simply the "frame" within which other—though equally important—processes (e.g., socialization into and through sport) take place, although organizing is that too. The employment of concepts from organizational institutionalism has availed for an account of the organizing of sport *as* processes wherein shared systems of meaning regarding sport's means and ends are expressed, created, reproduced, and changed. In relation to this, one might get the impression that processes related to the introduction of a new practice, in this case Drive-in sport, are more value-impregnated than those relating to extant practices. Indeed, the interpretive work connected to the confinement of legitimacy to a new practice more easily brings to the surface the typified social stock of knowledge (Schütz, 1967) invoked and added to in those processes. In regard to Drive-in sport, the analysis revealed systems of meaning that link (non-) participation in ("regular" and Drive-in) sport activities to conceived characteristics, wants, and needs of certain groups, in this case (male, immigrant) youth. However, interpretive work characterized by the coupling of participants to different versions of sport is, I propose, *as present* in sport clubs' extant organizational identities, i.e., the notion of "who we are and what we do" prevailing in the organizations. As opposed to in the interpretive work connected to the legitimization of new practices, the "package" is only more taken for granted (i.e., institutionalized) in the organizing of "regular" sport activities. Thus, I conclude, the organizing of sport is comprised by processes wherein the connection between sport activities of type X, Y, and Z are forged with participants of type X, Y, Z, producing different "sets" of conceptions on sport's means and ends, i.e., of what sport "is". Such typified categorization reveals the power to define reality that is inherent in processes of organizing. Indeed, it brings to attention how the organizing of sport, a seemingly "innocent" practice,

partakes in the definition and shaping of both the "players" and the "playing field" of social life.

This unveiling of the systems of meaning at work in the organizing of sport provides the opportunity to critically examine and reevaluate the manner in which questions are "asked" and "answered" in processes of organizing. As put forth in the introduction, examples of such questions are: "What should sport be?", "What should sport achieve?", "What should be achieved through sport?", "What are the appropriate means to achieve these aims?", and "Who should have the authority to prescribe the orientation and organizing of sport?" This concerns extant activities and various (new) ideas, programs, and initiatives that ask sport to develop, i.e., *change*. Indeed, given the magnitude of the Swedish sports movement, these questions must be considered within the wider context of the shaping of the Swedish population and Swedish society.

I suggest that the need to recognize these questions is even more acute given that, aside from being value-laden, organizing is also a practice with real consequences. As formulated by Zilber (2008, p. 152), "Meanings are encoded in structures and practices, while structures and practices express and affect those meanings." In other words, ideational aspects are externalized in the material side of organizing. This means that such processes have impact beyond sport. Drive-in sport activities, for example, are (or at least were) *de facto* offered in areas where there is a high percentage of youth with immigrant background and low socio-economic status. The notion that residents in these areas need to be "fixed," while those in other areas do not, is therefore very concretely realized through an externalization (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) of the gendered and ethnicized conceptions of the target group. I would claim, therefore, that Drive-in sport runs the risk of reaffirming the "otherness" of its participants. Arguably, any type of sport activity that is set up to "match" the conceived characteristics of a certain group runs this risk.[10] This suggests that one must tread carefully and remain critically aware when constructing policies and programs that target specific groups. However, the preceding reasoning applies to the organizing of various versions of "regular" sport activities identified in the thesis as well, where the (symbolic) coupling of sport activities of type X, Y, and Z to participants of type X, Y, and Z is realized materially in activity forms, resources allocations, training groups, and other very "real" structural expressions of systems of meaning.

---

[10] c.f., Svender, Larsson, and Redelius (2012) for an example of the discursive construction of "girls" in project applications concerned with gender equality in sport or Spracklen, Long, and Hylton's (2014) critique of claims of sport's ability to integrate new migrants by generating social capital).

Conceptual contributions to sport-related research and suggestions for future research

In this final section, I highlight three contributions that the thesis as a whole makes to sport-related research. In connection with this, I provide reflections on the methodology used, note the limitations of the study, and offer some suggestions on fruitful avenues for future research on the present topic.

Connecting sport policy implementation and sport organizing research

By proposing that the organizing of sport always and per definition is public sport policy implementation, I have made the connection between two research fields that have been surprisingly separate: research on sport organizations and sport policy research. In relation to this, I have demonstrated the importance of taking into account that sport is carried out in multi-level systems and that the organizations at various levels may be of very different character. Furthermore, using the translation and organizational identity concepts, I have theoretically conceptualized empirical observations in policy-implementation studies (e.g., Garrett, 2004; Harris et al., 2009; O'Gorman, 2011): the changeable character of ideas and the role played by the character of the implementing organization in shaping the implementation process. By conceptualizing the heterogeneity among sport clubs as variations of self-identifications, I have also put forth an alternative to the understanding of variation along a formalization continuum (e.g., May et al., 2013; Nichols et al., 2012). The study, therefore, constitutes an example of a cross-fertilization of perspectives on sport policy implementation and the organizing of sport, and I believe future research would benefit from engaging more extensively in such a cross-fertilization. Certainly, studies on the organizing of sport would benefit from taking greater into account an understanding of organizing as carried out in a multi-level system. Conversely, research on sport policies and programs that asks implementing organizations to change, would benefit from the theoretical concepts on organizations and organizational change provided within the organization theory paradigm.

Contributions to (sport-related) institutional research

The study makes several contributions to sport-related institutional research. In line with the call by Washington and Patterson (2011), my application of the theorization concept has allowed me to "zoom in" on the societally anchored yet social-constructionist micro-processes that constitute the knots and bolts of institutional maintenance and change processes. Previous sport-related institutional research has almost exclusively focused on the macro-processes related to, for example, shifts in logics. By placing

focus on the legitimization of a practice as a precursor to shifts in logics, I have "flipped the analytical coin" (Stenling, 2014, p. 12) and thereby revealed "a process in which organizational actors are not passive recipients of a practice, but rather active participants in the interpretive work needed to legitimize that practice" (Stenling, 2014, p. 12). Importantly, the advantage of the theorization concept is that it accounts for the intentionality and meaningfulness of actions while maintaining the understanding of actors and their interests as institutionally constituted (c.f., Chapter 3). Therefore, it does not resort to a methodologically individualist view of actors as somehow being able to evade or "escape the rules, routines, and norms of institutional fields" (Cooper et al., 2008, p. 687). To my knowledge, my employment of the theorization concept (Strang & Meyer, 1993; Tolbert & Zucker, 1999) is the first in sport-related research. In that sense, the study has introduced a conceptual tool that allows for a more nuanced analysis of institutional processes than the application of many other concepts in institutional research do (e.g., coercive, normative, and isomorphic pressures, DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). A drawback of this "zooming in" (as well as of the limited time over which I studied the theorization of Drive-in sport), is that I, in contrast to previous research on shifts in logics have not been able to account for "the further development of a practice which was theorized 'hard' at the point of its introduction" (Stenling, 2014, p. 12). Indeed, future studies would benefit from taking a more longitudinal approach to the study of processes of theorization. For example, the emergence of a practice that has reached an institutionalized state could be "traced backwards." Such an approach could gain insight into the manner in which theorizing modes shifts with societal climate.

Furthermore, previous sport-related institutional research has often focused on the organizational field level. By contrast, I have followed Zilber's (2008) advice to focus attention to organization-level processes of meaning, and the embeddedness of these processes in wider institutional dynamics of meaning. In relation to this, I have built on Skille's (2008) proposition to examine organizational processes from the perspective of the actor. Specifically, I have promoted the notion of institutionally constructed organizational identities (Glynn, 2008) in sport-related research. In doing so, I have furthered a depiction of organizational identity as internally defined yet institutionally productive and produced. Taking the perspective of the actor has effectively shown that organizations do the same thing, but for different reasons. Beyond being important in an applied sense, I believe this has implications for how we study and understand sport-related organizational processes. Put bluntly: we cannot take for granted that what seems to be the same, actually is. My proposition of organizational identities as organization-level instantiations of institutional logics (Thornton et al.,

2012) and my suggestion that many of the organizational identities constructed in this study (e.g., The School Sport Club) are anchored in spheres other than the sports movement has also put into question the usefulness of the organizational field concept in sport-related studies. At least, one should not start a study with the a priori assumption that organizations affiliated to a central body, such as the SSC, are "the same."

Promoting novelty in research approach

The validity of the claims put forth in the preceding rests, to great extent, on the rather large data-set employed in the thesis: 247 interviews with representatives of 233 organizations. Naturally, the inclusion of such a large number of cases in the study, particularly in the study reported on in Article 4, has been made at the expense of in-depth case studies. Although I maintain that the board is the main determinant of the club's organization and orientation (Hinings et al., 1996), it should be kept in mind that sport clubs are not solely constituted by those elected to govern them. In relation to this, future research could examine whether there is a unified conception of the club's organizational identity across the various levels of the club and, if not, what mechanisms could explain the shift in self-identification between various levels. For example, as shown by Engström (2012) and Karp (2000; 2010) in a Swedish context, and as pointed out by one of the reviewers of Article 4 (Stenling & Fahlén, 2014), individuals' habitus (Bourdieu, 1990) has great implications for their choice of sport clubs. Because of this, it would be interesting to explore whether organizational identities are connected to a particular habitus among the members. Are, for instance, Self-Realization Clubs constituted by individuals with a disposition (habitus) toward individualized training schedules and challenges in say, for example, triathlons? Such knowledge of the potential interplay between individual- and organization-level self-identifications would further explicate the fruitfulness of the organizational identity concept. It would also provide further insight into sport as a reproductive and segregating force in society.

The large amount of data included in the study, as well as the time limits of a PhD project, have also impeded the employment of a longitudinal study. In that sense, while I conceptualize organizational identity processes as a constant state of becoming, my study is confined to a temporal "slice" in the unfolding history of sport organizations. In relation to this, future studies could do a "life-history" analysis of such organizations. This could provide further insight into the recursive interplay between institutional conditions and processes of organizational identity construction. Indeed, these two features could be combined in an in-depth, multi-level longitudinal case study. Despite these limitations, the overall design of my studies has, arguably, contributed with a somewhat novel view of how to approach the

organizing of sport as an empirical object of inquiry. Regarding my study of the emergence and organizing of Drive-in sport (Stenling, 2013, 2014a, b), I would like to particularly highlight the use of the "follow the idea approach" (Lindberg & Erlingsdottir, 2005). The downside of this strategy is that it fails to identify and take into account those organizations that, for one reason or another, do not come in contact with or completely reject new ideas on organizing. On the other hand, the upside of the strategy is that it "ensures methodologically what is accounted for theoretically; that the travel of ideas on organizing may entail a (re)construction (i.e., translation) of the idea based on involved organizations' identities" (Stenling, 2014b, p. 60). Indeed, this point is related to an important conclusion of the thesis: that the legitimization of a practice (Stenling, 2014a) by no means guarantees that the practice will produce development in the implementing organizations (Stenling, 2013). This is because of the potentially different self-identifications of the various organizations involved in the implementation process.

With regard to Article 4 (Stenling & Fahlén, 2014), I would like to highlight the usage of a large-scale yet *qualitative* and *interpretive* study. This type of design provided the possibility of capturing the whole range of variation regarding a phenomenon, in this case self-identifications of sport clubs. In addition, and I believe this pertains particularly to research on organizations like sport clubs, telephone interviews—as opposed to questionnaires—are beneficial in producing a high response rate. Indeed, I am quite convinced that by using telephone interviews, we were able to get in touch with sport clubs that are highly unlikely to respond to a questionnaire. As an initial mapping, this type of design is, therefore, well-suited. Based on this initial charting, it would be interesting to conduct a follow-up on Stenling and Fahlén (2014) in, say, 5 or 10 years. Such a follow-up could be set up in numerous ways. For example, we could return to the very same sport clubs included in our sample in order to note organization-level changes while also probing into the institutional dynamics surrounding those changes. Furthermore, as noted in the article, I do believe that the organizational identities constructed in the study have analytical value for Swedish sport and—dare we say—the other Scandinavian countries whose sport systems and societies share many features with Sweden's. In that sense, the analytically constructed organizational identities are available for anyone to use in further research. One suggestion is to apply them in a questionnaire that empirically tests the correlation between organizational identity (independent variable) and the willingness to adhere to various sport policy goals (dependent variable).

To close, there is potential for many important and insightful studies on topics that are situated at the intersection of critical sport management, policy analysis, and the sociology of sport. Nevertheless, I hope that researchers as well as practitioners have found this thesis to have a heuristic and pragmatic value. That is, that I have succeeded in convincing you that the organizing of sport is comprised by processes set within a political context, that these processes continuously define sport's means and ends and therefore partake in the shaping of the Swedish population, the Swedish society, and organized sport's role in said society. In short, I hope that I have succeeded in convincing you that the organizing of sport *matters*, and that it matters *beyond* sport.

References

Agergaard, S., Michelsen la Cour, A., & Treumer Gregersen, M. (2015). Politicisation of migrant leisure: A public and civil intervention involving organised sport. *Leisure studies*.
Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2015.1009848

Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 263–295). Greenwich: JAI Press.

Alvesson, M. (2003). Critical organization theory. In B. Czarniawska & G. Sevón (Eds.), *The Northern Lights: Organization theory in Scandinavia* (pp. 151–174). Malmö: Liber.

Bacchi, C. (2009). *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Frenchs Forest: Pearson.

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. London: Penguin.

Bergsgard, N. A., & Norberg, J. (2010). Sports policy and politics: The Scandinavian way. *Sport in Society, 13,* 567–582.

Blomqvist, P. (2004). The choice revolution: Privatization of Swedish welfare services in the 1990s. *Social Policy & Administration*, *38*, 139–155.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis* (vol. 248). London: Heinemann.

CIF (Centrum för Idrottsforskning). (2013). *Spela vidare: En antologi om vad som får unga att fortsätta idrotta* [Keep on playing: An anthology on what makes youth remain in sport]. Stockholm: Centrum för Idrottsforskning.

CIF (Centrum för Idrottsforskning). (2014a). *Statens stöd till idrotten. Uppföljning 2013* [The government's support to organized sport. Follow-up 2013]. Stockholm: Centrum för idrottsforskning.

CIF (Centrum för Idrottsforskning). (2014b). *Etik och ekonomi i idrottsföreningar* [Ethics and economy in sport clubs]. Stockholm: Centrum för idrottsforskning.

Christensen, S., Karnoe, P., Strandgaard Pedersen, J. S., & Dobbin, F. (1997). Actors and institutions: Introduction. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 392–396.

Coakley, J. (2011). Youth sports: What counts as positive development? *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 35*, 306-324.

Coalter, F. (2007). *A wider social role for sport. Who's keeping the score?* London: Routledge.

Cooper, D. J., Ezzamel, M., & Willmott, H. (2008). Examining 'institutionalization': A critical theoretic perspective. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 673–701). London: Sage.

Cousens, L., & Slack, T. (2005). Field-level change: The case of North American major league professional sport. *Journal of Sport Management, 19,* 13–42.

Czarniawska–Joerges, B. (1994). Narratives of individual and organizational identities. *Communication Yearbook, 17*, 193–221.

Czarniawska, B., & Sevón, G. (1996a). Introduction. In B. Czarniawska & G. Sevón (Eds.), *Translating organizational change* (pp. 1–12). New York: De Gruyter.

Czarniawska, B. & Sevón, G. (Eds.). (1996b). *Translating organizational change.* New York: De Gruyter.

Dacin, M. T., Goodstein, J., & Scott, W. R. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal, 45,* 43–56.

DiMaggio, P. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment* (pp. 3–22). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociology of Review, 48,* 147–160.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction. In P. J. DiMaggio & W. W. Powell (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational institutionalism* (pp. 1–38). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Dir. 1996:84. Stöd till idrotten [Support to sport (Terms of reference for the public inquiry on government support to sports Dir. 1996:84)]. Stockholm: Inrikesdepartementet.

Ekström von Essen, U. (2003). *Folkhemmets kommun. Socialdemokratiska idéer om lokalsamhället 1939-1952* [The municipality in the people's home: Social democratic ideas about the local community 1939-1952]. Stockholm: Atlas.

Engström, L–M. (2008). *Forskning om Handslagets genomförande och resultat–en utvärderande sammanställning* [Research on the implementation and results of the Handshake: An evaluative summary]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet.

Engström, L–M. (2012). *Smak för motion. Fysisk aktivitet som livsstil och social markör*. Stockholm: Stockholms universitets förlag.

Esping–Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.

Ezzamel, M., Robson, K., & Stapleton, P. (2012). The logics of budgeting: Theorization and practice variation in the educational field. *Accounting, Organizations, and Society, 37*, 281–303.

Fahlén, J., Eliasson, I., & Wickman, K. (2014). Resisting self-regulation: An analysis of sport policy programme making and implementation in Sweden. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics.* Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1080/19406940.2014.925954

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*, 3–22.

Ferry, M. (2014). School sports is the solution: What is the problem? *European Journal for Sport and Society, 11,* 353–369.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach.* Boston: Pitman.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational institutionalism* (pp. 232–267). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Garrett, R. (2004). The response of voluntary sports clubs to Sport England's lottery funding: Cases of compliance, change, and resistance. *Managing Leisure*, *9*, 13–29.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Gioia, D. A., Patvardhan, S. D., Hamilton, A. L., & Corley, K. G. (2013). Organizational identity formation and change. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *7*, 123–193.

Glynn, M. A. (2008). Beyond constraint: How institutions enable identities. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 413–430). London: Sage.

Glynn, M. A., & Watkiss, L. (2012). Exploring cultural mechanisms of organizational identity construction. In M. Schultz, S. Maguire, A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *Constructing identity in and around organizations* (pp. 63–88). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Green, M. (2007). Governing under advanced liberalism: Sport policy and the social investment state. *Policy sciences*, *40*, 55–71.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., & Suddaby, R. (2008). Introduction. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 1–46). London: Sage.

Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 58–80.

Guba, E. G. (1978). *Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation*. CSE monograph series in evaluation, 99-0235846-2. Los Angeles: University of California.

Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. (1996). Political science and the three new institutionalisms*. *Political studies*, *44*, 936–957.

Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2008). Institutional entrepreneurship. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 198–217). London: Sage.

Harris, S., Mori, K., & Collins, M. (2009). Great expectations: Voluntary sports clubs and their role in delivering national policy for English sport. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *20*, 405–423.

Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hasselbladh, H., & Kalinikos, J. (2000). The project of rationalization: A critique and reappraisal of neo-institutionalism in organization studies. *Organization Studies, 21,* 697–720.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human relations*, *55*, 989–1018.

Hinings, C. R., & Greenwood, R. (1988). *The dynamics of strategic change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hinings, C. R., Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Kikulis, L. (1996). Values and organizational structure. *Human Relations, 49*, 885–916.

Hinings, C. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (2008). Organizational institutionalism and sociology: A reflection. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 473–490). London: Sage.

Hirsch, P. M. (1997). Review essay: Sociology without social structure: Neo-institutional theory meets brave new world. *American Journal of Sociology, 91,* 800–837.

Hirsch, P. M. & Lounsbury, M. (1997). Putting the organization back into organization theory: Action, change, and the "new" institutionalism. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 6*, 79–88.

Hjelm, J. (2013). *Den svenska statens stöd till idrotten 2012* [Review of the report The Swedish state's support to sport: Evaluation 2012]. Retrieved from http://idrottsforum.org/hjelm130911/

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

Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher, 19*, 2–9.

Ibsen, B. (2002). *Evaluering af det idrætspolitiske idéprogram* [Evaluation of the sport policy idea program]. København: Københavns Universitet og Institut for forskning i Idræt og Folkelig Oplysning.

Johansson, S. (2005). *Ideella mål med offentliga medel. Förändrade förutsättningar för ideell välfärd* [Non-profit goals and public funding. Changing conditions for non-profit welfare]. Stockholm: Sober förlag.

Karp, S. (2000). *Barn, föräldrar och idrott: En intervjustudie om fostran inom fotboll och golf* [Children, parents and sports: An interview study of ubringing as affected by soccer and golf] (Doctoral dissertation). Umeå: Umeå universitet.

Karp, S. (2010). Perspectives on the meaning of children's sport for adulthood. *European Journal of Sport and Society, 7*, 117–129.

Keat, R. A. & Sam, M. P. (2013). Regional implementation of New Zealand sport policy: New instrument, new challenges. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 5*, 39–54.

Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1992). Institutionally specific design archetypes: A framework for understanding change in national sport organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 27*, 343–368.

Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1995). Sector-specific patterns of organizational design change. *Journal of Management Studies, 32*, 67–100.

Klausen, K. K., & Selle, P. (1996). The third sector in Scandinavia. *Voluntas, 7,* 99–122.

Kulturdepartementet. (2014). *Uppdrag till Gymnastik- och idrottshögskolan, Centrum för idrottsforskning att följa upp statens stöd till idrotten*

[Commission to Swedish National Centre for Research In Sports to evaluate the state's support to sport]. Stockholm: Kulturdepartementet.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Larsson, S. (2005). Om kvalitet i kvalitativa studier [On quality in qualitative studies]. *Nordisk Pedagogik, 25*, 16–35.

Larsson, S. (2009). A pluralist view of generalization in qualitative research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 32,* 25–38.

Larsson, B., Letell, M., & Thörn, H. (2012). Transformations of the Swedish welfare state: Social engineering, governance, and governmentality. An introduction. In B. Larsson, M. Letell, & H. Thörn (Eds.), *Transformations of the Swedish welfare state: From social engineering to governance?* (pp. 3–22). New York: Pallgrave MacMillan.

Latour, B. (1986). The powers of association. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action, and belief* (pp. 264–280). London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.

Lawrence, T. B., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2010). *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1999). Establishing trustworthiness. In A. Bryman & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Qualitative Research,* vol. 3 (pp. 397–444). London: Sage.

Lindberg, K. & Erlingsdottir, G. (2005). Att studera översättningar. Två idéers resor i den svenska hälso-och sjukvården [Studying translations: The travels of two ideas in Swedish health care]. *Nordiske Organisasjonsstudier, 7*, 27–52.

Lindholm, J. (2014). *Idrottsjuridik* [Sports law]. Stockholm: Nordstedts juridik.

Lindroth, J. (1974). *Idrottens väg till folkrörelse. Studier i svensk idrottsrörelse till 1915* [Athletics becomes a popular movement: Studies in the Swedish athletics movement up until 1915] (Doctoral dissertation). Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

Lindroth, J. (2002). Idéer och debatter [Ideas and debates]. In J. Lindroth & J. Norberg (Eds.), *Ett idrottssekel. Riksidrottsförbundet 1903-2003* [A sport century: The Swedish Sports Confederation 1903–2003] (pp. 139–180). Stockholm: Informationsförlaget.

Lounsbury, M., & Crumley, E. T. (2007). New practice creation: An institutional perspective on innovation. *Organization Studies, 28*, 993–1011.

Lund, S. (2008). Choice paths in the Swedish upper secondary education: A critical discourse analysis of recent reforms. *Journal of Education Policy, 23,* 633–648.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*. New York: Free Press.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (2004). *The logic of appropriateness* (ARENA Working Papers WP 04/09). Oslo: University of Oslo, Centre for European Studies.

May, T., Harris, S., & Collins, M. (2013). Implementing community sport policy: Understanding the variety of voluntary club types and their attitudes to policy. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 5,* 397–419.

Meyer, R. E. (2008). New sociology of knowledge: Historical legacy and contributions to current debates in institutional research. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 519–538). London: Sage.

Meyer, J. W., & Jepperson, R. L. (2000). The "actors" of modern society: The cultural construction of social agency. *Sociological Theory, 18*, 100–120.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*, 440–463.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1983). The structure of educational organizations. In J. W. Meyer & W. R. Scott (Eds.), *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp. 71–98). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Meyer, J. W., & Scott, R. W. (Eds.). (1983). *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Mizruchi, M. S., & Fein, L. C. (1999). The social construction of organizational knowledge: A study of the uses of coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*, 653–683.

Montin, S., & Granberg, M. (2013). *Moderna kommuner* (4 uppl.) [Modern municipalities (4th ed)]. Stockholm: Liber.

Munir, K. A. (2005). The social construction of events: A study of institutional change in the photographic field. *Organization Studies, 26*, 93–113.

Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimate distinctiveness and the entrepreneurial identity: Influence on investor judgments of new venture plausibility. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*, 479–499.

Nichols, G., Padmore, J., Taylor, P., Barrett, D. (2012). The relationship between types of sports club and English government policy to grow participation. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 4,* 187–200.

Nielsen, J. A., Mathiassen, L., & Newell, S. (2014). Theorization and translation in information technology institutionalization: Evidence from Danish home care. *MIS Quarterly*, *38*, 165–186.

Nigam, A., & Ocasio, W. (2010). Event attention, environmental sensemaking and change in institutional logics: An inductive analysis of the effects of public attention to Clinton's health care reform initiative. *Organization Science, 21*, 823–841.

Norberg, J. (2002). Idrottsrörelsen och staten [The sports movement and the state]. In J. Lindroth & J. Norberg (Eds.), *Ett idrottssekel. Riksidrottsförbundet 1903-2003* [A sport century: The Swedish Sports Confederation 1903–2003] (pp. 181–298). Stockholm: Informationsförlaget.

Norberg, J. (2004). *Idrottens väg till folkhemmet. Studier i statlig idrottspolitik 1913-1970* [Sport's road to the welfare state: Studies in Swedish government policy toward sport, 1913-1970] (Doctoral dissertation). Stockholm: SISU Idrottsböcker.

Norberg, J. (2011). A contract reconsidered? Changes in the Swedish state's relation to the sports movement. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 3*, 311–325.

Norborg, L–A. (1993). *Sveriges historia under 1800- och 1900-talen. Svensk samhällsutveckling 1908-1992* [Sweden's history during the 19th and 20th century: The development of the Swedish society 1908–1992]. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Nordström, E. (2012). *Idrottslyftets externa utvärdering. Sammanfattande analys och slutsatser* [The external evaluation of the Sports Lift: Summarizing and analysis and conclusions]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet.

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*, 417–448.

O'Brien, D., & Slack, T. (2004). The emergence of a professional logic in English Rugby Union: The role of isomorphic and diffusion processes. *Journal of Sport Management, 18*, 13–39.

O'Gorman, J. (2011). Where is the implementation in sport policy and programme analysis? The English Football Association's Charter Standard as an illustration. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, *3*, 85–108.

Pallin, C. (2004). Idrottens organisation [The organization of sport]. In I. Broberg (Ed.), *Perspektiv på Sport Management* [Perspectives on sport management] (pp. 38–53). Stockholm: SISU Idrottsböcker.

Paramio–Salcines, J. L., & Kitchin, P. J. (2013). Institutional perspectives on the implementation of disability legislation and services for spectators with disabilities in European professional football. *Sport Management Review, 16,* 337–348.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource-dependence perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.

Prasad, A., & Prasad, P. (2002). The coming of age of interpretive organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *5*, 4–11.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildawsky, A. (1974). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland; or, Why it's amazing that federal programs work at all, this being a saga of the Economic Development Administration as told by two sympathetic observers who seek to build morals on a foundation.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Prop. 1970/79.

Reinfeldt, F., & Persson, M. (2013, March 12). Kräv mer av idrottsföreningarna [Demand more from sports clubs]. *Svenska Dagbladet.* Retrieved from http://www.svd.se/opinion/brannpunkt/krav-mer-av-idrottsforeningarna_7987380.svd

Reuter, M., Wijkström, F., & von Essen, J. (2014). Who calls the shots? The real normative power of civil society. In M. Freise, & T. Hallman (Eds.), *Modernizing democracy. Associations and associating in the 21st century* (pp. 71-82). New York: Springer.

Riksidrottsförbundet (n.d.). *Handslagets programförklaring* [The Handshake's program manifesto]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet

Riksidrottsförbundet (2009a). *Idrotten vill* [What sport wants]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet.

Riksidrottsförbundet (2009b). Drive-in idrott. Ny satsning på ungas villkor [Drive-in sports: A new initiative promoting youth's conditions in sports]. Retrieved from http://www.rf.se/Vi-arbetar-med/Pressrum/Pressmeddelanden2/Pressmeddelanden/Drive-in-idrott-ny-satsning-pa- ungas-villkor/

Riksidrottsförbundet (2010). *Idrotts-Sverige, en presentation av Riksidrottsförbundet* [Sports-Sweden, a presentation of the Swedish Sports Confederation]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet.

Riksidrottsförbundet (2013a). *Protokoll. Svensk idrott Riksidrottsmötet Luleå 2013* [Minutes. Swedish sports' general assembly Luleå 2013]. Retrieved from http://www.rf.se/ImageVaultFiles/id_46545/cf_394/Lule-_2013_-_Protokoll_med_bilagor.PDF Hämtat 2014-11-16 14:46

Riksidrottsförbundet (2013b). *Framtidens idrottsförening. Slutrapport* [The future sport clubs. Final report]. Stockholm: Riksidrottsförbundet. Retrieved from

http://www.rf.se/ImageVaultFiles/id_33841/cf_394/Framtidens_idrottsforening_slutrapport.PDF 2014-11-16

Riksidrottsförbundet (2014). Det ideella ledarskapet [The voluntary leadership]. Retrieved from http://www.rf.se/Idrottenssamhallsnytta/Detideellaledarskapet/

Rothstein, B. & Blomqvist, P. (2008). *Välfärdsstatens nya ansikte. Demokrati och marknadsreformer inom den offentliga sektorn* [The new face of the welfare state: Democracy and market reforms in the public sector]. Stockholm: Agora.

Sahlin–Andersson, K. (1996). Imitating by editing success: The construction of organization fields. In B. Czarniawska & G. Sévon (Eds.), *Translating organizational change* (pp. 69–92). New York: de Gruyter.

Sam, M. P. (2009). The public management of sport: Wicked problems, challenges and dilemmas. *Public management review*, *11*, 499–514.

Schatzki, T., Knorr Cetina, K., & von Savigny, E. (Eds.). (2001). *The practice turn in contemporary theory*. New York: Routledge.

Schütz, A. (1953). Common-sense and scientific interpretation of human action. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 14*, 1–38.

Schütz, A. (1967). *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Scott, W. R., Rueff, M., Mendel, P., & Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations: From professional dominance to managed care*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Selle, P. (1995). Idrætten og det offentlege: Ein familie? [Organized sport and the state: A family?] In K. K. Klausen & P. Selle (Eds.), *Frivillig organisering i Norden* [Voluntary sector organizing in the Nordic countries] (pp. 337–353). Oslo: TANO.

Sevón, G. (1996). Organizational imitation in identity transformation. In B. Czarniawska & G. Sévon (Eds.), *Translating organizational change* (pp. 49–67). New York: de Gruyter.

Sjöblom, P. (2006). *Den institutionaliserade tävlingsidrotten. Kommuner, idrott och politik i Sverige under 1900-talet* [Institutionalized competitive

sport: Municipalities, sport and politics in Sweden during the twentieth century] (Doctoral dissertation). Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis.

Sjöblom, P. (2011). *Kunskapsöversikt. Nutida samhällsrelaterad idrottsforskning i Sverige och några jämförbara länder* [Knowledge overview: Contemporary Society-related sports research in Sweden and a few comparable countries]. Stockholm: Sveriges Kommuner och Landsting.

Skille, E. Å. (2004). Sport for all? The 'Sports City Programme' in Norway. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics, 7,* 192-210.

Skille, E. Å., & Waddington, I. (2006). Alternative sport programmes and social inclusion in Norway. *European Physical Education Review, 12*, 251-271.

Skille, E. Å. (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. Å. (2009). State sport policy and voluntary sport clubs: The case of the Norwegian sports city program as social policy. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *9*, 63–79.

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*, 73–85.

Skille, E. Å. (2011a). The conventions of sport clubs: Enabling and constraining the implementation of social goods through sport. *Sport, Education, and Society 16,* 241–253.

Skille, E. Å. (2011b). Change and isomorphism: A case study of translation processes in a sport club. *Sport Management Review, 14*, 79-88.

Skille, E. Å. (2011c). Norges idrettsforbund–en ungdomsorganisasjon? [The Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of Sports–A youth organization?]. In D. V. Hanstad (Ed.), *Norsk idrett–indre spenning og ytre press* [Norwegian sport–endogenous tensions and exgenous pressure] (pp. 69–86). Oslo: Akilles.

Skirstad, B., & Chelladurai, P. (2011). For love and money: A sports club's innovative response to multiple logics. *Journal of Sport Management, 25,* 339–353.

Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1992). Understanding change in national sport organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6, 114–132.

Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1994). Institutional pressures and isomorphic change: An empirical test. *Organization Studies*, 15, 803–827.

SOU 1969:29. *Idrott åt alla. Betänkande avgivet av Idrottsutredningen* [Sport for all: Report delivered by the inquiry on sport (Official governmental report 1969:29)]. Stockholm.

SOU 1998:76. *Idrott och motion för livet. Statens stöd till idrottens och friluftslivets organisationer* [Sports and exercise for life: The government's support to sport- and outdoor life organizations (Official governmental report 1998:76)]. Stockholm: Inrikesdepartementet.

SOU 2008:59. *Föreningsfostran och tävlingsfostran. En utvärdering av statens stöd till idrotten* [Democratic and competitive fostering: An evaluation of the governmental support to organized sport (Official governmental report 2008:59)]. Stockholm: Kulturdepartmentet.

Spracklen, K., Long, J., & Hylton, K. (2014). Leisure opportunities and new migrant communities: Challenging the contribution of sport. *Leisure Studies*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2014.939989

Stenling, C. (2013). The introduction of Drive-in sport in community sport organizations as an example of organizational non-change. *Journal of Sport Management, 6,* 497–509.

Stenling, C. (2014a). The emergence of a new logic? The theorizing of a new practice in the highly institutionalized context of Swedish voluntary sport. *Sport Management Review, 17*, 507–519.

Stenling, C. (2014b). Sport programme implementation as translation and organizational identity construction: The implementation of Drive-in sport in Swedish sports as an illustration. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics, 6,* 55–69.

Stenling, C., & Fahlén, J. (2014). 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. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1177/1012690214557103

Stevens, J., & Slack, T. (1998). Integrating social action and structural constraints. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 33,* 143–154.

Stockholms stad. (2014). *Finansborgarrådets budgetförslag 2015* [Budgetproposal for 2015 from the Financial Commissioner of the City of Stockholm]. Stockholm: Stockholms stad. Retrieved from http://www.stockholm.se/budget

Strang, D. (1997, August). *Cheap talk: Managerial discourse on quality circles as an organizational innovation*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Toronto.

Strang, D., & Meyer, J. W. (1993). Institutional conditions for diffusion. *Theory and Society, 22,* 487–511.

Svender, J., Larsson, H., & Redelius, K. (2012). Promoting girls' participation in sports: Discursive constructions of girls in a sports initiative. *Sport, Education, and Society*, *17*, 463–478.

The Moderate Coalition Party. (2013). *Hälsosamma Sverige. Arbetsgruppens rapport till partistyrelsen* [Healthy Sweden. The working group's report to the party executive]. Stockholm: Moderata Samlingspartiet.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tolbert, P. M., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30*, 22–39.

Tolbert, P. M., & Zucker, L. G. (1999). The institutionalization of institutional theory. In S. Clegg & C. Hardy (Eds.), *Studying organization: Theory and method* (pp. 169–184*)*. London: Sage.

Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization Science*, *13*, 567–582.

Vetenskapsrådet. (1996). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning* [Ethical principles for research in the humanities and social sciences]. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Washington, M., & Patterson, K. (2011). Hostile takeover or joint venture: Connections between institutional theory and sport management research. *Sport Management Review, 14*, 1-12.

Wijkström, F. & Lundström. T. (2002). *Den ideella sektorn. Organisationerna I det civila samhället* [The voluntary sector: Organizations in civil society]. Stockholm: Sober förlag.

Wijkström, F. & Einarsson, T. (2011). *Från nationalstat till näringsliv? Det civila samhällets organisationsliv i förändring* (2 uppl.) [From nation state to market? Changes in the organizational life of civil society organizations (2nd ed)]. Stockholm: SSE Institute for Research.

Wikström, G., & Carlsson, G. (2015, April 15). Idrottsministern: Regeringen satsar 224 miljoner på idrott för nyanlända [The Sport Minister: The government invests SEK 224 million in sport for newly arrived immigrants]. *Metro*. Retrieved from http://www.metro.se/metro-debatt/idrottsministern-regeringen-satsar-224-miljoner-pa-idrott-for-nyanlanda/EVHodn!o3PEvxjKQX4o/

Willmott, H. (2011). "Institutional work" for what? Problems and prospects of institutional theory. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 20*, 67–72.

Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimating nascent collective identities: Coordinating cultural entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, *22*, 449–463.

Zilber, T. (2002). Institutionalization as an interplay between actions, meanings, and actors: The case of a rape crisis center in Israel. *The Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 234–254.

Zilber, T. (2008). The work of meanings in institutional processes and thinking. In Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism (*pp. 151–169). London: Sage.

Zucker, L. G. (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 726–743.

Österlind, M. & Wright, J. (2014). If sport's the solution, then what's the problem? The social significance of sport in the moral governing of "good" and "healthy" citizens in Sweden, 1922–1998. *Sport, Education, and Society, 19*, 973–990.

Acknowledgements

Some time ago, a friend of mine warned me against writing too long of a thesis acknowledgment. "Keep it short and not too emotional," he said, "it'll save you some embarrassment in a few years." However, given the immense gratitude I feel toward all the people that have, in one way or another, been part of this process, I believe I'm going to fail completely in keeping it short and unemotional. I'll simply have to deal with the embarrassment later on. So, without further ado, my deepest thanks to:

- The 247 interviewees, most of you sport volunteers, for letting me take up some of your valuable time. I admire and have the utmost respect for the work you do.

- My supervisors Tor Söderström and Josef Fahlén. Tor, your eye for research design issues has been very valuable throughout the project and your advice (almost) always turned out to be spot-on (I promise to include some Bauman I my future work). Thank you also for your positive attitude toward my capability and progression, giving me the sense that "it's almost finished". Josef, I owe so much of my interest in questions regarding the organizing of sport to you, and I am quite convinced that I would not have applied to grad school or made it through without your endless commitment, support, and constructive feedback. I hope that you've had as much fun as I have working together. In addition, I am grateful to both of you for general cheers along the way ("Bra jobbat Cissi!") and for not taking my setbacks as seriously as I did, especially when it felt like I was caught in endless rounds of manuscript revisions.

- Paul Sjöblom, who asked critical questions and gave valuable advice on my midterm seminar. I am indebted to you for much of my understanding of local authorities' roles in the organizing of sport.

- Mike Sam, for saying "Yes of course!" when I, out of the blue, asked if I could visit University of Otago, NZ, and for being such a great host during my three-week stay. Furthermore, I am so grateful that you, one year later, said "Yes of course!" when I asked you to be my final reader. I could not have found a more suitable reader and I owe much of my interest in and understanding of the policy aspects of the organizing of sport to you.

- Fanny. Imagine sitting across the hall from a person that is bright, committed, thorough, wise, AND super fun to be around. That's what work life has been for me this past year. I hope you know how much that has meant for me.

- All my "real life" friends, for hardly caring about my thesis work and for caring SO much for me. Your friendship means the world to me, without you I would be Lost.

- The Lindahls (Malin too!), for welcoming me into your fantastic family and for coming to the rescue when we need help.

- Stockholmsbumlingarna, for being family.

- Andreas, my darling, for loving me the way you do. We're halfway to proving Bengt Grensjö wrong, and my love for you deepens every day. I'm so proud of how we live our life and of our mutual commitment to everyday happiness.

- Bertil and Aldor, for coming into the world and thereby showing me what unconditional love truly feels like.

- Mom and Dad, for invaluable help with the kids and the house, but most of all for raising me into a person that believed she could pull through a project like this. I love you.

Well, that might very well be one of the longest acknowledgements in the history of time. Epic fail.

Umeå, 20 April, 2015

Cissi

Appendix 1: Interview guide, first round of data collection

1. Organisatorisk självförståelse [Self-identification]
   - Hur skulle du beskriva den här orten? [How would you describe this town?]
   - Hur skulle du beskriva din förening, vad är er kärnverksamhet? (Noggrant!) [How would you describe your organization, what are your core activities? (Very thorough!)]
   - Vad är din roll och dina uppgifter i organisationen? [What are your role and your tasks in the organization?]

2. Det ömsesidiga förhållandet mellan idotten och samhället [The interrelation between organized sport and the Swedish society]
   - Vilka funktion kan/bör den organiserade idrotten fylla i Samhället? Fyller den organiserade idrotten denna funktion? [What function does and/or should organized sport fill in Swedish society? Does organized sport fill this function?]
   - Vad gör den organiserade idrotten lämpad att fylla denna funktion? [What makes organized sport appropriate to fill this function?]
   - Vilket samhälleligt stöd kan den organiserade idrotten förvänta sig i utbyte mot detta? [What societal support can organized sport expect in return for filling this function?]
   - Hur skulle du beskriva relationen mellan idrottsrörelsen och kommunen på just denna ort? [How would you describe the relation between organized sport and the local authorities in this municipality?]
   - På vilket sätt stödjer kommunen idrottsrörelsen? [In what way does the local authority support organized sport?] Vad grundas detta stöd på? [What is the rationale for this support?]
   - Utvärderas detta stöd? Hur? [Is the support evaluated? How?] Kan en sådan uppföljning få några konsekvenser? (positiva/negative) [Are there ever any repercussions due to such evaluations? (Positive/negative)]
   - Vilka andra aktörer kan/bör bidra till idrottsrörelsens förutsättningar? [What other actors can/should contribute to the conditions of organized sport?]
   - Vad anser du rent allmänt om samarbeten mellan kommun och föreningsliv? [What is your general opinion on collaborations between the local authorities and voluntary sector organizations?]

- Är någon form/föreningstyp/verksamhet bättre lämpad för ett sådant samarbete? [Are there any form/voluntary organization/type of activities that are more appropriate to collaborate on?]
- Är din organisation inblandad i något sådant samarbete? Om så, beskriv det. [Is your organization involved in any such collaboration? If so, please describe it.]
- Utvärderas detta samarbete av någon av parterna? [Is that collaboration evaluated by any of the parties?]
- Kan det bli några följdverkningar, för någon av parterna, på grund av sådana utvärderingar? [Can there be any repercussions, for any of the parties, due to such evaluations? (positive/negative)]

3. Initieringen av Drive-in idrott i organisationen [The initiation and rationalization of organized spontaneous sport in the organization]
   - När och hur hörde du första gången talas om fenomenet organiserad spontanidrott? [When and how did you first hear of the phenomenon organized spontaneous sport?]
   - Hur gick det till när Drive-in idrott kom till er organisation? [How would you describe the introduction of Drive-in sport in your organization?]
   - Hur togs idén emot i organisationsen? [How was the idea received within the organization?] Vilka argument gavs för och emot engagemanget i organiserad spontanidrott? Av vem? [What arguments where given for and against an engagement with organized spontaneous sport? By whom?]
   - Vad gör er organisation till en lämplig aktör i organiseringen av Drive-in idrott? [What makes your organization an appropriate actor in the organizing of Drive-in sport?]
   - Känner du till någon liknande idé? (Historiskt/Nutid) [Are you aware of any similar ideas? (Historical/contemporary)]

4. Drive-in sport
   - Vad 'är' Drive-in idrott? [What 'is' Drive-in sport?]
   - Varför 'behövs' Drive-in idrott? [Why is Drive-in sport "needed"?]
   - Vad är syftet och målet med Drive-in idrott? [What is the purpose and goal of Drive-in sport?]
   - Riktar sig aktiviteterna till några särskilda individer/grupper? Om så, beskriv dessa. [Is Drive-in sport targeted at any specific individuals/groups? If so, describe these.]

- På vilket sätt liknar/skiljer sig Drive-in idrottsaktiviter från 'vanlig' föreningsidrott? [How is Drive-in sport similar/dissimilar to "regular" sport activities?]
- When is Drive-in sport "successful"?

5. Integreringen av Drive-in idrott med den befintliga verksamheten i organisationen [The integration of Drive-in sport with the organization's regular activities]
   - Vad är er organisations syfte och mål med medverkan i organiseringen av Drive-in idrott? [What is your organization's purpose and goal with being involved in the organizing of Drive-in sport?]
   - Hur skulle du beskriva din organisations inblandning i organiseringen av Drive-in idrott? [How would you describe your organization's involvement in the organizing of Drive-in sport?] Vad kan andra aktörer förvänta sig av er medverkan i organiseringen av Drive-in idrott? [What could other actors expect from your organization in the organizing of Drive-in sport?]
   - På vilket sätt liknar/skiljer sig Drive-in idrott från era övriga aktiviteter? [In what way is Drive-in sport similar/dissimilar to other activities?]
   - Vilket utrymme får Drive-in idrott i er organisation? (Antal inblandade/uppgifter/anledning till att just dessa personer gör dessa uppgifter) [What "space" is Drive-in sport awarded within your organization? (People involved/tasks/rationales for these particular persons' involvement)]
   - Finns det några riktlinjer nedskrivna i er organisation för hur man ska arbeta med Drive-in idrott? [Do you have any written guidelines on how to work with Drive-in sport?]
   - Vem i er organisation har mandat att fatta beslut gällande er inblandning i organiseringen av Drive-in idrott? [Who in your organization has the mandate to make decisions regarding your involvement in the organizing of Drive-in sport?]
   - Bidrar er organisation ekonomiskt till Drive-in idrott? (Om så, hur mycket och vad går dessa resurser till? Från vart tas dessa resurser?) [Does your organization contribute financially to the organizing of Drive-in sport? (If so, how much and what kind of expenses are these resources used for? From where are these resources drawn?)]
   - När är er organisation nöjd med er inblandning i organiseringen av Drive-in idrott? [When is your organization happy with the involvement in Drive-in sport?] Hur vet ni inblandningen är

'lyckad'? [How would you know that your involvement is successful?]

- Vilka andra aktörer är delaktiga i organiseringen av Drive-in idrott? (Varför just dessa? Vilka funktioner fyller de?) [What other actors are involved in the organizing of Drive-in sport? Why these particular actors? What functions do they fill?]
- Hur vet de olika aktörerna hur de ska förhålla sig till varandra? [How do the various actors know how to relate to each other?] Regleras samarbetet på något sätt? [Is the collaboration regulated in any way?]
- Vilken/vilka av de inblandade aktörerna har mandat att besluta om frågor gällande Drive-in idrott? (Vem 'äger' Drive-in idrott?) [Which of the involved actors have the mandate to decide in matters regarding Drive-in sport? (Who "owns" Drive-in sport?)]
- Avslutningsvis, är det något jag inte frågat om som du skulle vilja berätta? [Lastly, is there anything that I have not asked about that you would like to tell me?]

Appendix 2: Interview guide, second round of data collection

1. Föreningens kärnverksamhet [The club's core practice]
   - Hur skulle du beskriva din förenings kärnverksamhet? Vad består den av? [How would you describe your club's core practices? What are they characterized by?]

   - Hur skulle du säga att det visar sig i er organisations att detta är er kärnverksamhet? [In what way/s does this specific set of practices manifest itself in the organization?]

2. The club's engagement in ancillary activities
   - Förutom er kärnverksamhet, sysslar er organisation med något annat? Om så, beskriv för var och en av dessa kringverksamheter: [Besides your core practices, does your organization do anything else? If, so, describe for each of these ancillary activities:]
     - På vilket sätt de liknar/skiljer sig från er kärnverksamhet? [How they are similar/dissimilar to your core practices?]
     - Varför engagerar ni er i dessa? [*Why* does your organization engage in these ancillary activities?]
     - Om det är ett engångs- eller återkommande engagemang? [Are they a one-time or regular engagement?]

3. The identity distinguishing markers of the club
   - Kan du ge ett exempel på en organisation, vilken som helst, som *liknar* er? [Could you give an example of an organization, any type of organization, that is *similar* to yours?]
   - På vilket sätt liknar den er organisation? [In what way is this organization similar to yours?]
   - Kan du ge ett exempel på en organisation, vilket som helst, som *inte* liknar er? [Could you give an example of an organization that is *dis*similar to yours?]
   - På vilket sätt skiljer den sig från er organisation? [In what way is this organization *dis*similar to yours?]

Appendix 3: Illustration of coding procedure

Excerpt of raw data	Theoretically driven a-priori code	Emergent code
Areas X and Y are very immigrant dense, with these hormonal boys that need something to do. Otherwise, they will make a lot of mischief. That's a fact. (Sport club representative, data collection 1)	Problem/s constructed to legitimize Drive-in sport (RQ1/Article 1).	Society has a problem; Drive-in sport can solve it.
So you see why we want to do this [engage in Drive-in sport]? We know that there are a lot of talented youth out there, and there's no rule stating that you have to have played [organized sport] since you were a child to perform well. (Sport Club representative, data collection 1)	Rationale for engagement in Drive-in sport (RQ2/Article 3)	Instrumental rationalization
(In contrast to clubs in the city), we're used to solving problems on our own. We don't apply for or get any funding when, for example, our showers need renovating. We get together and talk about it and solve the problem by ourselves. In the end, that's a strength. We know that we're not dependent on anyone else, we just do it together. That's a strength in itself. We know that we're capable of carrying many things through. (Sport club representative, data collection 2)	Identity-defining marker/s (RQ3/Article 4)	Community-focused, self-sufficient and strong volunteer commitment