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Abstract

The aim of this research was to investigate the effects of Olympic inclusion on sport through the case study of trampolining in England. This was considered in terms of changes to elite trampolining, recreational trampolining and school trampolining across the dimensions of organisational structure, funding and support, and underlying policy. This has been achieved through constructing a primarily qualitative piece of work underpinned by a critical realist ontology and epistemology. 45 individuals involved in the sport of trampolining or working in the more general sport delivery system were interviewed using semi-structured interviews.

Most of the direct implications of the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympics have only affected the elite level of the sport. Adding trampolining to the Olympic programme was viewed as a very positive thing by interviewees involved in the sport because it was seen to improve the status of the sport. The forced merger of the British Trampoline Federation with British Gymnastics received significant criticism from former British Trampoline Federation members due to a perceived loss of power and autonomy. However this amalgamation did raise standards of governance and management in elite trampolining, as did increased expectations from organisations such as UK Sport. As a consequence of the increased professionalisation of the governance of elite trampolining, there is now more tension between paid staff and volunteers. Since the sport has been in the Olympic programme elite trampolining has benefitted from significant funding from UK Sport and also support from the English Institute of Sport and the British Olympic Association. Assistance from all three organisations is extremely ring-fenced and channelled towards the elite. For example, English Institute of Sport support is totally focussed on a very limited number of named individuals who compete at an international level. Funding from UK Sport is dependent on British
Gymnastics meeting ambitious performance targets in trampolining and so forms an incentive contract which has dictated the focus within the National Governing Body. Hence the balance between elite trampolining and sport for all has swung towards the higher echelon of the sport from both economic and structural perspectives.

Few benefits from trampolining being in the Olympic programme filter down to the recreational and school levels of the sport and those that have tend to be indirect impacts. This is partly due to a lack of coherent governance both within the sport and also in terms of the wider sporting landscape. Support given to recreational trampolining by English Gymnastics, Sport England and County Sport Partnerships, and support given to school trampolining by the British Schools Gymnastics Association, the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships appears to be relatively unaffected by trampolining being in the Olympics. Also there are more pressing issues and priorities in recreational and school trampolining which prevented the Olympic inclusion of trampolining having a greater impact. For example, at a recreational level there is often a shortage of trampoline clubs to cater for demand and similarly in schools there is often a lack of trampolines and trained teachers.
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Chapter One - Introduction

1.1) Research aims

The Olympic Games can be described as “the most powerful expression of international sport” (Segrave, 1988, p.149). So, will admittance of a sport to the Olympic programme have an effect on the sport’s development? There has been much research on the impact on the host city of holding the Games (for example Lenskyj, 2000). Research has looked at economic, social and environmental aspects using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. In London’s successful bid to host the 2012 Olympics, the Games are referred to as:

an unparalleled opportunity to achieve the sporting, cultural, economic, social and environmental objectives of the UK, London and its neighbouring regions (London Olympic Bid Commission, 2005, p.23).

But there has not been the equivalent level of research on sports joining the Olympic programme. Current research is fairly disparate looking at a variety of sports in a variety of countries and the limited number of studies only consider narrow aspects of how a sport has changed. For example, Villamón, Brown, Espartero and Gutiérrez (2004) predominantly looked at changes in the philosophy of judo post-Olympic inclusion. This and other studies will be considered further in Chapter 2. Thus there is a need for a more holistic understanding of the effect Olympic inclusion has on a sport. This requires considering changes across the sport from different perspectives.

This study considers how Olympic inclusion affects sport through the case study of trampolining in England. To address the gaps in current research and literature and to develop a more coherent picture of the implications of inclusion in the Olympics, the sport will be considered across the sport delivery system. Sport England (n.d.) defines the ‘sport delivery system’ to be the different agencies and organisations that play a part in delivering
opportunities for sport and active recreation. What is considered the ‘case’ in this study is discussed in more detail in Chapters Two and Four, but includes the National Governing Bodies (NGBs) for trampolining, UK Sport, Sport England, the Youth Sport Trust, the English Institute of Sport (EIS), the British Olympic Association (BOA), County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships. While there is some overlap and blurring of boundaries, British Gymnastics, UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA are responsible for the delivery of elite trampolining; English Gymnastics, Sport England and County Sport Partnerships are responsible for the delivery of recreational trampolining; and the British Schools Gymnastics Association (BSGA), the Youth Sport Trust, and School Sport Partnerships are responsible for the delivery of recreational trampolining. The roles and remits of these organisations will be discussed in Chapter Two. It must be acknowledged that the research and writing of this PhD occurred prior to the change in the United Kingdom government in May 2010 and the coalition government’s Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010 with its resultant consequential changes for the sport delivery system.

Also the definitions of ‘elite’ and ‘recreational’ will be discussed in Chapter Four, but for now it could be said that ‘elite’ refers to participants that compete at a national level and ‘recreational’ any participation below this level within a formal club structure.

Hence the sub-questions investigated were:

- How does Olympic inclusion affect elite trampolining in England?
- How does Olympic inclusion affect recreational trampolining in England?
- How does Olympic inclusion affect school trampolining in England?
Because the likely effects of Olympic inclusion would be felt across the sport delivery system it follows that this study needs not only to investigate how the system changes, but why it changes. In this respect elements of organisational, economic and policy analysis are required to understand the impacts. This leads to a second set of interrelated sub-questions looking at the changing nature of organisations responsible for delivering trampolining:

- How and why does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of trampolining in England and the relationship between these agencies? For example, has the governance of trampolining become more formal?

- How and why does Olympic inclusion affect the funding and support of trampolining in England? For example, priorities within organisations, benefits and costs.

- How and why does Olympic inclusion affect the interpretation and development of policies relating to trampolining in England in the organisations that are part of the delivery system? For example, if relationships and priorities have changed does that affect formal structures?

Table 1.1 gives a diagrammatic illustration of how the two dimensions of the study were combined.
Table 1.1 – Key aspects investigated to consider how Olympic inclusion has affected trampolining in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of trampolining</th>
<th>Aspect of change</th>
<th>Organisational structure</th>
<th>Funding and support</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elite trampolining</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of elite trampolining and the relationship between agencies? For example, has the governance of trampolining become more formal?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of elite trampolining and the relationship between agencies? For example, has the governance of trampolining become more formal?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the funding and support of elite trampolining? For example, will it receive more funding and support and if so will this influence the focus of the NGB?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the interpretation and development of policies relating to elite trampolining in the organisations that are part of the delivery system? For example, do British Gymnastics’ policies have a focus on Olympic disciplines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational trampolining</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of recreational trampolining and the relationship between agencies? For example, will the balance of priorities between elite sport and sport for all change?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of recreational trampolining and the relationship between agencies? For example, will the balance of priorities between elite sport and sport for all change?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the funding and support of recreational trampolining? For example, will any changes to the support of elite trampolining affect support at this level too?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the interpretation and development of policies relating to recreational trampolining in the organisations that are part of the delivery system? For example, will policy relating to recreational sport be influenced by whether a sport is in the Olympics or not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School trampolining</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of school trampolining and the relationship between agencies? For example, will there actually be any change demonstrated at this level?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of school trampolining and the relationship between agencies? For example, will there actually be any change demonstrated at this level?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the funding and support of school trampolining? For example, will any changes to the support of elite trampolining affect support at this level too?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the interpretation and development of policies relating to school trampolining in the organisations that are part of the delivery system? For example, will policy relating to school sport be influenced by whether a sport is in the Olympics or not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2) Rationale for investigation

Trampolining was selected as a case study sport to investigate the effect of a sport becoming an Olympic sport upon the sport delivery system because: it is a fairly mainstream sport and it is a sub-discipline of the established Olympic sport of gymnastics so it is possible to have an element of internal comparison between disciplines of gymnastics. This section will explore this reasoning further. Furthermore because trampolining made its Olympic debut at Sydney 2000 and it also appeared in Athens 2004 and Beijing 2008; what the sport was like prior to Olympic inclusion is still within recent memory but equally it has been in the Olympic programme for significant time for changes to have occurred. For ease of access and language, trampolining in England has been examined. The focus is on England, as opposed to the UK, since sport is a devolved area of public policy and “many structures – such as Lottery funds and sports organisations - have a home country remit” (Carter, 2005, p.6).

Elite gymnastics, and in turn trampolining, have well established governing bodies – internationally, the Federation Internationale de Gymnastique (FIG), and in England, British Gymnastics. Prior to Olympic inclusion trampolining had a separate governing body structure and this will be discussed further in Chapter Two and the implications of this discussed in Chapters Five to Seven. Trampolining is practiced recreationally and more competitively by children and adults in local clubs, schools and universities. i.e. trampolining is a mainstream sport and practiced through a fairly standard club structure. This was an important criteria in selecting trampolining to study the effects of a sport becoming an Olympic sport upon the nature of that sport in a England, since alternative sports may have a different relationship with the Olympics than more mainstream ones and the development of the sport within the country may also differ as demonstrated through the example of snowboarding discussed in section 2.4.
Trampolining is considered a discipline (a branch of a sport) of gymnastics, together with artistic gymnastics, rhythmic gymnastics, sports acrobatics, tumbling, sports aerobics and DMT (double mini trampoline). See Appendix One for an explanation of what the different disciplines of gymnastics involve. For a discipline to be accepted into the Olympics it “must have a recognised international standing” (IOC, 2004a, p.89) and “the standards for the admission of disciplines are the same as those required for the admission of Olympic sports” (IOC, 2004a, p.89). Gymnastics, or rather artistic gymnastics, competitions for men appeared in the first of the modern Olympics in Athens in 1896 and events for women were added in the Amsterdam 1928 Games, so it is a longstanding Olympic sport. Rhythmic gymnastics joined the Olympic programme for gymnastics in the Los Angeles 1984 Games. The Federation Internationale de Gymnastique (FIG) would like to introduce some of the other disciplines into the Olympics. However considering the overall balance of sports present, the Olympic Programme Commission “does not recommend the admission of additional gymnastics disciplines” (2002, p.16) apart from as a replacement for one of the existing disciplines. Thus the existence of disciplines of gymnastics which are not currently in the Olympic programme offered a degree of internal comparison to better assess which changes in the nature of trampolining in England were due to it becoming an Olympic sport and which were due to concurrent changes in sport and gymnastics.

Thus there is significant justification for selecting trampolining as the case study sport. The rationale behind picking a case-study approach to enquiry has been discussed in Chapter Four.
1.3) Thesis structure

This section will briefly describe the content of each chapter of the thesis, identifying the purpose of the chapter and how it helps to answer the research questions.

The next chapter, Chapter Two, is a review of the relevant empirical literature. The key aspects covered are the background to the Olympics; the Olympic sporting programme; existing literature regarding the effect on sports of them joining the Olympic programme; the history and development of trampolining; an overview of the current structure of sport in England; key policy documents; and an overview of school trampolining and gymnastics. This chapter offers further justification for the research question selected and also provides a contextual background to the Olympic Games and current sporting landscape in England to understand the environment in which any changes due to Olympic inclusion take place.

Chapter Three then discusses the theoretical constructs that will be used when analysing why changes have occurred in the sport delivery system. Concepts from organisational theory, economic theory and policy theory were identified as the most relevant bodies of knowledge to highlight areas to investigate and also to place findings in a theoretical context. Power theory has also been considered because it intersects with the other theoretical constructs used.

The methodology for the research is discussed in Chapter Four. The chapter begins with and description and justification for the ontological and epistemological stance adopted and also how theory is used in the study. It proceeds to discuss why a case study approach was the most appropriate strategy to take and then finally discusses the methods of data collection used. In particular, an explanation of why interviews were the predominant source of data collection and supplemented by written
sources is given. The practical details of data collection are reported and a discussion of the data quality, both in terms of reliability and validity, is also given.

The data collected is discussed and analysed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. Chapter Five considers how Olympic inclusion has affected elite trampolining in England; Chapter Six considers how Olympic inclusion has affected recreational trampolining in England; and Chapter Seven considers how Olympic inclusion has affected school trampolining in England. Each chapter is structured to examine organisational impacts, economic impacts and policy impacts – these are then drawn together in an overall conclusion.

Chapter Eight draws together the conclusions related to elite trampolining (Chapter Five), recreational trampolining (Chapter Six) and school trampolining (Chapter Seven) and uses theory to provide an overall account of how the sport delivery system is affected. Thereby providing an answer to the overall topic of investigation:

The effects of Olympic inclusion on sport:
the case of trampolining in England.

The thesis ends with a conclusion which, as well as offering an overview of the study, considers the contribution of this research study to knowledge, the limitations of this research and consequential implications for future research.
Chapter Two - Review of literature

2.1) Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to addressing the research aim of this thesis, which is to examine the effects of Olympic inclusion on the sports delivery system in England by considering the case of trampolining. Firstly section 2.2 offers a brief background to the Olympic Games to provide context. Section 2.3 then gives an overview of how sports are admitted to the Olympic programme. The limited existing literature regarding the effect of joining the Olympic programme on sports is then reviewed in section 2.4. This section reveals the need for further research in the area, thereby identifying the gap in the literature addressed by this thesis. Finally, an overview of the current sport structure in England is given to set the detailed context of the research undertaken. Recent policy documents and initiatives are discussed in section 2.5. Then in section 2.6 the consequential sports delivery system is explored from an organisational and economic perspective. A history of the development of the sport of trampolining, culminating in the current context, is given in section 2.7. This makes reference to the generic sports delivery system covered in sections 2.5 and 2.6. Details of school trampolining are covered in section 2.8, in terms of educational policies and initiatives which influence it in addition to the sports related documents already discussed. School trampolining is considered as a separate section at the end of this chapter because it is strongly influenced by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) as well as the wider sporting landscape. In addition to acknowledging a gap in current research, this chapter also identifies the sampling unit to be investigated and indicates some of the themes and tensions that are researched, such as conflict between elite sport and sport for all.
2.2) Background to the Olympics

Coubertin was fundamental in reviving the Olympic Games and augmenting the first of the modern Games in Athens in 1896 (Olympic Museum and Studies Centre, 2002a; Lucas, 1992; Diem, 1957; and Coubertin, 1931). He introduced fundamental principles that are still adhered to today which are:

- the interval of four years,
- the exclusively modern character of the events,
- the exclusion of school sports, and finally the appointment of an International Committee (1931, p.12).

The programme of sports in the first Olympic Games consisted of gymnastics, athletic sports, fencing, shooting, yachting, rowing, swimming, cycling, riding and athletic games (tennis). The sports included have changed over time. Changes to the sports in the Olympic programme will be discussed in section 2.3 with a focus on the process by which sports are selected for inclusion.

Many athletes view the Olympic Games as more than a “sum total of World Championships” (Diem, 1954, p.20). For example one athlete said:

I took part in a lot of world championships and I won several medals, but I never felt the same as I did when I was at the Olympic Games (Nesticky, 1985, p.1).

And another argued:

a World Championship gold medal may not be quite the same as an Olympic gold but it has rightly become a pretty good consolation prize, and anyone who has won both is a champion indeed” (Coe, 1996, p.102).

Hence it could be proposed that among athletes the Olympic Games is considered the world’s premier sporting championships.

The Olympics raises other important issues to researchers since:

- the Olympic Games are no longer – if they ever were – just a sporting event: they are cultural, political and economic phenomena (Toohey and Veal 2007, p.6)

Culturally, the Games have “been carefully orchestrated to portray ‘high’ values” (Warnsley, 2004, p.213) and it has been argued by Warnsley that
they are “ethically and morally situated above such competitions as the World Cup of football” (2004, p.213). Moreover, Tomlinson claimed that the Olympic Games have “produced the highest television viewing figures in the history of the world” (2000, p.170) though no data was cited. From a political and economic perspective, countries compete to hold the Games because it has been connected to economic and regional development (for example London Olympic Bid Commission, 2005). There has also been extensive research on the negative impacts on host cities too (for example Lenskyj, 2000).

Furthermore, sports also lobby to be in the Olympic programme so must see a clear benefit to it. However, the impact of inclusion on sports delivery systems and individual sports is not well understood. Due to the perceived importance of the Olympics, as discussed in this section, investigating the effect of Olympic inclusion on a sport is a valid area for research. The limited existing research looking at the impacts on sports of inclusion in the Olympics will be discussed in section 2.4.

### 2.3) The Olympic sporting programme

It has been widely noted that a key factor in the success of the Olympic Games is the Olympic Programme, and any changes in the structure or content of the Olympic Programme must result in a benefit for the Olympic Movement (Felli, 2003, p.45).

According to Cashman the Olympic Games programme is “a loosely integrated smorgasbord of events” (2004, p.129) consisting of a variety of sports. This section considers how the current Olympic programme has been derived.

In the early days of the revival of the Games Coubertin “reached agreement of the principle of the equality of sports” (1931, p.13). Although
it may be argued that this was more of a theoretical than practical equality since authors such as Coe asserted that “for a full century, now, the track-and-field programme has been the jewel in the Olympic crown” (1996, p.116) and Diem called athletics “the uncrowned queen” (1954, p.20). Correspondingly, other sports are seen as less important:

except for the Olympics, when the team represents the nation and can add a medal to the count, who watches volleyball or luge or dressage?

(Guttmann, 1988, p.440).

Whilst the definition of ‘a sport’ might be problematic more generally in terms of boundaries, the Olympic Programme Commission made it clear that “‘mind sports’ [such as bridge and chess] should not be eligible for admission to the Olympic Programme” (2002, p.8).

Initially the Olympic Charter:

laid no absolute obligations either on the organisers or on the International Olympic Committee, except as regards the compulsory sports categories

(Coubertin, 1931, p.60).

The compulsory sports were athletics, gymnastics, combat sports, nautical sports and equestrian sports and there were a range of optional sports that the host could choose from. This initial freedom meant there was significant change in the programme between one Olympics and the next – see Appendix Two for a list of past, present and future sports on the programme of the Summer Olympic Games.

Today, one of main prerogatives of the IOC Session (a meeting scheduled for IOC members during a non-Olympic year) is to decide “on the inclusion or exclusion of a sport on the programme of the Olympic Games” (IOC, 2005b, p.1). The summer Games must include at least fifteen sports and there is no current mandate for the winter Games in terms of number of sports. During its Extraordinary Session in Mexico in 2002, the IOC decided to restrict the Games of the Olympiad (i.e. Athens 2004) to 28 sports and subsequently after each Olympic Games review the programme for future Games. The programme review is done by a vote and a two-thirds majority must be achieved for a sport to be introduced.
into the Games or remain in the Games. The criteria for a sports inclusion in the Olympics can be seen in Appendix Three. Broadly speaking, Rules 46 and 47 of the current Olympic charter help to determine which sports are included in the Olympics (IOC, 2004a) and are summarised in Table 2.1. Also, while not explicitly stated, “consideration of women’s participation is an important principle” (Felli, 2003, p.44) when reviewing changes. Furthermore, the editors of the International Sports Law Journal argued that when deciding which sports should be included in the Olympic programme the IOC “must take into account the value that the sports add to the Olympic Games” (2009, p.139). ‘Value’ is now believed to mean ‘commercial value’ rather than ‘sporting value’ since the Olympics are “a multi-million dollar money spinner for the IOC” (International Sports Law Journal, 2009, p.139).

Table 2.1 - Criteria for analysing sports for inclusion into the Olympic programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for inclusion into the Olympic programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be included in the programme of the Olympic Games, an Olympic sport must conform to the following criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only sports widely practised by men in at least seventy-five countries and on four continents, and by women in at least forty countries and on three continents, may be included in the programme of the Games of the Olympiad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only sports widely practised in at least twenty-five countries and on three continents may be included in the programme of the Olympic Winter Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only sports that adopt and implement the World Anti-Doping Code can be included and remain in the programme of the Olympic Games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sports are admitted to the programme of the Olympic Games at least seven years before specific Olympic Games in respect of which no change shall thereafter be permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taken from IOC, 2004a, p.89.)

The support of International Federations (IFs) for sports included in the Olympics is mandatory:

the IFs governing the sports included in the programme of the Olympic Games must confirm to the IOC their participation in the respective Olympic Games not later than at the time of the IOC Session which elects the host city for such Games (IOC, 2004a, p.91).

Each sporting association “is responsible for the technical control and direction of its sport at the Olympic Games” (IOC, 2004a, p.92). This
includes all elements of the competitions such as the schedule, field of play, training sites and ensuring all equipment complies with its rules. According to Cashman, tug-of-war was dropped from the Olympic programme after 1920 because “it lacked an international federation to defend its interests” (Cashman, 2004, p.129). Felli (the Olympic Games Executive Director) highlighted how the IOC still identified principles for the selection of Olympic athletes “in order to have a consistency between the systems for each sport” (2003, p.43); these are given in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 - Sports systems identified by the IOC to ensure consistency in competition between sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports systems identified by the IOC to ensure consistency between athletes competing in different sports:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● The qualification systems must allow the participation of the best athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The principles of universality shall be reflected in each qualification system, principally through continental representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Athletes / teams shall have more than one opportunity to qualify, however the qualification systems should not necessitate extensive and expensive travel requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● In most cases only existing events should be used for qualification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The qualification period should usually cover a maximum of a two-year period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taken from Felli, 2003 p.43.)

If one considers the recent summer Olympics, in Sydney 2000 the following new sports were added: weightlifting, modern pentathlon, taekwondo and triathlon; the new discipline of trampoline was included; and also several additional events were added and others modified. Cashman argued that “while politics was obviously a factor in the selection of taekwondo [judo was the only Asian sport included before Sydney 2000], taekwondo could not have achieved this status without some degree of global spread” (2004, p.122). From Sydney 2000 to Athens 2004 no new sports were added although some events were modified. Fourteen sports applied for admission to Athens but none were accepted - waterskiing met all the conditions but still was not included (Cashman, 2004). “The Olympic Games, it seems, have reached saturation point”
(Cashman, 2004, p.125); new sports can only be added in the future if some existing sports are lost. The non-inclusion of baseball and softball in the London 2012 Olympics allowed the IOC members to vote on the inclusion of two new sports for the Games (IOC, 2005a). Despite the Olympic Programme Commission (2002) recommending golf and rugby sevens for inclusion in Beijing 2008, and investigating these and three other ‘non-Olympic’ sports (roller sports, squash and karate) for inclusion in London 2012, none received the two-thirds majority vote necessary for inclusion (IOC, 2005a, p.1).

The Olympic Programme Commission admitted that moving a sport in and out of the Olympic Programme would “cause challenges for current Olympic sports” (2002, p.6) and particularly “for the long-term planning of more developed NOCs and national sports organisations” (2002, p.6), exacerbated by “the heavy dependence of some Olympic IFs on IOC funding” (2002, p.6). The effect would be especially problematic if some sports were included in the Olympics on a cyclical basis. Even for established Olympic sports there is a need to ensure the Games is congruent with the sport specific competition structure (for example timing to avoid overload). If Olympic recognition is so central to the planning and delivery of sport, then changes to the Olympic programme will have strategic implications. This is what this thesis seeks to address.

2.4) Existing research on the effect on sports of joining the Olympic sporting programme

Despite the potential strategic importance to a sport of inclusion in the programme of the Olympic Games, there is little research on the impact on sports of joining the Olympics. This section summarises the existing research looking at the reported impacts on judo, taekwondo, curling, snowboarding and triathlon. The findings from each article have been
considered under the themes of impacts on policy, organisational impacts and economic impacts to reflect the sub-questions considered within this thesis. Most of the existing research considers changes from a broadly organisational perspective, so this aspect will be reviewed first. There is also some limited coverage of the economic impact of Olympic inclusion but no mention of policy change is given in the existing research. Lastly, the methodologies adopted will also be considered.

Villamón, Brown, Espartero and Gutiérrez (2004) considered some of the changes to judo from a sociological perspective in its process of transformation from a Budo based martial art (where attention is given to development of the mind as well as the physical aspects of fighting) into a modern competitive spectator sport. They considered the period from 1946 until the Sydney Olympics; thus looking at changes prior to judo being recognised as an Olympic sport as well, since it became an Olympic sport in 1964. Their investigations reveal “a judo that stands in direct contrast to that initiated by judo’s founder, Jigoro Kano” (Villamón et.al, 2004, p.140). Jigoro Kano believed that judo should never become one of the Olympic sports because it would be detrimental to the philosophy of the sport. The central theme to emerge from their analysis is how the social forces of internationalization, institutionalization and commodification contributed to the modernization process of judo, taking it away from the philosophical principles on which it was originally conceived. Villamón et.al. (2004) also looked at changes in the nature of the sport. They cited statistics which revealed that the use of judo control techniques (katame-waza consisting of hold-downs, arm lock and strangleholds) were in decline and believed part of the reason for this was changes in the design of suit worn which made these moves more difficult. They felt this represented a “serious loss to judo” (Villamón et.al., 2004, p.149). Though not acknowledged by the authors, the article implied that the most fundamental changes to the nature of judo took place prior to it being made an Olympic sport, and it was possibly only due to these
changes that it was feasible to incorporate judo in the Olympic sport programme.

Niehaus (2006) also investigated the implications of Olympic inclusion on judo. However his focus was on how including judo in the Olympic programme “played a dominant role in the reconstruction of post-war cultural and rational Japanese identity” (Niehaus, 2006, p.1173). Niehaus paints a more positive account of judo’s inclusion into the Olympics referring to it as a symbol of “the fundamental rehabilitation of Japan as a nation” (2006, p.1173) and something which had been pressed for by Europe and the United States as well as Japan. For Japanese nationals “tradition became once again a reference of and source for a cultural and national self-identity” (Niehaus, 2006, p.1181). Despite this, Niehaus (2006) also raised concern over fundamental changes and ‘westification’ to the nature of the sport. Furthermore, before judo was admitted to the Olympic programme there was conflict between the International Judo Federation (formerly the European Judo Union) the International World Judo Federation (originating in Japan) over which one would be recognised by the IOC (Niehaus, 2006).

Taekwondo was the second martial art (and also only the second sport of non-western origin) to be included in the Olympic programme and first featured in the Sydney 2000 Olympics. Allegedly “taekwondo specialists are head-over-heels with joy” (The Economist, 1994, p.121). However, like judo, the sport changed to fit western ideas of sport (The Economist, 1994). Also it was argued that “exclusive control of the sport is likely to slip from South Korean hands” (The Economist, 1994, p.121) in terms of rising above black-belt because this can now be assessed outside of South Korea. Furthermore, Cashman asserts that taekwondo “has increased its global spread in recent decades” (2004, p.122) but no evidence is cited in terms of global participation or spectator levels.
Wieting and Lamoureux (2001) investigated the nature of curling in Canada since the sports inclusion in the 1998 Winter Olympics. Again a key theme to emerge is the:

- tension that persists between the need to maintain the purity of the sport’s history and integrity in Canada (and other countries where it is a durable sport) and the attempts to make it a popular and marketable sport in other countries (Wieting and Lamoureux, 2001, p.141).

This echoes the difficulties with maintaining the integrity of the sport yet at the same time making it accessible throughout the world as discussed by Villamón et.al. (2004) and Niehaus (2006) in relation to judo and the Economist (1994) in relation to taekwondo. Wieting and Lamoureux (2001) also looked at other aspects of organisational change in terms of the spread of the sport as a result of Olympic inclusion. Wieting and Lamoureux argued that “attendance at the yearly national championships has grown steadily as has the volume of television coverage” (2001, p.147) and “grass-roots participation figures and consumption patterns suggest the continuing popularity of the sport” (2001, p.147). However, no evidence is cited to support either of these assertions. Also, the popularity could instead be ascribed to Canada’s history of curling success and the fact it is an established sport within the country. Furthermore by contrast, the authors describe how in the past in America there have been interscholastic high school programs for curling in Minnesota and Wisconsin but “the numbers of institutions and participants involved have waned in recent years” (Wieting and Lamoureux, 2001, p.149).

As well as curling, snowboarding also made its debut at Nagano 1998. However the issues reported were quite different from those involved in curling. Prior to the Games, Lidz commented that:

- worlds will collide in February when snowboarding makes its debut at the sporting nexus of nationalism, politics and Big Money: the Winter Olympics (1997, p.114).

When Lidz interviewed Haakonsen, the ‘freestyle master’, Haakonsen emphasised how “snowboarding is everything the Olympics isn’t. I don’t really want to be part of them” (Haakonsen, cited in Lidz, 1997, p.114).
Another aspect of controversy mentioned by Lidz (1997) is that the IOC chose the Federation Internationale de Ski to oversee Olympic snowboarding rather than the International Snowboard Federation, the sport’s original governing body.

Humphries (1997) also wrote about the impacts of Olympic inclusion on snowboarding. According to Humphries (1997) snowboarding has always been considered an ‘alternative sport’ and so disapproved of by ‘mainstream sports’ and the ‘general public’. Initially, “competitions existed, but were more social gatherings than rigorous contests” (Humphries, 1997, p.150). And even later, snowboarders “adopted a more casual approach to competition” (Humphries, 1997, p.152).

Heino summarises discourse around the inclusion of snowboarding in the Olympics as “a dialectic between the positive aspects of mainstreaming and legitimisation, and the negative aspects of control and discipline” (2000, p.188). Control and discipline takes the form of power now asserted by the IOC and the Federation Internationale de Ski (Heino, 2000). Heino argues that in the future “the amount of television time will do much more to legitimate a sport than its acceptance into the Olympics itself” (2000, p.189).

The final sport to be discussed in terms of the organisational implications of it joining the Olympic programme is triathlon, which first appeared in the Sydney 2000 Games. Given that the sport only dates back to 1974:

it would appear that the inclusion of the sport in the 2000 Olympic Games should be considered a stunning success for triathlon (Strudler, 2001, p.521).

However, Strudler argues that in fact “inclusion in the Olympic Games came at a considerable cost to the sport of triathlon” (2001, p.521). Issues cited included: rule changes to make the sport more spectator friendly; strong-handed leadership; a controversial Olympic selection process; and the alienation of many participants in the sport (Strudler, 2001). The author looked at the implications for triathlon in America and found:
it neither attracted new American fans to the sport nor did it further invigorate current American amateur triathletes (Strudler, 2001, p.521).

Now moving on to consider the economic impacts of Olympic inclusion, the only existing research is that from Cassidy (2002). They argued that one way in which elite snowboarding in America has benefited from Olympic inclusion is from substantially increased sponsorship opportunities. Specific examples of new sponsorship deals were given, but there was no pre and post-inclusion comparison.

The perceived importance of the Olympic Programme for sports can be exemplified by the fact that:

requests were received from IOC-recognised IFs for the addition of 18 new sports for the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games (Felli, 2003, p.46).

As can be seen from the discussions in section 2.3, the process sports go through prior to inclusion in the Olympics is reasonably well documented. There has also been some initial research on the effect on a sport of its inclusion in the Olympic programme as described in this section. In terms of organisational change, the focus of the existing research is on the following areas: changes in philosophy; how minority sports have been altered by majority consumption; how sports which originated in one country and are still dominated by this country; the effect on alternative sports; increased participation; and changing power relationships. The only economic change reported is increased sponsorship and there is currently no research on changes in policy. Other potential areas of change worthy of investigation include: the organisational structure of the NGB and relationships with other agencies; funding, facilities and support and the implications of this for the NGB; the balance between elite sport and grass-roots sport; and perceptions and status of the sport. Furthermore, all the authors adopted a predominantly qualitative approach to the research with most using secondary data. In many cases, no methodological details were given in the article and secondary data was referred to but no sources explicitly cited. Lidz (1997) was the only author to use both primary and secondary data and the primary data came from a
limited un-specified number of interviews. Villamón et.al. (2004) and Heino (2000) were the only authors to explicitly use theory to guide their investigations. For example, Villamón et.al. (2004) utilise notions of reflexive modernisation to explain how key aspects of judo are disembedded from the original practice of the sport and then re-embedded with western structures and meanings. Although there were loose references to sociological ideas in Humphries (1997) work there was no clear citation of theories. Hence there is scope to adopt a more rigorous methodology to investigate these issues with a clear research design focussing on collecting primary data and reinforced by the use of theory.

2.5) Policy development and emphasis

It has been established in sections 2.2 to 2.4 that investigating the effect of Olympic inclusion on sport in England through the case study of trampolining in England is a valid area for research and fills a gap in current literature. It is now necessary to develop a sense of what the broad nature and emphasis of the current delivery system is for trampolining with respect to the elite, recreational and school domains to provide a context for subsequent data collection and analysis. This section will address the changing policy context and policy priorities and then section 2.6 will establish how this has affected the sports delivery systems and structures and influenced economic changes. Policy documents give a strategic direction for sports and provide another stimulus aside from Olympic inclusion which impacts on trampolining in England. This then forms the basis of the empirical enquiry which explores in detail how Olympic inclusion has affected policy, organisational structure and economic support for trampolining, as well as changes and emphases not detailed in the literature.
In England, recent years have witnessed unprecedented central government policy commitment to investment in physical education and sport (Donovan, Jones and Hardman, 2006, p.16).

Since the inauguration of the Great Britain Sports Council in the 1970s, Conservative and Labour governments have increased their intervention in sports policy (Green, 2004a). Until the mid-1990s, initiatives generally focussed on encouraging mass participation. Green and Houlihan (2004) cited two factors which changed the focus. The first was the introduction of the National Lottery in 1994 and the associated increase in funding for sport; and the second was the publication of Sport: Raising the Game (Department of National Heritage, 1995) which was the first government policy on sport for 20 years. The pursuit of international sporting success meant that “broader social goals associated with sport become routinely subordinated to the production of performance” (Green, 2007, p.921).

Under New Labour, A Sporting Future for All (DCMS, 2000) was published which set out the governments aspirations for sport. Game Plan (DCMS/Strategy Unit Report, 2002) was subsequently written as a strategy for achieving the objectives set out in A Sporting Future for All. In direct response to the requirements in Game Plan, Sport England (2004) wrote The Framework for Sport in England. Also relating to Game Plan, the Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL) strategy was written to link school sport and club sport (DfES and DCMS, 2002). Carter (2005) undertook a further appraisal of sport in the Review of national sport effort and resources and finally Sport England produced a new strategy document in 2008. This section gives an overview of these policy directives and also looks at the underlying ideas of sport for all and elite sport and how they are manifest within the policies. This last aspect will be considered first.

From a review of policy documents and interviews with key actors, Green and Houlihan found that over the past 30 years in the UK (and in Canada) “there have been shifts in policy emphasis directed towards the ultimate goal of medal-winning performances at the highest level” (2004, p.395). When allocating funding, the skew towards elite sport is often defended in
a pyramid model by the idea of a ‘trickle-down effect.’ I.e. as you get further along a talent development continuum from beginner to elite there are fewer individuals and it is assumed that the high level of funding given to a small number of elite athletes at the top of the pyramid is warranted since their achievements inspire others at lower levels to train harder and also their victories boost national morale. Whilst the two British NGBs Green and Houlihan focussed their investigations on, the Amateur Swimming Association and UK Athletics, were “receptive to the increased emphasis on the value of elite achievement” (2004, p.399), it was acknowledged that “the primary source of momentum was exogenous” (2004, p.399); so they may have focussed more on participation if it had not been for external directives.

The focus on elite level sport was not welcomed by all parties, since it served “to subdue alternative voices within the sporting community” (Green, 2004b, p.386). The influence of recreational sport “was considerably weaker and is likely to remain so, given its limited access to funding and organizational resources” (Green and Houlihan, 2004, p.399). Green argued that policies for sport in the UK have “shifted away from a Sport for All ethos” (2006, p.232) and moved towards “a twofold focus on the ‘active (child) citizen’ and elite performance” (2006, p.232). The government did set a target “for 70% of the population to be reasonably active by 2020” (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002, p.80). But there is the implication that the focus is on physical activity (such as walking, cycling and aerobics etc) rather than developing recreational pathways in sport. Unfortunately:

any resistance to the drive for Olympic medals is somewhat fragile, however, as NGBs become ever more dependent upon government resources, which are linked inextricably to Olympic medal targets (Green, 2006, p.227).

Coupled with the above strategic policy emphases, specific policies have been developed. In 1995 the Conservative government “published a comprehensive policy statement” (Green, 2007, p.937) entitled Sport:
Raising the Game (Department of National Heritage, 1995). Sport: Raising the Game was influential because it “signalled the emerging salience of sport at central government level” (Green, 2006, p.226) and for the first time in its fairly short history sport policy was considered a discrete domain (Green, 2007). It is implied in the policy document that the primary reason for its formulation was that sport is considered an important part of Britain’s culture and heritage: “we invented the majority of the world’s great sports” (Department of National Heritage, 1995, p.ii). And it was necessary to “rebuild the strength of every level of British sport” (Department of National Heritage, 1995, p.i). The ‘Action Agenda’ within Sport: Raising the Game is split into four sections, namely: 1) Sport in Schools; 2) Extending the sporting culture; 3) Further and Higher Education; and 4) The development of excellence. There is less attention given to the social and health benefits of sports participation which are so pertinent in later sports policies.

Green argued that Sport: Raising the Game “abandoned any pretence of an integrated and multi-dimensional approach to sports development” (2006, p.226) which was central in the work of the Great Britain Sports Council in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Houlihan also contended that the policy’s “twin emphasis on school sport and excellence made little attempt to demonstrate the potential areas of overlap or common interest” (2000, p.175). While there are both continuities and discontinuities with later policy frameworks (as explored in this section), Sport: Raising the Game has “provided an organisational and administrative framework for the shape and direction of sports policy in the 21st century” (Green, 2004a, p.371).

According to Green (2004a) there is some evidence of policy continuity between Sport: Raising the Game and A Sporting Future for All which was published by the Labour government in 2000; i.e. the dual emphases of school / youth sport and elite sport. However he highlights there are ideological differences. Sport: Raising the Game is based on and justified
by traditional values and the cultural tradition of sport (Green, 2004). Whereas A Sporting Future for All is “illustrative of the Labour Party’s modernising, reform agenda” (Green, 2004a, p.373) and is seen as part of a strategy to achieve key welfare goals such as social inclusion. Hence this is important in establishing the research context.

The aims set out in A Sporting Future for All are:
- “more people of all ages and all social groups taking part in sport” (DCMS, 2000, p.5);
- “more success for our top competitors and teams in international competition” (DCMS, 2000, p.5).

Thus both sport for all and elite sport are being considered, as in Sport: Raising the Game, because:

the drive to encourage wide participation in sport and the drive to achieve excellence at the highest levels are necessarily part of the same package (DCMS, 2000, p.55).

The DCMS justify this joint emphasis by saying how a broad base of participation offers a greater talent pool but also participation offers individual benefits. Then from the other direction, elite performers promote interest in sport.

Table 2.3 shows the key barriers in terms of increasing participation and raising performance as highlighted in A Sporting Future for All. These are then addressed in the report through five interlinked themes: ‘Sport in Education;’ ‘Sport in the Community;’ ‘Sporting Excellence;’ ‘Modernisation;’ and ‘Implementation.’ Partnership between governmental bodies and National Governing Bodies is central to the ‘modernisation’ strategy. The DCMS believe “governing bodies must be responsible for setting the strategic vision for their sport” (2000, p.47) but will give resources to support these strategies. The language of contracts is introduced: funding is only given on condition that “governing bodies agree to work to a number of clear and agreed targets for the development of their sport” (DCMS, 2000, p.19). The implementation strategy was
followed up by the publication of *The Government’s Plan for Sport* (DCMS, 2001).

Table 2.3 - Key issues highlighted in a *Sporting Future for All* which hinder performance in sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues identified in <em>A Sporting Future for All</em> which must be tackled if the nation's performance in sport is to improve:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● There are not enough opportunities for children and young people to take part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● People lose interest as they get older, reducing participation and diminishing the pool of talent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● There are too many obstacles to the progress of those with the potential to reach the top.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The organisation and management of sport is fragmented and too often unprofessional. (DCMS, 2000.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Game Plan* was published the DCMS / Strategy Unit in 2002 in response to *A Sporting Future for All*. While progress had been made towards the proposals set out in *A Sporting Future for All* (in terms of both participation and high performance sport) the government believed they could make further improvements and needed to reconsider priorities (DCMS / Strategy Unit Report, 2002). *Game Plan* concluded that the government should set itself two overarching objectives:

- A major increase in participation in sport and physical activity, primarily because of the significant health benefits and to reduce the growing costs of inactivity (DCMS / Strategy Unit Report, 2002, p.12).
- A sustainable improvement in success in international competition, particularly in the sports which matter most to the public, primarily because of the ‘feel good factor’ associated with winning (DCMS / Strategy Unit Report, 2002, p.12).

In order to achieve these twin-track targets, recommendations were made in four areas - grassroots participation, high performance sport, mega sporting events and delivery - as detailed in Table 2.4. There are also recommendations in *Game Plan* for structures and systems of sports delivery to be modernised and made more effective. Support structures should follow on from strategies rather than vice versa (DCMS / Strategy...
Unit, 2002) and these are discussed in section 2.6. The authors acknowledge that:

it is not possible to say that increasing mass participation will automatically improve international success, or that international success will necessarily drive mass participation (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002, p.83).

Hence, both issues are tackled separately, leading to a twofold approach as shown in Table 2.5 and Figure 2.1. However, there are still linkages between the two.

Table 2.4 – Recommendations to improve participation and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In order to achieve the targets set for improvements in participation and performance, Game Plan this we make recommendations in four areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Grassroots participation: a wide range of initiatives are needed, with a focus on economically disadvantaged groups, in particular young people (the focus of much current policy), women and older people. These need to tackle all the barriers to participation (such as lack of time, cost, information or motivation), as well as failures in provision (poor coaches or facilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High Performance sport: there needs to be a better prioritisation of which sports are funded at the highest level; better development of talented sportspersons and women to help them reach that level; with funding streams and service delivery more focused on customer needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mega sporting events: there should be a more cautious approach to hosting these events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delivery: organisational reform and determining exactly what works is needed before the Government considers further increases to its investment in sport. Less money should go to bureaucrats and more to the end user. Public, private and voluntary sectors need to work together better towards a common goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5 - Developing the twin track approach (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002, p.83)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the individual</th>
<th>Mass participation</th>
<th>Linking mechanisms</th>
<th>International success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For society</td>
<td>Health, economic benefits</td>
<td>Talent development</td>
<td>National pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For society</td>
<td>Fun, health</td>
<td>Talent identification</td>
<td>Success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Green argues that as well as changing sporting structures (as discussed in section 2.6), *Game Plan* also emphasises “the symbiotic, and overtly instrumental, relationship between sport education and health policy” (Green, 2004a, p.374). The instrumental value of sport and physical activity to wider society is also prominent in *Game Plan* through the subtext that through sport and physical activity, marginalised groups could access better health, gain employment, be diverted from antisocial behaviour and be better educated. According to Green (2006) this mirrors social investment objectives in other policy sectors, though it must be acknowledged that appealing to the extrinsic benefits of sport and physical activity further justifies government investment in the area.

Connected to these recommendations to modernise structures, *Game Plan* discusses Balyi’s (2001) model for Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD). The idea is that children begin by participating in a range of physical activities to develop a range of capabilities and only specialise after the age of ten and then incrementally increase the focus on competition until adulthood. There is a athlete centred and clearly signposted pathway “from Playground to Podium” (DCMS/Strategy Unit, 2002, p.125). It is congruent across sports to “enable partnership working” (DCMS/Strategy Unit, 2002, p.126) but is also “adaptable to be sport and
gender specific” (DCMS/Strategy Unit, 2002, p.126). For a summary see Table 2.6. In addition to the LTAD model offering a well defined route for elite athletes, the FUNdamentals stage is designed to provide a solid foundation for all. This is intended to ultimately “enhance the likelihood of increased lifelong participation” (DCMS/Strategy Unit, 2002, p.126) through introducing people to physical activity in a fun non-threatening setting. In terms of this study, it is difficult to see how the age groups can apply to trampolining and other disciplines of gymnastics given the age of Olympic performers and the consequential need for early specialisation. It could be possible to adopt a condensed version of the LTAD framework, but this would negate correlation with other sports.

Table 2.6 - The LTAD Framework adopted in Game Plan (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002, p.125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LTAD stage</th>
<th>Age for females</th>
<th>Age for males</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Phase in player pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training to Win</td>
<td>17+</td>
<td>18+</td>
<td>● Integration phase, all physical and mental capacities engaged</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 25:75 training-competition ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training to Compete</td>
<td>13 – 17</td>
<td>14 – 18</td>
<td>● Investment phase, develop technical and tactical skills</td>
<td>Specialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 50:50 training-competiting ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training to Train</td>
<td>10 – 13</td>
<td>10 – 14</td>
<td>● Learn how to train, develop the basic skills of a specific sport</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● 75:25 training-competing ratio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNdamentals</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>● Basic Sports Skills (physical literacy) – running, jumping, throwing</td>
<td>Talent identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● ABCs (agility, balance, coordination, speed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Development of power and endurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Participation in variety of sports (no competition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relating to the objectives in Game Plan, the first major policy documents to link school and club sport was launched in October 2002 by the DfES and the DCMS – the Physical Education, School Sport and Club Links (PESSCL) strategy. The overall aim is “to enhance the take up of sporting opportunities by 5-16 year olds” (DfES and DCMS, 2002, p.2); with an initial target of 85% of children experiencing a minimum of two hours high
quality PE and school sport within and beyond the curriculum each week. The DfES and DCMS's (2002) definition of ‘high quality sport is given in Table 2.7. According to Bloyce and Smith the PESSCL strategy can be considered “one of the most significant youth sport policy initiatives to have been introduced to schools in England in recent years” (2010, p.66). The PESSCL strategy is supported by over £1.5 billion investment from the government and the National Lottery and consists of eight interlinked programmes: Specialist Sports Colleges; School Sport Coordinators; Gifted and Talented; QCA PE and School Sport Investigation; Step into Sport; Professional Development; School/Club Links; and Swimming (DfES and DCMS, 2002). The PESSCL strategy was superseded in 2008 by the Physical Education and Sport Strategy for Young People (PESSYP) (DfES and DCMS, 2008). Both have a similar remit and according to Bloyce and Smith (2010) it was fundamentally only a change in name.

Table 2.7 – Characteristics of the outcomes of high quality PE and school sport according to the DfES and DCMS (2002, p.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When there is high quality PE and school sport, you will see young people who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Show a strong commitment to making PE and school sport an important and valuable part of their lives in both school and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Know and understand what they are trying to achieve and how to go about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Have an understanding of how what they do in PE and school and community-based sport contributes to a healthy and active lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Have the confidence to get involved in PE and school and community sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Have the skills to take part in PE and school sport and are in control of their movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Respond effectively to a range of different competitive, creative and challenge-type activities both as individuals and as an integral part of teams and groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Are clearly thinking about what they are doing and making appropriate decisions for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Show a desire to improve and achieve in relation to their abilities and aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Have the stamina, suppleness and strength to keep going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Enjoy PE and school and community sport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to *Game Plan* Sport England published *The Framework for Sport in England* (Sport England, 2004). The intention was that this document:

> provides the strategic direction and policy priorities that unite sport in its commitment to make England the most active and successful sporting nation in the world by 2020 (Sport England, 2004, p.2).

In addition, reports such as *First Game Plan Delivery Report* (DCMS, 2004a); *Sporting Britain* (DCMS, 2004b) and *The Government’s Plan For Sport - Second Annual Report* (DCMS, 2003) cite some evidence of improvement on the targets set out in *A Sporting Future For All* (DCMS, 2000). Like *Game Plan*, *The Framework for Sport in England* also has a twin-track approach to sport for all and elite sport, and defines these strands as “making England active” (Sport England, 2004, p.6) and “making England successful” (Sport England, 2004, p.6). There is also a third strand: “backing the bid to host the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games” (Sport England, 2004, p.6). Targets to complement those in *Game Plan* were set (see Table 2.8).

**Table 2.8 – Targets set in *The Framework for Sport in England***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of key targets against sporting outcomes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Start in sport</strong>: increasing participation by a minimum of 1% annually and making significant reductions in the ‘equity gap’ for women and girls, ethnic minorities, people with a disability and people in the lowest socio-economic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Stay in sport</strong>: increasing club membership, people receiving coaching and tuition and the number of people taking part in competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● <strong>Succeed in Sport</strong>: becoming the best nation in the world by 2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sport England, 2004, p.27).

The report identified seven key drivers towards change in participation (decided upon through an extensive consultation process): the ageing population; time pressures; well-being and obesity; variations in access; utilising education; volunteers and professionals; and levels of investment in sport (Sport England, 2004). Using this and evidence from successful nations (the ones assessed were not stated), *The Framework for Sport in England* revealed six priority areas for change: promotion and marketing;
legislation and regulatory change; quality accreditation and improvement; structures and partnerships; innovation and delivery; and strategic planning and evidence (Sport England, 2004, p.16). A fundamental feature is the notion of ‘partnership’ to “bridge the gap between national and local” (Sport England, 2004, p.18) - in the past there has been a lack of unity between delivery in the community, national planning and strategic thinking. The essential characteristics are: the EIS, Higher Education Talented Athlete Scholarship Scheme Consortia, Regional Sports Boards, County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships (see sections 2.6 and 2.8 for more details of the EIS, County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships). A further way of drawing together all aspects of a sport are Whole Sport Plans. These have been produced by English NGBs for prioritised sports representing their contribution to The Framework for Sport in England. NGBs which cover the whole of Great Britain, such as British Gymnastics, were required to produce One Stop Plans which were essentially the same, just with a wider geographical remit. British Gymnastics’ (2005) One Stop Plan will be discussed in more detail in section 2.7.

A more recent overhaul and assessment of sport and physical activity in England was reported in the Review of national sport effort and resources (Carter, 2005), otherwise known as the Carter Report. The team, lead by Carter, “distilled evidence from a wide variety of sources” (Carter, 2005, p.2), including over 200 stakeholders from the public, private and voluntary sectors.

Using data from several studies, Carter (2005) highlights how sport participation rates are still a concern. He identified barriers to further success which can be categorised as: inadequate facilities, poor financial support, sporting provision not being well joined up and a lack of strategic governance of some aspects. On the positive side, Carter (2005) found the decline in PE and school sport, highlighted by authors such as Hardman and Marshall (2000), Speednet (1999), Harrison and Warburton (1998)
and Zeigler (1994), has been reversed in more recent years. Also, elite success has increased and the performance infrastructure is improving (Carter, 2005). Carter (2005) reiterates the need for a co-ordinated sport system as advocated in *The Framework for Sport in England*. While Carter’s vision for sport is broadly similar to that suggested in *The Framework for Sport in England*, it is interesting to notice how the ‘community,’ ‘national facilities’ and ‘elite’ are combined in a ‘single brand’ and ‘schools’ are slightly separate, though this could be because they also come under the jurisdiction of the DCSF.

Further to *The Framework for Sport in England* and the *Carter Report*, the Audit Commission and the National Audit Office joint report entitled *Delivering Efficiently: Strengthening the Links in Public Service Delivery Chains* also emphasised the importance of delivery chains in achieving targets in the public sector (National Audit Office and Audit Commission, 2006). A delivery chain refers to a network of organisations from different sectors (including central government, local government, non-governmental agencies, private sector bodies and voluntary groups) working together to achieve public sector targets/outcomes. Sport England (n.d.) used this to construct a further vision for the delivery systems for sport in England as referred to in section 2.6. In addition to sporting bodies, the delivery system also needs to make links with: community and voluntary sectors; community safety; children and youth sector; economic development; education (including schools, further education and higher education) and skills; health; local and regional government; private sector; regeneration; and transport (Sport England, n.d.).

In December 2007 the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport tasked Sport England with reviewing its strategy for community sport in England. It was felt that because at that time it was just over four years until London hosted the 2012 Olympics and Paralympics it was an appropriate time to “take a clear look at the sport development system and
its fitness for purpose” (Sport England, 2008, p.1). The three key challenges facing community sport were: increasing participation in sport; tackling drop-off; and developing talent. Sport England’s aim was then to:

build the foundations of sporting success through the creation of a world leading community sport system in England (Sport England, 2008, p.8).

The policy detailed in *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011* demonstrated “a significant shift in focus and direction” (Sport England, 2008, p.1). Key features of it include:

- Sport for sport’s sake;
- A seamless pathway from school to community to elite;
- National Governing Bodies will be at the heart of delivery and funded via a simple single pot;
- More frontline coaching – deployed expertly;
- The particularly English passion for volunteering will be maximised;
- A modern network of sports clubs will be the centrepiece of people’s sporting experience;
- Creating opportunity for all;
- A simplified way of working that will reduce bureaucracy and release more funding into frontline delivery;
- A clear set of measurable achievements to pursue and deliver.

The intended outcomes of *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011* can are summarised as ‘excel,’ ‘sustain,’ and ‘grow’ (Sport England, 2008). In terms of funding, approximately 25% of Sport England’s investment will focus on developing and accelerating talent (i.e. excel); approximately 60% of Sport England’s investment will focus on sustaining current participants in sport (i.e. sustain); and the remaining 15% of Sport England’s investment will be focused on increasing regular participation in sport (i.e. grow).

During the course of the past two decades or so, sports policy has changed from a concern to provide sport for all to the general population, to a twin-fold focus on children / young people and “a ‘no compromise’
approach to winning (Olympic) medals and trophies on the international stage” (Green, 2006, p.217). Green argues that to a certain degree “the effect of policy is primarily discursive; it changes the possibilities we have for thinking ‘otherwise’” (2004a, p.365). Hence the balance between sport for all and elite sport has altered dramatically and possibly irreversibly. Furthermore, there is also the issue that elite sport and sport for all are underpinned by fundamentally different philosophies – the former being based on inequality and the later on equality. While the increase in government interest and investment to the sport sector has been welcomed by sport policy makers and practitioners:

it remains to be seen whether this political and financial commitment endures if Olympic medal targets are not met and if the evidence for increases in sport and physical activity participation rates do not materialise (Green, 2006, p.234).

In terms of the research topic, this section has offered a detailed discussion of policy development and emphases which underpins the sport delivery system. It has also indicated how issues relating to elite sport and sport for all are present at the policy level. Whether the balance between elite and recreational trampolining has been affected by Olympic inclusion is an important aspect for investigation.

2.6) Current structure and development of the sporting landscape

2.6) Current structure and development of the sporting landscape sport in England

This section outlines the organisational developments that arose out of the policy changes discussed in section 2.5 and which will form the basis of this investigation. The organisations discussed all have some responsibility for the delivery of trampolining and hence it is necessary to have an understanding of their role and remit. Funding and support will also be discussed in this section because it is very closely connected to organisational structure and to consider it in a separate section would lead to repetition.
The structure of sport in the UK, although complex, caters for the needs of sport at every level – from grass roots development and recreational sport through to the best sportsmen and women representing the UK on the world stage (UK Sport, n.d., www.uksport.gov.uk).

Following the policy changes discussed in section 2.5, currently the overall organisation and structure of sport in England is controlled and managed by the DCMS under the auspices of UK Sport, Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust. The BOA is ultimately responsible for Team GB’s entry into the Olympics. Additionally the DCSF has input into school sport. This, along with other parts of the sport delivery system, is represented diagrammatically in Figure 2.2. Key historical and operational aspects of each component of the system are discussed in this section. School trampolining will be discussed in more detail in section 2.8. The twin-track approach of elite sport and sport for all as set out in Sport: Raising the Game (Department of National Heritage, 1995), A Sporting Future for All (DCMS, 2000), Game Plan (DCMS/Strategy Unit Report, 2002), and the Review of national sport effort and resources (Carter, 2005) is reflected by separate non-governmental organisations responsible for elite sport and recreational sport (i.e. UK Sport and Sport England). Similarly there is a separate non-governmental organisation responsible for school sport (i.e. the Youth Sport Trust).
UK Sport was established by Royal Charter in 1996 and became fully operational in 1997. It is a non-departmental public body, funded by, and accountable to, the DCMS. It also receives some National Lottery money; thus making it responsible for managing and distributing more than £100 million per year (UK Sport, 2006b). The importance of National Lottery funding in changing the sports delivery system is emphasised in Sport: Raising the Game – “the existence of the National Lottery has transformed forever the prospects of British Sport” (Department of National Heritage, 1995, p.1). Indeed funding sport was one of the rationales behind setting up the National Lottery. UK Sport works in partnership with the home country sports councils (i.e. Sport England, Sportscotland, the Sports Council for Wales and the Sports Council for Northern Ireland) and other agencies “to lead sport in the UK to world-class success” (UK Sport, n.d., www.uksport.gov.uk). I.e. it is only responsible for elite sport, reinforcing
the importance of elite sport in the government’s agenda as discussed in relation to policies in section 2.5.

UK Sport assumed full responsibility for all Olympic and Paralympic performance-related support in England from 1st April 2006, from the identification of talent right the way through to performing at the top level, and offers similar high performance consultancy to non-Olympic sports such as cricket (UK Sport, 2006a). UK Sport provides support to elite athletes through its World Class Performance Programme, which has two main elements: 1) funding for NGBs to provide a support infrastructure for elite athletes (who meet agreed performance criteria); 2) funding for these individuals towards their living and sporting costs (UK Sport, n.d.). The World Class Performance Pathway operates at three key levels: 1) World Class Podium (realistic medal capabilities at the next Olympic / Paralympic Games); 2) World Class Development (realistic medal winning capabilities at the Olympics after next); 3) World Class Talent (athletes who have the potential to progress through the World Class pathway with the help of targeted investment and are a maximum of eight years away from the podium). The limited funding available is:

- directed at those sports and individuals that can demonstrate that they have the capability to deliver medal winning performances when it matters (UK Sport, n.d., www.uksport.gov.uk).

Hence UK Sport developed a series of ‘Funding Release Triggers’ to ensure the monitoring of government bodies and the achievement of performance targets. *Game Plan* (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002) called for increased accountability due to the amount of money invested in sport and also felt this would lead to more professional systems.

The EIS is now under the strategic direction of UK Sport “to create an even stronger co-ordination of support for athletes within the World Class Pathway” (UK Sport, 2006b, p.24). The services offered by the EIS include: sports medicine, physiotherapy, nutrition, psychology, physiology, performance analysis, biomechanics, strength and conditioning,
performance lifestyle, sports massage and talent identification (EIS, n.d.). The EIS also provide support services to Sport England high performance sports such as cricket and netball.

The BOA was formed at a meeting at the House of Commons in 1905 and is the NOC for Great Britain and Northern Ireland (BOA, n.d.). It is “a unique blend of elected officials and professional staff” (BOA, n.d., www.olympics.org.uk) with representatives from all the Olympic sports UK governing bodies. The BOA’s role is “to lead and prepare our nation’s finest athletes at the Olympic Games” (BOA, n.d., www.olympics.org.uk). Indeed, only a NOC “is able to recommend a competitor for participation at the Games” (British Olympic Foundation, 2001, p.22). The BOA has developed a range of programmes and facilities to meet the needs of Team GB athletes throughout the four-year Olympic cycle: the Olympic Training Centre, Performance Lifestyle (a programme, run in conjunction with the EIS, designed to help athletes balance all other aspects of their life with their sport), the Olympic and Paralympic Employment Network, the Olympic Medical Institute, the Athlete Medical Scheme, the Olympic Passport Scheme (this allows reduced access to sports centres and beneficial services), Planning for Success Workshops and the British Olympic Foundation (inspiring through sport and education).

The BOA is “not funded or controlled by government, [and] has no political interests” (BOA, n.d., www.olympics.org.uk). To this end it receives no funding from Government or National Lottery. Figure 2.3 shows how the BOA put NOCs in context in terms of their relationship with other sporting organisations. The diagram shows no mention of the BOA or NOC working with sports councilis or agencies such as UK Sport or Sport England, despite their support for elite sport. This is particularly interesting since in addition to their ‘Olympic duties,’ NOCs “must also encourage participation in sport at all levels and further the Olympic ideals within their countries” (British Olympic Foundation, 2001, p.22). By
contrast, Figure 2.3 does show them operating in partnership with NGBs and international sports federations.
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Figure 2.3 - NOCs in context (BOA, n.d., www.olympics.org.uk)

Now that UK Sport is solely responsible for all Olympic and Paralympic performance-related support in Great Britain, Sport England (and other home country Sports Councils) “lead on participation and community sport” (UK Sport, 2006b, p.18) and provide an important link between Government policy and sports organisations (from NGBs to community sports groups). It was highlighted in *Game Plan* that there had been “confusion among those trying to access the system and inefficiency where roles and responsibilities overlap” (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002, p.164) and the clear separation between the roles of UK Sport and Sport England was designed to address this. Sport England’s vision is “building the foundations of sporting success” (Sport England, n.d., www.sportengland.org) by “creating a world-leading community sport system of clubs, coaches, facilities and volunteers” (Sport England, n.d., www.sportengland.org). They aim to get people to start, stay and succeed in sport and do this through:
• Encouraging people to get involved with sport and physical activity. For example, Active Places, Sporting Champions, Sport Action Zones and Everyday Sport (such as walking to work).
• The distribution of government and National Lottery funding and investment in a range of sporting projects. For example, the Active England Fund, the Community Investment Fund and national investment into things such as NGBs and coaching.
• Influencing decision makers and public opinion on sport.

The evolution of Sport England’s function and role is underpinned by the Governmental policies and documents which were discussed in section 2.5, the most recent of which being *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011* (Sport England, 2008).

Sport England began ‘Active Sports’ in 1999 as a five year development programme. It aimed to help young people to improve their skills in a number of key sports selected by Sport England through co-ordinated programmes throughout the country (Sport England, 2002). The Active Sport programme provided the impetus for Local Authorities and NGBs to work together for the first time on coherent plans. This work has been further developed through County Sport Partnerships; which go beyond the ideas initiated through Active Sports. County Sport Partnerships are designed to “bring sport into the community” (Sport England, n.d., www.sportengland.org) and were fully operational from March 2006. A County Sport Partnership is a “partnership of agencies committed to providing a high quality single system for people to benefit from sport” (Sport England, n.d., www.sportengland.org). While they develop sport through NGB plans, they are fundamentally independent from NGBs so can act impartially. The three key areas that County Sport Partnerships focus on are: pathways for young people; club development; and workforce development. Because it is managed on a county level “action is based on local need” (Sport England, n.d., www.sportengland.org). County Sport Partnerships are also required to fulfil the core functions of
strategic co-ordination and planning; performance management; and marketing and communications.

Finally, the Youth Sport Trust was established in 1994 as a charity with the remit to “improve the quality and quantity of PE and school sport for young people” (Youth Sport Trust, n.d., www.youthsporttrust.org). Its core work can be divided into a number of key areas:
- Raising the standards of PE and school sport;
- Improving educational standards through sport;
- Getting more young people involved in sport;
- Creating opportunities for young leaders and volunteers;
- Supporting sporting talent in young people;
- Creating a global sporting community (Youth Sport Trust, n.d.).

The Youth Sport Trust develops educational sporting programmes to meet these objectives. The programmes are generally delivered through schools and “are supported by a range of corporate partners, trusts and foundations and government departments” (Youth Sport Trust, n.d., www.youthsporttrust.org). The Youth Sport Trust also supports specialist sports colleges.

The Youth Sport Trust works with the DCSF, DCMS and Sport England to support the development of School Sport Partnerships in terms of both infrastructure and professional development (Youth Sport Trust, n.d.). School Sport Partnerships are “groups of schools working together to develop PE and sport opportunities for young people” (Youth Sport Trust, n.d., www.youthsporttrust.org). A typical partnership consists of 1) a Partnership Development Manager, who manage the School Sport Partnership and are often based at a sports college; 2) up to eight School Sport Co-ordinators, who are based in secondary schools and are responsible for improving school sport opportunities in their ‘family’ of schools; and 3) about 45 primary and special school link teachers who aim to improve sport in their schools (Youth Sport Trust, n.d.). The three-fold
aim of School Sport Partnerships is to enable young people to experience different sports, access high quality coaching and engage in competition. 22 NGBs, including British Gymnastics, receive funding to support clubs working with County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships. Early research by TNS (2004) revealed that gymnastics is the second most widely provided sport by partnership schools – 94% of schools offer it. There are also club links for gymnastics in 24% of schools, making it the tenth most popular out of the 42 mentioned (TNS, 2004). No specific mention of trampolining was made and it was not asked about as a separate sport in the questionnaire. Also “competitive sport is on the increase” (DfES, n.d., www.teachernet.gov.uk). From September 2005 Competition Managers have been phased into the network of School Sport Partnerships. Their remit is to organise a programme of inter-school competitions across their school sport partnership and against others and also to involve their schools in NGB school sports competitions.

From this account of sport in England it can be concluded that UK Sport, along with the EIS and the BOA, are primarily responsible for elite level sport; with Sport England and County Sport Partnerships being geared more towards recreational athletes; and the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships focussing on school sport and sport for young people. All the organisations apart from the BOA come under the jurisdiction of the DCMS. NGBs then support the whole spectrum of abilities in their given sport. Trampolining has only had involvement with UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA since it has been an Olympic sport so it is important to investigate the implications of this. It is also necessary to consider if the support offered by organisations such as Sport England is influenced by whether the sport is in the Olympic programme or not.
2.7) The history and development of trampolining

The evolution of policies which have resulted in the present sports delivery system in England have been discussed in sections 2.5 and 2.6 respectively. This section will now consider trampolining within this current context. Firstly a brief history of the development of the sport will be given and then information about the forced merger of the British Trampoline Federation and British Gymnastics and the consequential governance of trampolining including details of the One Stop Plan (British Gymnastics, 2005).

When reviewing published literature on trampolining to ascertain its history and development, the majority of studies focus on injuries incurred by participants. Some information on coaching trampolining exists, but this tends to be over twenty years old and focuses on beginners to the sport (for example Walker, 1988; Davis and Macdonald, 1980; Carter and Phelps, 1979; and Laude and Norman, 1960). The majority of sources used in this description of the history and development of trampolining may not be considered scholarly, but through cross-checking of sources an adequate account has been constructed. A particular problem was websites – it was possible to accurately reference some, while on others information seems to have been cut and pasted from one site to another! Horne highlighted an additional problem in Britain: “because the sport set up its own governing body in 1965, the BAGA [British Amateur Gymnastics Association] discarded all the papers and results of the trampoline competitions” (1970, p.163). While some similar issues might be present when charting the development of other sports, it is likely to be a particular issue with more minority sports such as trampolining since there are scores of books on sport such as football, cricket, rugby and golf.

The first trampolines were constructed in 1934 (Laws, 2003). Initially trampolines were primarily used as a training aid for divers (Davis and Macdonald, 1980). They were also used as a physiotherapy aid (Davis
and Macdonald, 1980) and in the Second World War in spatial awareness training for pilots (Bramall, 2007). Horne, who was instrumental in introducing trampolining into Great Britain, felt “the introductory phase of the trampoline into the world of gymnastics was no smooth journey” (1970, p.156). They were suspicious of its effect on gymnastics and “scorned the arrival of a new piece of apparatus” (Horne, 1970, p.156).

The first governing body for trampolining in Britain was the Scottish Trampoline Association, formed by David Webster from the Scottish Council of Physical Recreation, which eventually merged with the Scottish Amateur Gymnastics Association (Horne, 1970). In 1959, UK wide trampolining was catered for by the creation of the British Amateur Gymnastics Association (BAGA) Trampoline Committee by founder members Ted Blake, Jack Garstang, Geoff Elliott, Syd Aaron and Dennis Horne (Horne, 1970). It is not clear whether the later incorporated the Scottish Trampoline Association. By 1963 Horne felt “there was a great undercurrent of dissatisfaction raging in the world of British trampolining” (1970, p.164). The majority of the trampoline committee members handed their resignations to BAGA; meanwhile the British Trampoline Association (BTA) was concurrently formed to take control of the sport. For two and a half years “there prevailed a great deal of antagonism” (Horne, 1970, p.169) between the BAGA Trampoline Committee and the British Trampoline Association, resulting in two separate sports development systems (two coaching schemes, two proficiency award schemes and twice as many competitions). In 1965, Ted Blake assisted BAGA and the British Trampoline Association to come to an amicable arrangement and pool all their resources to form the British Trampoline Federation (Horne, 1970), and thus offer more strength and congruence to trampolining in Britain. Further unity occurred in 1974 when the British Trampoline Federation and the English Schools Trampoline Association “merged under the British Trampoline Federation banner” (Laws, 2003, p.2).
The Federation Internationale de Trampoline (FIT) was formulated, in agreement from every country present, after the first World Trampoline Championships in 1964; “another great stride was taken in the progress of trampolining” (Horne, 1970, p.175). In the early 1960s the German Gymnastic Federation proposed that the FIG should “take the new sport under its wing” (River, 1994, p.1). The FIG President at the time rejected the proposal despite a certain amount of interest amongst colleagues.

In the USA the first unofficial National Championship was held during the Amateur Athletic Union Championships in 1947; and by 1955 trampolining was included in Pan American games (Laude and Norman, 1960). A water carnival organised by the Ilford diving club in 1957 was host to the first open trampoline competition to be held in Britain. The first official National Championships were held in conjunction with the BAGA’s Vaulting and Agility Championships in 1959 (Horne, 1970). Early two-way international competitions took place between England and Wales in 1960, and Britain and West-Germany in 1961. When England staged the first ever World Trampoline Championships in 1964: “the biggest step forward in the history of trampolining was taken” (Horne, 1970, p.171). In the second World Championships in 1965 synchronised trampolining and tumbling were added to the programme (Horne, 1970). Since then “championship activity continued to develop and has grown continuously year after year” (West Midlands Amateur Gymnastics Association, n.d., www.wmgymnastics.org.uk/page.asp?node=390sec=Trampolining). From 1969, European and World Championships have taken place in alternate years - the European in the odd and the World in the even year (Matthews, n.d., www.trampolinewa.info). Trampolining has been a World Age-Group Games sport since 1981. And the introduction of the World Cup event in 1993 “has seen a tremendous interest in the sport” (West Midlands Amateur Gymnastics Association, n.d., www.wmgymnastics.org.uk/page.asp?node=390sec=Trampolining). See Appendix Four for details of what is required and judged in a trampoline routine.
Even as early as 1965, it was decided at a meeting of the FIT that “the Federation should try to get trampolining acknowledged as an Olympic sport” (Horne, 1970, p.186). According to the Gillingham Jumpers (n.d.), trampolining was recognised by the IOC in 1988 but was not included at this time due to a lack of participating countries – no IOC documentation or evidence has been found to corroborate this statement. After performances in the gymnastics gala at the Atlanta 1996 Olympic Games, at the 106th Session in 1997, the IOC Executive Board agreed that trampolining would feature in the Olympic Programme of the XXVII Olympiad in Sydney 2000 (Laws, 2003). While the IOC recognised the FIT, authors such as Laws (2003) mention how it was necessary for the FIT to merge with the FIG. This was reportedly “a tricky business that was successfully accomplished at the end of 1998” (Laws, 2003, p.2). According to Lokendahle (1999) this was the first time in the history of the IOC that two international federations merged. This unification was an official IOC requirement made on the basis that trampolining is considered a discipline of gymnastics in the Olympics. Some authors such as Lokendahle, incorrectly felt that it was the unification which “opened the door for trampoline to become an official medal event in the 2000 Olympics” (1999, p.1), when in fact it had been decided prior to this. The European Union of Gymnastics (n.d.) adopted trampolining at a similar time. According to Lokendahle, while the IOC and FIG will only deal with one national governing body per nation, trampolining in Britain could remain under separate jurisdiction from gymnastics “as long as the gymnastics body and the sports council in that nation are happy with this situation” (1999, p.1). However, the British Trampoline Federation was subsumed into British Gymnastics in 1999.

British Gymnastics is the NGB for the sport of gymnastics in Great Britain. It was founded in 1888 as the ‘British Amateur Gymnastics Association’ and changed its name to ‘British Gymnastics’ in 1997 to reflect the increasingly professional nature of the sport (British Gymnastics, n.d.).
is an umbrella governing body for the disciplines of artistic gymnastics, rhythmic gymnastics, trampolining, DMT, tumbling, sports acrobatics, cheerleading, team gymnastics, gymnastics for people with disabilities and general gymnastics (see Appendix One for an explanation of what the different disciplines involve). British Gymnastics is run by a Board of Directors, with each discipline having a Technical Committee as well.

English Gymnastics was formed in 1982 as a subsidiary of British Gymnastics by the English regions “to ensure that England was represented in the Commonwealth Games and other international events” (English Gymnastics, n.d., www.gymnasticsengland.org). It has been known by a variety of different names including the English Gymnastics Association, and in 2010 became Gymnastics England. While British Gymnastics remains the NGB for gymnastics in England, it has now tasked English Gymnastics with delivering development plans for gymnastics on behalf of British Gymnastics. In this respect English Gymnastics is more focussed on the recreational side of the sport. The aims of English Gymnastics are:

- To increase participation in gymnastics sport;
- To increase quality of provision;
- To improve performance throughout the pathway (English Gymnastics, n.d.).

English Gymnastics has a Chief Executive Officer and eight other key national staff and ten regional development teams (English Gymnastics, n.d.).

As detailed in section 2.5, under The Framework for Sport in England (Sport England, 2004) NGBs were required to produce a planning document for the whole of their sport. British Gymnastics’ (2005) One Stop Plan will now be briefly summarised to help understand the current governance and objectives for the sport. In England this was implemented in conjunction with English Gymnastics. While this document refers to the
period 2005 to 2009, this covered the time in which interviews were undertaken and so is more pertinent than any later plan produced.

The *One Stop Plan* for gymnastics represents the objectives for the sport over the Olympic cycle 2005 to 2008. British Gymnastics mission statement for the whole of gymnastics in the UK is:

To provide the opportunity for every individual with an interest or talent for gymnastics to be able to realise their full potential within the whole sport of Gymnastics from novice to Olympian (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.5).

British Gymnastics (2005) then states how it’s role is to work with the home countries to produce strategies and support mechanisms for the complete athlete pathway in the UK. The overall structure for delivery is illustrated in Figure 2.4.
Through the *One Stop Plan*, British Gymnastics identified its key roles which can be summarised under the headings of: improving performance and performance structures; providing support services and structures; and developing policy. These are detailed in full in Appendix Five. It then used this to develop key objectives which focused on: 1) performance; 2) support services; 3) corporate governance, management and administration. The World Class Performance Action Plan is designed to achieve international success. While “it is the wish of British Gymnastics to develop all of its competitive disciplines to World Class level” (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.7); they acknowledge that different disciplines are at
different stages of the process and also only some disciplines are eligible for World Class lottery funding. Separate plans have been drawn up for each discipline, and the one from trampolining will be discussed later in this section. In terms of playing a part in the partnership with other sports agencies, one of the key roles of NGBs in the UK is to provide a range of support structures servicing the needs of elite success and grass-roots participation. Recent progress includes modifying the coach education system to adopt the UK Coaching Certificate and reflecting the LTAD model. Another achievement is having a membership increase of 27% across all membership categories in the past four years (British Gymnastics, 2005) – although some of this increase can be attributed to the merger with the British Trampoline Federation. There is little explicit discussion of the potentially conflicting demands of sport for all and elite sport as discussed in section 2.5. Hence the strategic aims have been analysed in terms of whether they focus on grassroots, elite sport or participants at all levels (see Table 2.9). It can be seen that the majority of strategic aims intend aim to improve gymnastics at all levels and some focus just on the elite but the only one specific to grassroots level concerns developing gymnastics in educational settings. Gymnastics was not involved with the ‘Active Sports’ programme (the precursor of County Sport Partnerships) yet British Gymnastics have indicated an overall commitment and intention to work with County Sport Partnerships to deliver its performance plan.
Table 2.9 - Strategic aims for British Gymnastics (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic aim</th>
<th>Focus (grassroots, elite or all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide a corporate governance and management structure that ensures the</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best possible delivery of the policies, aims and objectives of the Association.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To maintain and raise the World, Olympic and European ranking of our</td>
<td>Elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gymnasts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have British representation on all key committees and commissions of the</td>
<td>Elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG &amp; UEG.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To secure one major international event bi-annually.</td>
<td>Elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide high quality National events in all disciplines.</td>
<td>Elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish an effective communications policy.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To raise the profile of gymnastics across the UK.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure there are sufficient numbers of fully qualified and active coaches.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure there are sufficient numbers of fully qualified and active judges.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide support to and liaise with the home countries in coordinating</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development programmes of a UK quality standard and framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop gymnastics in educational settings.</td>
<td>Grassroots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that Health, Safety and Welfare are embedded in the culture of our</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure gymnastics is fully accessible to all.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect the well being of all those taking part in the sport.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote the principles of fair play.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that there are UK policies in place that comply with current</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance and legislation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To strive towards financial independence.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop membership services which meet and exceed expectations.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of trampolining, there is more discussion of the pathways from grassroots to elite level in the One Stop Plan, but it is focused on developing elite performers rather than considering sport for all for its own sake. It is believed that the Start and Performance Programmes which began in 2002 “have already begun to significantly raise performance standards” (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.33) and must be continued with refinements. Eight to ten individuals should be supported at Performance level, with the number supported by Start or Potential at Youth Squad level remaining at 20 to 24. Due to the amount of training required, relative to other disciplines, it was decided by British Gymnastics (2005) that the current localised approach to elite coaching was appropriate (especially since apparatus can be easily moved); but there did need to be a national base for some centralised training. A long-term aim is to “strengthen the
infrastructure of the discipline” (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.33) by “increasing the number of full time employment opportunities for trampoline coaches” (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.33). A more immediate recommendation is to appoint a National Coach with responsibility for the day-to-day coaching of the elite to allow the Technical Director more time to take a strategic role in planning and implementation.

Thus it can be concluded the trampolining has progressed relatively quickly from its beginnings in 1934 to now being an Olympic sport and part of a well established system of governance. The forced merger of NGBs due to Olympic inclusion is of particular pertinence for this study.

2.8) School trampolining and gymnastics

From consideration of sport related policies in section 2.5 and the resultant sport delivery system in section 2.6, it can be seen that in some respects school sport is connected to other parts of the delivery system. However there are some differences and disconnections and this can be exemplified by the fact that school sport falls under the remit of the DCSF as well as the DCMS. Whilst physical education involves advancing children’s physical capabilities, it is not synonymous with sport since “physical education is essentially an educational process [as opposed to training] whereas the focus in sport is on the activity” (Capel, 2000, p.137). This section looks at the place of trampolining and gymnastics in the school curriculum and the structure of the school competition system to provide an overview of the current delivery context in order to aid understanding of the implications of Olympic inclusion on school trampolining. It also sets out how it differs from trampolining under the NGB.
The National Curriculum sets out a statutory entitlement to learning for all pupils from the age of 5 to 16 and must be taught in all schools in England (DfEE and QCA, 1999). Physical Education (PE) is a compulsory subject across all age groups. Figure 2.5 gives a diagrammatic image of the National Curriculum. It can be seen that gymnastics must be taught in primary school and is an optional activity at secondary school.
Note: KS refers to ‘Key Stage.’ Key Stage 1 is school years 1 and 2, i.e. 5 to 7 year olds; Key Stage 2 is school years 3 to 6, i.e. 7 to 11 year olds; Key Stage 3 is school years 7 to 9, i.e. 11 to 14 year olds; and Key Stage 4 is school years 10 and 11, i.e. 14 to 16 year olds.

Figure 2.5 – Diagrammatic interpretation of the nature of PE in schools, based upon the National Curriculum (DfEE and QCA, 1999) programme of study for physical education
The National Curriculum also specifies what should be taught in ‘gymnastic activities’ and this can be seen in Table 2.10. It is interesting to notice how, in the breadth of study, all the areas of sport are referred to as ‘activities’; i.e. ‘gymnastic activities’ as opposed to ‘gymnastics’, ‘athletic activities’ not ‘athletics’ etc. Smith asserts that educational and more traditional artistic or Olympic gymnastics are “bipolar opposites” (1989, p.74). Teaching for understanding with pupil led decision making is emphasised in the Programme of Study for gymnastics and other sports. Pupils are encouraged to choose what gymnastic skills to perform to fulfil a given requirement (for example, balance on both hands and another part of your body) and later create their own routines. This lies in stark contrast to the British Gymnastics award schemes for various disciplines which are commonly used in clubs. These comprise of a list of skills for children to master, and in some disciplines a routine to learn, before progressing to the next award.

Table 2.10 - National Curriculum requirements for gymnastics activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key stage</th>
<th>National Curriculum requirements for gymnastics activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS1</strong></td>
<td>Pupils should be taught to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. perform basic skills in travelling, being still, finding space and using it safely, both on the floor and using apparatus;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. develop the range of their skills and actions (for example, balancing, taking off and landing, turning and rolling);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. choose and link skills and actions in short movement phrases;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. create and perform short, linked sequences that show a clear beginning, middle and end and have contrasts in direction, level and speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS2</strong></td>
<td>Pupils should be taught to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. create and perform fluent sequences on the floor and using apparatus;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. include variations in level, speed and direction in their sequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS3</strong></td>
<td>Pupils should be taught to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. create and perform complex sequences on the floor and using apparatus;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. use techniques and movement combinations in different gymnastic styles;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. use compositional principles when designing their sequences (for example, changes in level, speed, direction, and relationships with apparatus and partners).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KS4</strong></td>
<td>Students should be taught to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. compose and perform sequences, both on the floor and using apparatus, in specific gymnastic styles, applying set criteria;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. use advanced techniques and skills with precision and accuracy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. use advanced compositional concepts and principles when composing their sequences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No specific disciplines of gymnastics are referred to in the National Curriculum. In the Programme of Study for both primary and secondary school mention is made of “using apparatus” (DfEE and QCA, 1999, p.17, p.19, p.21, p.24). The requirements for Key Stage 3 refer to “different gymnastics styles” (DfEE and QCA, 1999, p.21) and the requirements for Key Stage 4 refer to “specific gymnastic styles” (DfEE and QCA, 1999, p.24), but no styles are specified. In a sense now trampolining has been incorporated into British Gymnastics, rather than having its own governing body (British Trampoline Federation) there is more justification for including it in PE lessons since it is now formally a discipline of gymnastics. Referring back at the knowledge, understanding and skills which must be taught through the curriculum, trampolining could fulfil the requirements for ‘acquiring and developing skills’ and ‘evaluating and improving performance’ across all four Key Stages supporting its inclusion in the curriculum.

Schemes of work have been produced by the QCA for all subjects; they are not mandatory, but rather show a way for schools to put the National Curriculum into practice and may be adapted (QCA, 2000a and 2000b). There is a unit of gymnastics written for each year group of the primary school and a transition unit. In addition to the transition unit, there are three more units specifically designed for secondary school. Appendix Six highlights key features of the units of work with respect to trampolining. It can be seen that a trampoline is not listed as an example piece of apparatus under the resources suggested in any of the units of work. However, in the plans for Year 3, Year 5, Year 6, the Link Unit and the Development Unit a trampoline could fit in the examples of ‘fixed high apparatus’ given, and for the Intermediate and Advanced Units a trampoline would come under ‘Olympic apparatus.’ Looking at the suggested core tasks, very few could be successfully completed on a trampoline – due to the nature of the sport, set moves and routines consist of jumps involving change of shape, rotation, landing on different body parts or a combination. Other disciplines of gymnastics, particularly
artistic, rhythmic and sports acrobatics appear more suitable. The required task for the Advanced Unit is “pupils work in a small group to plan, organise and perform gymnastic competitions or displays” (QCA, 2000b) which is suited to trampolining because trampolining is perhaps one of the easiest disciplines for pupils to mark, given that each of the ten moves is scored as a decimal out of one mark. It must be remembered that it is not compulsory for schools to follow these schemes of work.

A new Secondary Curriculum for England has been launched and will be implemented in schools in a phased process from September 2008 to 2011 (QCA, 2007a, 2007b). During the period of field work (the academic years 2007 to 2008 and 2008 to 2009) schools would have predominantly followed the ‘old’ curriculum (DfEE and QCA, 1999). The requirements for the breadth of study have changed. In the revised curriculum at Key Stage 3 activities should be chosen to cover four of the following, and at Key Stage 4 two of the following:

- Outwitting opponents;
- Accurate replication of actions;
- Exploring and communicating ideas, concepts and emotions;
- Performing at maximum levels;
- Identifying and solving problems;
- Exercising safely and effectively.

Trampolining fits in more readily with the requirement for “accurate replication of actions, phrases and sequences, as in gymnastic activities” (QCA, 2007a, p.7 and QCA, 2007b, p.7) than with the requirements of the previous curriculum, since it implies that more creative routines are not required, and it is the final skill or routine is important rather than the process. All other disciplines of gymnastics would also offer suitable activities.

Inaugurated in 2006, the UK School Games is a multi-sport event for school aged athletes. It has been developed and organised by the Youth Sport Trust with the support of £2.3 million from the Big Lottery Fund and
extra finance from Visa and the host city council. The UK School Games is for the most talented young people selected by their NGB to represent England, Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland; i.e. it is not a ‘school versus school’ competition. The event is designed to emulate the atmosphere of the Olympic Games with all competitors staying in an athletes’ village and participating in an opening and closing ceremony. The aim is for the UK School Games to “create an inspirational and motivational setting which will encourage more young people to take part in sport” (UK School Games, n.d., www.ukschoolgames.com); but quite how this will actually follow through in practice has not been made explicit. Artistic gymnastics has been included in the programme for the UK School Games since the beginning. Gymnasts compete in standard artistic gymnastics events – i.e. floor, vault, beam and asymmetric bars for women, and floor, vault, high bar, rings, pommel horse and parallel bars for men. Trampolining, and other disciplines of gymnastics such as rhythmic, have not been included. No information is given on how the sports and disciplines or events were selected. Ultimately, the intention is that each NGB involved will work in partnership with their school association to use the UK School Games as “a catalyst to review and modernise their competitive structures for young people in sport” (UK School Games, n.d., www.ukschoolgames.com). The Games currently has funding until 2011 and it is unclear whether they will continue after this time.

Unlike the events in the UK School Games, the British Schools Gymnastics Association (BSGA) National Schools Trampoline Competitions appear quite separate from the NGB for trampolining, British Gymnastics. Each year the BSGA organises a series of Schools Trampoline Competitions (BSGA, n.d.). There are two preliminary rounds: Regional then Zonal (northern, central and southern); followed by a National Championship. Full-time students in schools or college up to the age of 19 are eligible (university students or others in higher education are not eligible); and compete in the following age-groups: under-11 (Year 6 and below), under-13 (Years 7 and 8), under-15 (Years 9 and 10) and
under-19 (Years 11, 12, 13, and 14). In each age-group there is a novice and elite level competition and the routines are the same for all age groups (see Table 2.11). By looking at the British Gymnastics Trampoline Grade Routines (see Appendix Seven) it can be seen that the novice level school routine is equivalent in difficulty to the Club H routine as it contains body landings but no somersaults. The elite level school routine is comparable to the Club G routines since all include one somersault. The use of ‘elite’ is spurious as within the NGB competitions there are still Grades A, B, C, D, E and F above Club G with categories for school aged competitors. Thus the schools’ trampoline competitions are relatively low level competitions compared to those operated by British Gymnastics. In addition, “there is no requirement to be affiliated to British Gymnastics for these school events” (BSGA, n.d., www.schools-trampolining.co.uk).

Table 2.11 – Routines for Schools Trampoline Competitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Level</th>
<th>Elite Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Twist Jump</td>
<td>Full Twist Jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straddle Jump</td>
<td>Straddle Jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Drop</td>
<td>Seat Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-twist to Seat</td>
<td>Half-twist to Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-twist to Feet</td>
<td>Half-twist to Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike Jump</td>
<td>Pike Jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Drop</td>
<td>Back Drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-twist to Feet</td>
<td>Half-twist to Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck Jump</td>
<td>Tuck Jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half twist jump</td>
<td>Front Somersault (Tucked)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum tariff for voluntary routine = 2.0

Maximum tariff for voluntary routine = 7.0

This description of school trampolining and gymnastics has revealed that trampolining may not have played a major part in school gymnastics lessons due to the National Curriculum requirements (DfEE and QCA, 1999) and QCA recommendations (QCA, 2000a and 2000b) but may be more suitable under the revised National Curriculum. However, schools may still choose to include trampolining in their PE lessons and of course are free to run extra-curricular clubs. Trampolining has not been included in the UK School Games and the BSGA National Schools Trampoline Competitions are quite low-level and separate from the British Gymnastics
competition structure and development plans for trampolining. Because school trampolining appears to be fairly disconnected from the NGB and due to National Curriculum requirements it may not play a major part in school gymnastics, Olympic inclusion is unlikely to have a major impact on trampolining in schools.

2.9) Conclusion

From the review of literature, it appeared that investigating the effect of Olympic inclusion on sport was a valid and valuable area for study and fills a gap in existing research.

In section 2.2 a case was made for the perceived importance of the Olympic Games, hence implying that inclusion in the Olympic programme would have an effect on a sport. Section 2.3 then detailed the criteria and process for including a sport or discipline in the Olympic Games. Existing research on the implications of Olympic inclusion was considered in section 2.4. From looking at the sports of judo, taekwondo, curling, snowboarding and triathlon, effects observed focussed around changes in philosophy, how minority sports have been altered by majority consumption, specific difficulties faced by alternative sports, increased participation, new power influences and increases in sponsorship. However, each study just concentrated on researching limited aspects of a sport and most focussed on aspects of organisational change and perceptions. Only one study considered economic changes due to Olympic inclusion and this just looked at sponsorship. There was no consideration of changes to policy. Furthermore, the majority of the studies relied on secondary data. Thus there is a need for a comprehensive examination of organisational, economic and policy changes to a sport since it has joined the Olympic programme using primary data.
Recent policy initiatives for sport were reviewed in section 2.5. An important theme to emerge was the twin-track approach of developing elite sport and sport for all and difficulties relating to this. Section 2.6 looked at the background sporting landscape and how it has emerged and developed as a result of the policies detailed in section 2.5. UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA are responsible for elite sport; Sport England and County Sports Partnerships for community sport; and the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships for school sport and sport for young people. The NGB is then responsible for the whole of their sport from grass-roots to elite. The history of trampolining was detailed in section 2.7. The most pertinent point for this study being the forced merger of the British Trampoline Federation with British Gymnastics due to trampolining being considered a discipline of gymnastics within the Olympics and the IOC having a ruling of only recognising one NGB per sport for management reasons. Lastly, in section 2.8 school trampolining and gymnastics were analysed. It was found that it would be difficult for trampolining to play a major part in the National Curriculum (DfEE and QCA, 1999) and QCA recommendations (QCA 2000a and 2000b). While the revised National Curriculum for secondary schools is more amenable to including trampolining in the curriculum, this is unrelated to Olympic inclusion. Furthermore, the competition structures for school trampolining and club trampolining are very separate.

From discussions in this chapter a number of specific aspects emerged as being particularly important for consideration in this study and which underpin the research questions as specified in Chapter One. Beginning with organisational structure, the British Trampoline Federation was subsumed into British Gymnastics in 1999 as a consequence of trampolining being in the Olympic programme. This merger, as well as Olympic inclusion, is likely to have repercussions for the structure and delivery of the sport. Furthermore, trampolining has been subject to new power influences since it has been in the Olympic programme.
Organisations include British Gymnastics, the IOC, the BOA, UK Sport and the EIS. A substantial body of literature reviewed suggests conflict between the two aims of sport: elite sport and sport for all (for example, Green, 2006, 2004a, 2004b and Green and Houlihan, 2004). This may be exacerbated in trampolining by Olympic inclusion. Increasing levels of participation in sport is a key issue on the Government’s agenda (for example, DCMS, 2000). Whether Olympic recognition affects recreational participation rates in a given sport such as trampolining is unclear. According to sources such as the Carter Report (Carter, 2005) lack of funding and facilities is a barrier in sport. Funding from UK Sport, Sport England and British Gymnastics and also sponsorship may have changed since trampolining has become an Olympic sport. School trampolining appears to be fairly separate from that governed by the NGB. Moreover, trampolining does not fit easily within the National Curriculum requirements or QCA plans. Because of these issues it is questionable to what degree Olympic inclusion will affect trampolining in school.

To investigate the effect of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England requires exploring these dimensions in detail. However, in order to do this a clear understanding of the theoretical dimensions and concepts of organisational theory, economic theory, policy theory and power theory are required. Hence the underlying theoretical areas have been considered in Chapter Three.
3.1) Introduction

In Chapter Two it was argued that the sports system is influenced by policy and organisational development. To better comprehend how these developments arise and the effects that they have requires an understanding of relevant elements of their theory. For example, because the sports delivery system has changed this suggests that looking at organisational structure and theoretically how organisations change would be useful. This chapter therefore reviews the areas of organisational theory, economic theory and policy theory to try to explain what was covered in the descriptive review of change in Chapter Two. It also indicates their potential relevance for this investigation and makes some tentative predictions. The theory will also be useful for explaining findings and reasons behind observations.

Power underpins both inter-organisational and intra-organisational relationships and thus aspects of power impinge on organisational, economic and policy changes. This can be exemplified by things such as funding relationships between organisations. Hence power theory has been discussed in this chapter too. In the empirical chapters (Chapters Five to Eight) while power has received consideration it has not been treated as a discrete entity because of its strong links with the other aspects.

Thus in this chapter section 3.2 considers relevant organisational theories, section 3.3 relevant economic theories, section 3.4 relevant policy theories and section 3.5 relevant power theories. In the introduction within the separate sections justification is made for the choice of theories discussed. In Chapter Two policy changes were discussed before looking at the consequential organisational and economic implications. However
in this chapter and in subsequent ones, topics will be considered in the order of organisational change, economic change and policy change. This is because the empirical work suggested that changes were driven more explicitly by organisational and economic change and also empirically it was found there are sometimes not explicit written policies to explain behaviour, but rather organisational and economic actions highlight underlying belief systems and un-written policies. This is inevitably because the research question is essentially directed at the impacts of policy change, rather than the process by which policy changes; that is the impacts of Olympic inclusion on the sports system, as opposed to why a sport is recognised by the Olympics or why Olympic sport is promoted by the Government. By contrast when discussing the context of sport in the UK, as it Chapter Two, it makes more sense to discuss broader policy impetus first, and then organisational and economic issues that result from changes.

The philosophy behind the use of the elements of this theory in this study is discussed further in Chapter Four (section 4.2) where the research design is considered. Because a critical realist approach has been adopted (as justified in section 4.2) it is important to acknowledge at this point that critical realism emphasises both agency and structure so concordance of this is necessary in the selection of theories used.

Jackson argued “the tension between structure and agency underlies much social theory” (2006, p.309). ‘Structure’ relates to macro-theories that emphasise organisational and institutional aspects of society (Sztompka, 1994). Jackson’s definition also includes “social facts that surround and mark each of us” (2006, p.309). More broadly, structure can be thought of as “a specific entity that participates in the structuring of our world” (Cooren, Thompson, Canestraro and Bodor, 2006). Examples of this are a procedure, an idea, a presupposition, a title, a document or an architectural element.
'Agency' then refers to:
our capacity at the micro-level to decide and act within the constraints of social facts, and sometimes to act across those constraints (Jackson, 2006, p.309).

I.e. agency is the capacity to make a difference or to alter the chain of actions in some way. Most researchers in the field treat the agent as an individual actor, yet some use the term interchangeably for individuals or collectives (Ritzer and Gindoff, 1994). Furthermore, Cooren et.al. (2006) introduce the notion of ‘non-human’ agency. This refers to the belief that “objects do things” (Cooren et.al., 2006, p.535). So for example, things such as documents contribute to the development of organisational and social processes.

According to Jackson, the distinction between agency and structure is “a border between everyday experiences and the esoteric knowledge of social science” (2006, p.310). While at the micro-level we are free to conduct ourselves how we see fit, at the macro-level national and international laws makes us responsible for our actions. Thus we are treated as “agents who make choices and bear the consequences of these choices” (Jackson, 2006, p.310). Yet, at the same time it is argued by sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists, economists etc that social structure precedes actions.

The attempts at structure-agency synthesis “flow from a variety of very different theoretical directions” (Ritzer and Gindoff, 1994, p.10) resulting in deterministic or voluntarist theories of human behaviour. In the theories discussed in the following sections there may be differences in the implied relation between the individual and society. The stance adopted is determined by the philosophical position taken and this is discussed and elaborated on in Chapter Four, but broadly speaking critical realism emphasises the importance of both structure and agency.
3.2) Organisational Theory

The study of organisation is not about how berries are arranged on a
tree of authority but about how people are coordinated and motivated
to get things done (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992, p.16).

Slack defined a sports organisation as a “social entity involved in the
sports industry; it is goal-directed, with a consciously structured activity
system and a relatively identifiable boundary” (1997, p.5). In this study the
focus is on the sport delivery system surrounding trampolining. This is
comprised of a series of organisations as detailed in Chapter Two,
namely: British Gymnastics, UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA for elite
trampolining; English Gymnastics, Sport England and County Sport
Partnerships for recreational trampolining; and the BSGA, the Youth Sport
Trust and School Sport Partnerships for school trampolining.

To assist in understanding sports organisations, Slack (1997) considered
applying the following areas of organisation theory: goals, effectiveness,
dimensions of structure, design options, strategy, impacts of size,
environments, technology, organisational power, politics, conflict, change,
human resources, decision making, culture and leadership. For the
purpose of this investigation, attention will be focussed on structure,
change, power, partnership and conflict since these facets appear to be
most pertinent to the remits of the study. The reasoning behind this will
now be justified. In Chapter Two it was established that since trampolining
had joined the Olympic programme there has been a forced merger of
NGBs and trampolining now has interactions with additional agencies. For
example, UK Sport has an influence on elite trampolining. Hence there
have been changes to the organisational structure and influences
connected with trampolining. Partnership is a key notion underpinning
recent recreational sport policy, as exemplified by the creation of County
Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships. Lastly, intra and inter-
organisational conflict has been considered because organisational
change has been found to be a major cause of conflict in sports organisations (Amis, Slack and Bennett, 1995). Power has been considered as a separate section in this chapter (3.5) as detailed in section 3.1.

To explore organisational structure, change, partnership and conflict, a number of general organisational theories will be utilised in this section, such as Mintzberg’s (1980) typology of organisational configurations. However, it must be acknowledged when using more generic organisational theories that sport organisations have a number of unique features (Hoye, Smith, Westerbeek, Stewart and Nicholson, 2006). For example compared to businesses, there can be strong interdependencies and partnerships between organisations whereas businesses may be more characterised by competition. Table 3.1 lists the factors which it is argued distinguish sports organisations from other organisations. From outside of the organisation there are wider environmental influences including: globalisation, government policy, professionalism and technological developments (Hoye et.al., 2006). Using organisational theory will help to inform how sport is delivered and assist in the investigation of the delivery system highlighting areas to be covered in interviews. According to Smith and Stewart (2010) there are two contrasting philosophical approaches to researching sports organisations. The first views sport as “a unique cultural institution” (Smith and Stewart, 2010, p.1) and under the second approach “sport is seen to be nothing more than just another generic business enterprise” (Smith and Stewart, 2010, p.1). This thesis adopts a mid-way position, in that some generic organisational theories will be used with the caveat that sport does have features which distinguish it from other organisations.
Table 3.1 - Factors which distinguish sports organisations from other organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique features of sport:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Irrational passions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Differences in judging performances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Interdependence between organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Anti-competitive behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Product of variable quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● High degree of product loyalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Engenders identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Fans exhibit optimism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Organizations reluctant to adopt new technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Limited supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken from (Hoye et.al., 2006).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An organisation’s structure can be thought of as a framework that “outlines how tasks are divided, grouped and coordinated within an organization” (Hoye et.al., 2006, p.9). The structure of an organisation is important because it specifies how staff (and volunteers) coordinate with colleagues in relation to work tasks, decision-making procedures, collaboration, levels of responsibility and reporting mechanisms etc (Hoye et.al, 2006). For any given organisation, its structure and functioning is the result of strategic choices made by the organisational administrators. Additionally, Slack argues that the structure of any specific sports organisation is “closely related to the particular context in which the organisation operates” (1997, p.6). This is a basic premise of organisational theory. In organisational literature, the dimensions of structure are (for example, Slack, 1997 and Child, 1973): complexity (type of differentiation, i.e. horizontal, vertical and/or special), formalisation (the extent to which mechanisms govern operation) and centralisation (where decision making takes place). From empirical data collection, Child (1973) found that increased complexity is likely to generate administrative problems of co-ordination and control, which in turn is a major determinant of formalisation. Child found that while size correlates with decentralisation and affects complexity, “the degree of complexity itself has a more direct relationship with formalisation than does size” (1973, p.166). Furthermore, four main contextual factors have been identified as influencing structure; namely strategy, size, environment, and technology (Slack, 1997).
Mintzberg’s (1980) suggested a typology of five basic configurations of organisational structure: simple structure, machine bureaucracy, professional bureaucracy, divisional form and adhocracy. These are summarised in Table 3.2. Mintzberg’s typology is based on a synthesis of existing literature. He found “that number five kept coming up” (Mintzberg, 1980, p.322) which influenced his model. Firstly, the organisation has five basic parts: the operating core, the strategic apex, the middle line, the technostructure and the support staff. Secondly, there are five basic mechanisms of coordination: mutual adjustment, direct supervision, the standardisation of work processes, the standardisation of outputs and the standardisation of skills. There are then five design parameters: job specialisation, behaviour formalisation, training and indoctrination, unit grouping, unit size, action planning and performance control systems, liaison devices, vertical decentralization and horizontal decentralization. Lastly there are five contingency factors: age, size, technical system, environment and power. Each of Mintzberg’s five configurations of organisational design relies on one of the five coordinating mechanisms (i.e. mutual adjustment, direct supervision, the standardisation of work processes, the standardisation of outputs or the standardisation of skills) and also each tends to favour one of the five parts of the organisation (i.e. the operating core, the strategic apex, the middle line, the technostructure and the support staff). So for example, in ‘Simple Structure’ the “key part is the strategic apex, which coordinates by direct supervision” (Mintzberg, 1980, p.322).
Table 3.2 - A summary of Mintzberg’s (1980) typology of five basic organisational configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure in 5’s: a synthesis of the research on organisation design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simple Structure</strong> – The strategic apex co-ordinates by direct supervision, with the rest of the structure being minimally elaborated and highly centralised. It is associated with simple dynamic environments and strong leaders; and is usually found in smaller, younger organisations or those facing severe crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Machine Bureaucracy</strong> – Co-ordination is primarily by the imposition of work standards from the technostructure. Power is centralised vertically at the strategic apex with limited horizontal decentralisation. This structure is usually found in simple, stable environments; and is often associated with older, larger organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Bureaucracy</strong> – Co-ordination relies on the standardisation of skills in its operating core. This structure is typically found in complex but stable environments, with technical systems that are simple and non-regulating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divisional Form</strong> – Much power is delegated to market-based units with limited vertical decentralisation. Co-ordination is via the standardisation of outputs through the use of performance control systems. This structure is typical of very large mature organisations operating in diversified markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adhocracy</strong> – Co-ordination is achieved through mutual adjustment among all its parts, including the collaboration of support staff. Jobs are specialised but there is little formalisation and decentralisation occurs in both vertical and horizontal dimensions. These structures are found in complex, dynamic environments and are often associated with highly sophisticated and automated technical systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morgan (1997) takes a different approach to the idea of classification of organisations focussing on “ways of seeing and shaping organisational life” (Morgan, 1997, p.349). While Mintzberg’s (1980) model centres on categorising more static organisational structures, Morgan (1997) identifies ways of looking at organisations as living changing entities. Morgan (1997) uses a range of metaphors based on implicit images (see Table 3.3 for a summary of these). He argues these “lead us to see, understand, and manage organizations in distinctive yet partial ways” (Morgan, 1997, p.4). There are similarities between the different authors’ models. For example, the ‘machine bureaucracy’ and ‘machine’ metaphor both describe a broadly similar organisation which is managed hierarchically. However Morgan’s (1997) model discusses additional aspects, such as how each type of organisation adapts to change. Morgan (1997) additionally introduces some more abstract understandings of organisations, for example organisations as psychic prisons where people are trapped in an organisation by their mind.
Table 3.3 - Morgan’s (1997) ‘Images of organisations’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational metaphor and a description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations as machines</strong> - The origins of ‘organisations as machines’ is through factories and the military, and these types of organisations are now usually called bureaucracies. The organisational chart is one of a pattern of precisely defined jobs organized in a hierarchical manner through defined lines of command or communication, notably there is unity of command (each subordinate only has one senior).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations as organisms</strong> - This metaphor focuses attention on organisational needs and environmental relations. Different types of organisation as belonging to different species and different species are suited to different environments. It also considers the relations between species and recognises the importance of the environment (organisations as open systems).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations as brains</strong> - Organisations are viewed as brains in three interconnected ways: information processing brains; complex learning systems and holographic systems combining centralised and decentralised characteristics. The metaphor draws attention to the importance of information processing, learning and intelligence - providing a set of principles for creating learning organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations as culture</strong> - Since the rise of Japan theorists and managers awareness of the relationship between culture and management has risen. The word culture is derived metaphorically from the idea of cultivation so in essence it is an agricultural metaphor. It views the organisation as a cultural phenomenon (e.g. distinct concepts of work and leisure, routines / rituals) with a cultural context – i.e. the enactment of a shared reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations as political systems</strong> - There are different modes of political rule in an organisation: autocracy, bureaucracy, technocracy, codetermination, representing democracy, direct democracy. One can analyse organisational politics looking at relations between interests, conflicts and power. Organisations can be thought of as a coalition, and may have coalitions within them (offer a strategy to advance one’s own interests).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations as psychic prisons</strong> - Organisations are ‘psychic prisons’ where people become trapped by their own thoughts, ideas or beliefs or by the unconscious mind. While organisations may be socially constructed realities, these constructions are often attributed an existence and power of their own that allow them to exercise a measure of control over their creators. For example, there is a trap of favoured ways of thinking and powerful visions can lead to blind spots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation as flux and transformation</strong> - According to the metaphor there are four ‘logics’ of change: 1) organisations are self-producing systems that create themselves in their own image; 2) organisation life is viewed through images of competing ‘attractor patterns’; 3) the organisation is a product of circular flows of positive and negative feedback; 4) features of modern organisation are the product of a dialectical logic whereby every phenomenon generates its opposite. This metaphor helps to understand and manage organisational change and appreciate some of the forces shaping the nature of organisation at a societal level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations as instruments of domination</strong> - This metaphor focuses on the potentially exploitative aspects of corporate life, i.e. that organisations may use their employees, their host communities, and the world economy to achieve their own ends. Organisations are used as instruments of domination with asymmetrical power relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kikulis, Slack and Hinings (1992) proposed a sports-specific model of organisational structure and change. This is based on the study of Canadian National Sports Organisations (NSOs) and their “evolutionary movement toward a more professional and bureaucratic design” (Kikulis
et.al., 1992, p.343). This change has, in part, been motivated by government funding reflecting their focus on “increasing administrative efficiency and providing comprehensive high performance sport programmes” (Kikulis et.al., 1992, p.347). Kikulis et.al. (1992) argued that the structure of an organisation is interrelated with the beliefs of the members and to what degree these beliefs are valued – for example, resistance to some advised changes may be a result of strong commitment to beliefs. Key values identified by Kikulis et.al. (1992) were: orientation, domain, principles of organising and criteria of effectiveness. They also used standard features of organisational structure in their model: specialisation, standardisation and centralisation. The three common organisational structures for Canadian NSOs were: ‘Kitchen Table’, ‘Boardroom’ and ‘Executive Office.’ ‘Kitchen Table’ organisations are characterised by a lack of professionalisation and a lack of bureaucratisation. They are generally run by volunteers and “personal qualities of the individual tend to override the specific requirements of the role” (Kikulis et.al., 1992, p.356). So for example it is felt that a person with interest in the sport and / or seniority in the organisation has the competencies to coach, judge and administer the sport. This organisational design was more prevalent before the 1970s but can still be seen in newer or smaller sports organisations. In ‘Boardroom’ organisations there are bureaucratic procedures and formal structures. Similar to ‘Kitchen Table’ organisations they are directed by volunteer executives; however they are supported by public agencies. By acceptance of governments funding they are subject to government influence. This type of organisation emerged in the 1970s and continues to be prevalent today. ‘Executive Office’ organisations are largely influenced by external public interests and the providers of financial support such as government agencies and sponsors. Because of this, committee and executive positions are filled by individuals with specific expertise and there are “professional and national interests in systematically controlling the direction of the sport” (Kikulis et.al., 1992, p.361). For a full description of each design archetype see Table 3.4. The
identification of these organisational designs provides a basis for
describing the development of a sports organisation. Kikulis et.al. (1992)
found that the most frequent transition was from a ‘Kitchen Table’ design
archetype to either a ‘Boardroom’ or ‘Executive Office’ design archetype.
Some organisations remain as ‘Boardrooms’ while others move to
‘Executive Offices’ although the transfer is not always permanent.

Table 3.4 – Institutionally specific design archetypes for NSOs (Kikulis et.al., 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational values</th>
<th>Kitchen Table</th>
<th>Boardroom</th>
<th>Executive Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>Private, volunteer, non-profit (membership &amp; fundraising)</td>
<td>Private, volunteer, non-profit (public &amp; private funds)</td>
<td>Private, volunteer, non-profit (government and corporate funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Broad: mass to high performance sport</td>
<td>Competitive sport opportunities</td>
<td>Narrow: high performance sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of organising</td>
<td>Minimal coordination, decision making by volunteer executives</td>
<td>Volunteer hierarchy, professionally assisted</td>
<td>Formal planning, professionally lead and volunteer assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of effectiveness</td>
<td>Membership preferences, quality service</td>
<td>Administrative efficiency &amp; effectiveness</td>
<td>International success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational structure</td>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>Standardisation</td>
<td>Centralisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>Roles based on interest &amp; loyalty</td>
<td>Few rules, little planning</td>
<td>Decisions made by a few volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardisation</td>
<td>Specialist roles &amp; committees</td>
<td>Formal roles, rules &amp; programmes</td>
<td>Decisions made by the volunteer board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralisation</td>
<td>Professional, technical &amp; administrative expertise</td>
<td>Formal roles, rules &amp; programmes</td>
<td>Decisions decentralised to the professional staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a later study Kikulis, Slack and Hinings (1995a) found that despite the
professionalization of Canadian NSOs in the 1980s and 1990s, the shift in
control and decision making from volunteers to professionals had not
occurred to the degree expected. While decision making had changed,
there was variation according the direction of change, the decision making
dimension and the decision topic (Kikulis et.al., 1995a).

In this investigation the typologies of organisation structures and models of
change as proposed by Mintzberg (1980), Morgan (1997) and Kikulis et.al.
(1992) have been used to help identify or highlight areas of importance rather than as a rigid categorisation tool. The decision to draw pragmatically on the different typologies is reinforced by the fact that several studies have found that there is “low convergence between survey and institutional measures of organisational structure” (Walton, 1981, p.155).

As discussed in the introduction to this section, organisational change is fundamental to this study. Slack comments on the “paradoxical nature of change” (1997, p.214), since a sports organisation must adapt if it wishes to remain competitive but management prefers stability and predictability. The impetus for change may arise externally from changes in the environment in which the sports organisation operates or from inside the organisation itself (Slack, 1997). According to Kikulis, Slack and Hinings (1995b), Canadian NSOs faced pressure from the government agency Sport Canada to modernise their operating procedures in the 1980s. Rather than passively following these requests, Kikulis et.al. found evidence of the NSOs demonstrating resistance in the form of “pacifying activities and ceremonial conformity” (1995b, p.135). They felt that agency and the choices that organisations make in response to legislation are important aspects of the dynamic of change.

The merger of NGBs could be considered one of the most dramatic examples of organisational change. Stevens (2006) investigated the merger of two Canadian hockey associations in 1994. The Canadian Amateur Hockey Association, which catered for recreational hockey, joined together with Hockey Canada, which was performance focused, to form the Canadian Hockey Association. The two organisations had “distinct traditions and an antagonistic history” (Stevens, 2006, p.79). Stevens (2006) charted the stages of the merger. One of the major conflicts was regarding the balance between elite hockey and sport for all. Despite conflicts, the resultant governing body was felt to be more effective overall, although during the transition period there were more
stages in decision making and some uncertainty on new operating procedures (Stevens, 2006). Also, Stevens (2006) identified a new organisational archetype further to those proposed by Kikulis et.al. (1992) - the Amateur Sport Enterprise. This is because “the interpretive and structural elements explained in existing archetype research for this institutional sector no longer accurate” (Stevens, 2006, p.97). Amateur Sport Enterprises are characterised by “commerce-based values and community-based structures” (Stevens, 2006, p.97).

Another example of governing body merger is between USA Equestrian (formerly the American Horse Shows Association) and the US Equestrian Team to form a single NGB for equine sports. This occurred as a result of a ruling by the United States Olympic Committee. There is no literature on the resultant NGB, but prior to the two organisations joining there were great concerns regarding issues of prioritisation of certain disciplines and also questions over who would head the new NGB (Jaffer, 2002).

In this thesis the external force was trampolining conforming to the requirements of being admitted to the Olympic programme but the impetus towards incorporation within Olympic competition was the product of prior internal lobbying. This then caused the British Trampoline Federation to join together with British Gymnastics. The effects of these events may have then resulted in internal change.

Morgan (1997) offered the view that organisational change is a function of learning. In the single-loop model learning “rests in an ability to detect and correct error in relation to a given set of operating norms” (Morgan, 1997, p.87). Morgan (1997) illustrates this through the example of a central heating system which is able to learn, in the sense of detecting and correcting deviations in temperature from externally decided levels, but is not able to determine itself what level of temperature is appropriate. In organisational terms, this would relate to an organisation which is able to scan the environment, set objectives and measure performance in relation
to these objectives and fundamentally ‘stay on course.’ By contrast, double-loop learning relies on the organisation “being able to take a ‘double look’ at the situation by questioning the relevance of operating norms” (1997, p.87). This involves the organisation reviewing and challenging basic or standard paradigms and operating norms. Factors which make this double-loop model of organisational change more difficult to implement include: bureaucratization which creates fragmented patterns of thought and action; and accountability and other systems of rewarding and punishing employees (Morgan, 1997). So organisations are linked to control here.

Hrebiniak and Joyce (1985) constructed an alternative typology of organisational adaptation resulting from an underlying belief that strategic choice and environmental determinism are not mutually exclusive causes of organisational change but rather variable on a continuum. The first category ‘natural selection’ is characterised by minimum choice and adaptation or selection out. It is exemplified by few strategic choices, low autonomy due to external constraints and low levels of conflict. The second category ‘differentiation’ is characterised by high choice and high environmental determinism and adaptation with constraints. It is exemplified by a medium to high number of strategic choices, medium autonomy and high levels of inter-organisational conflict. The third category ‘strategic choice’ is characterised by maximum choice and adaptation by design. It is exemplified by a high number of strategic choices, high autonomy and high levels of inter-organisational conflict. The final category ‘undifferentiated choice’ is characterised by incremental choice and adaptation by chance. It is exemplified by few strategic choices, low autonomy due to internal constraints and low levels of conflict (Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1985).

Progressing on from these two alternative models for organisational change, Amis, Slack and Hinings (2004) investigated the role that internal dynamics have on the propensity of organisations to change through an
investigation of 36 Canadian NSOs. They found that NSOs that were willing and able to change were lead by people with transformational leadership skills (i.e. the technical and behavioural capacity for initiating and sustaining change); had an organisational structure in which volunteers were willing to share power with professional staff; and embraced change so it affected the whole of the organisation (Amis et.al., 2004). Table 3.5 shows the theoretical functions of different levels of managers in augmenting change according to Floyd and Lane, 2000). It must be acknowledged however that “interaction among environmental, structural, and strategy-making variables can richly characterise the adaptive process” (Miller and Friesen, 1980, p.271).

Table 3.5 - The function of managers in change (adapted from Floyd and Lane, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management</td>
<td>Ratifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>Championing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating management</td>
<td>Experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in section 2.6 when describing the sport delivery system sports organisations such as British Gymnastics exist as autonomous units but are linked to other organisations as part of delivering their objectives – they are part of a partnership of public sector and voluntary sector establishments. Under New Labour, partnerships pervaded the discourse of social policy (McDonald, 2005). While the term ‘partnership’ is used in a wide variety of settings, its precise meaning is unclear. The rationale is “to bring together actors with a shared interest in the problem around which the collaboration is built” (Tomlinson, 2005, p.1173) to “create collaborative advantage and synergy… and draw on different resources and expertise in relation to it” (Tomlinson, 2005, p.1173). For funding bodies it is administratively convenient and spreads their risks, but
organisations may participate primarily as a means to access funds. Tomlinson (2005) drew on a case study of refugee resettlement to reveal two contrasting versions of the discourse of partnership. The ‘idealistic’ version views partnership as something of benefit whereas the ‘pragmatic’ version sees partnership from the perspective of the instrumentality of stakeholders (see Table 3.6). The conflicts between these accounts are reflected in “tensions between trust and power within inter-organizational relationships” (Tomlinson, 2005, p.1169). McDonald “questioned the claims made for the benefits of partnerships by politicians and policy makers” (2005, p.579). Specifically, just because governments or others classify a relationship as a partnership “it does not follow ipso facto that it is a partnership” (McDonald, 2005, p.579). A key issue is unequal power relationships. This is true in trampolining, since to a certain extent there is a hierarchy with UK Sport, Sport England and the BOA being in control of funding and hence possessing the most power, then British Gymnastics being at the next level down followed by individual clubs. Astley and Sachdeva (1984) refer to this as ‘asymmetries in dependency’ and it is reflected in asymmetry in power between the actors involved. Through investigation of Canadian non-profit sports organisations, Babiak and Thibault found that cross-sector partnerships offer particular “potential structural and strategic challenges” (2009, p.138).
Table 3.6 - The ‘idealistic’ version of partnership versus the ‘pragmatic’ version of partnership (Tomlinson, 2005, p.1183)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of use</th>
<th>Idealistic</th>
<th>Pragmatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the outcomes and benefits of partnership</td>
<td>Contribution to the resolution of a shared social problem; wider sharing of resources, expertise and experience.</td>
<td>Spreading of funders’ costs and risks; to achieve coordination and economies of scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main beneficiaries</td>
<td>Benefit to all involved, including ‘weaker’ members.</td>
<td>Primarily serves the interests of more powerful members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal reasons for organizations to join.</td>
<td>Sharing good practice and networking.</td>
<td>To access resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis on which members conform to expectations</td>
<td>Internalized sense of loyalty and commitment (goodwill trust).</td>
<td>Through formal controls and resource-based influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for stakeholder legitimacy</td>
<td>Interest and involvement in the issue, including those affected by it.</td>
<td>Access to resources and perceived competence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sport organisations “exhibit characteristics that render them significantly more susceptible to conflict than organizations in other institutional spheres” (Amis, Slack and Berrett, 1995, p.1). Conflict can be thought of as two or more parties in opposition (who perceive a conflict to exist) with one or more of the parties preventing other parties from achieving its goals by some form of blocking behaviour resulting in an emotional response (Slack, 1997). This is why control is important in organisations. Theoretically, organisational sources of conflict include: mutual dependence, asymmetries, rewards, organisational differentiation, role dissatisfaction, ambiguities, common resources, communication obstacles, and personal skills and traits (Walton and Dutton, 1969). Through investigation of Canadian sports organisations undergoing conflict, Amis et.al. (1995) found the main sport specific structural antecedents of conflict were sub-units, elite sport versus sport for all, volunteers and organisational change. Structurally, “the differentiated and interdependent nature of these organizations” (Amis et.al., 1995, p.1) and “informal operating procedures” (Amis et.al., 1995, p.2) precipitated conflict between
organizational sub-units in sport. Types of interdepartmental conflict more generally include: inference, overstatement, withholding of information, annoyance and distrust (Walton, Dutton and Cafferty, 1969). In British Gymnastics, English Gymnastics and clubs there may be potential conflicts between perceived prioritisation of different disciplines. Also, within departments or between coalitions there may be debates on the importance of elite sport versus sport for all. A further source of major conflict fairly specific to sports organisations is the tension between “volunteers who direct and set policy for these organizations” (Amis et.al., 1995, p.2) and “the professionals who are hired to be responsible for their day-to-day operation” (Amis et.al., 1995, p.2). For example, some volunteers with managerial posts “often perceive that the paid employees are just there to ‘help them out’” (Taylor and O’Sullivan, 2009, p.687). From studies of six sports organisations Thibault, Slack and Hinings (1991) found the impact of hiring professional staff on voluntary sports organisations was increased levels of formalisation, specialisation (often as they were specifically hired for this purpose) and standardisation, and initially greater centralisation of decision making. Overall:

- there is a clear link between professionalisation and bureaucratisation
- in the organisations studies… also a difficulty over control

(Thibault et.al., 1991, p.95).

This has been manifest to a greater degree since the “incorporation of sports into public policy, with the consequential focus on accountability” (Downward, Dawson and Dejonghe, 2009, p.163). Pondy (1969) differentiates between frictional conflict within a stable organisation and conflict aimed at changing the organisation structure. The later source on conflict may be more prominent in British Gymnastics due to the amalgamation with the British Trampoline Federation and the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympic programme. Finally, it must be remembered that “not all conflict is dysfunctional” (Amis et.al., 1995, p.1).

A further related issue that may need consideration is organisational stress in elite athletes – organisational stress can be defined as “the stress
that is associated primarily and directly with an individual’s appraisal of the structure and functioning of the organization within which he/she is operating” (Woodman and Hardy, 2001, p.208). From interviews with fifteen elite athletes prior to international competitions, Woodman and Hardy (2001) identified that major sources of organisational stress were: environmental issues (selection, the training environment, and finances); personal issues (nutrition, injury, and goals and expectations); leadership issues (coaches, and coaching styles) and team issues (team atmosphere, support network, roles, and communication).

Theoretically, the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympic programme will have had an impact on structure, change, power, partnerships, and conflict within the organisation of British Gymnastics and more widely. Aside from the specific impacts, according to Hoye et.al. (2006) global areas of future challenge for sport managers include: strategic management, organisational structure, human resource management, leadership, organisational culture, governance and performance management. However, Hinings and Greenwood highlight that in terms of organisations, “our generalised theories are highly contextualised in time and place” (2002, p.417), i.e. they are based on data collected from North America in the 1980s and 1990s. This may need to be taken into account when utilising the theories.

3.3) Economic Theory

The field of economics is divided into two areas. Macroeconomics “views an economy as a whole, focussing on economic aggregates” (Li, Hofacre and Mahony, 2001, p.24) while microeconomics “examines the behaviour of individual elements or markets of an economy (such as the sport industry) and how these elements interact” (Li et.al., 2001, p.24). This section attempts to understand the rationale behind the funding of sport in
England through the use of microeconomics; looking at the aspects of government funding, contracts, the labour market and sponsorship. In sections 2.5 and 2.6 the place of funding in terms of policy documents and organisational structure was explored. The staffing of these initiatives was also discussed to a certain degree. In the review of existing literature looking at the impacts of Olympic inclusion on sport (section 2.4) one study suggested an implication of being included in the Olympics was increased sponsorship for the sport (Cassidy, 2002). Thus it is important to investigate these aspects in this study.

To recap from section 2.6, in terms of the current structure of sport in England it was concluded that sport in England is managed and organised as follows: UK Sport, along with the EIS and the BOA, are primarily responsible for elite level sport; with Sport England and County Sport Partnerships being geared towards recreational athletes; and finally the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships are responsible for school sport. All, apart from the BOA, come under the jurisdiction of the DCMS. NGBs, such as British Gymnastics, then support the whole spectrum of abilities within a formal club-based setting in their given sport. When it comes to funding the situation is pretty similar. The DCMS are responsible for the allocation and distribution of Government funding for sport to UK Sport, Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust. All three also receive some National Lottery money (DCMS, 2006). UK Sport then provides support to elite athletes through its World Class Performance Programme; which offers funding for NGBs to provide a support infrastructure for elite athletes, but only those who meet agreed performance criteria. Also British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics receive subsidies for participation level sport from Sport England and assistance for gymnastics in school from the Youth Sport Trust. The BOA receives no financial support from Government or National Lottery (BOA, n.d.).
According to Gratton and Taylor (1991), principles of economic welfare explain the government interest in funding sport. Due to welfare benefits such as health and reduced crime which are externalities, the government has a reason to encourage higher production and consumption of sport. They may do this by subsidising consumers, subsidising suppliers or directly supplying the product at a lower price (Downward et.al., 2009). Thus the Government’s motivation for intervention is partly based on addressing inequity (an approach promoted through Game Plan). Government support is essential since “this is unlikely to be done by private market suppliers in the interest of public welfare” (Gratton and Taylor, 1991, p.56). Therefore it can be argued that Government support is also necessary to address inefficiencies or market failures, i.e. public goods exist as extreme forms of externalities when markets fail (Downward et.al., 2009). According to the neoclassical approach to economics (one that is generally anti-government intervention), the government’s intervention is assumed to: have motives geared towards the ‘public purpose’ (i.e. no vested interests), have the information necessary to do intervene effectively, be representative of society’s group preferences and be cost effective (Gratton and Taylor, 1991). However, it is recognised by Gratton and Taylor (1991) that these are substantial assumptions.

Furthermore, Gratton and Taylor (1991) argue that “some sport and recreation products demonstrate characteristics which qualify them for recognition as ‘public goods’” (1991, p.72) – namely that they are non-rival (consumption by one person does not preclude consumption by others) and non-excludable (no consumer can be excluded). While, this clearly applies to provisions such as free parks and to a certain extent council run leisure facilities, its application with respect to say a trampolining class is more debatable. For example, for safety reasons there may be a maximum number of participants, so consumption by one person may prevent consumption by others if the class is full, and participants can be excluded if they do not pay their fees. Hence it is still in the private
sector’s interest to provide certain types of sporting provision. Clubs run by volunteers may also fulfil this role (Downward et.al., 2009). Downward et.al. argue that when sport is provided by a voluntary organisation “this is an example of government, as well as market, failure” (2009, p.25).

Due to funding and subsidies for public sector sport, the profit maximisation model – “the most common model of firm motivation” (Li et.al, 2001, p.30) - is not applicable. From the alternative models which have been proposed, Li et.al. believe the goal orientated model of efficiency is most appropriate for sport: “non-profit managers make decisions that maximise the ratio of benefits to costs” (2001, p.35). While rational optimising behaviour is central to business (i.e. maximising the ratio of benefits to costs), in the case of sport ‘benefits’ and ‘costs’ are not seen in purely financial terms. UK Sport having funding release triggers (UK Sport, n.d.) and Sport England and NGBs releasing funding on the basis of development plans and targets (Sport England, n.d.), supports the notion of efficiency. I.e. funding is linked to clear medal targets or participation targets. Li et.al. raise the concern that:

because the number of participants is easier to quantify than positive experiences, participation numbers is the goal that has a greater impact on decision making (2001, p.36).

An alternative model which may be more applicable for elite level sport, especially given the underpinning idea of payment for results, is the winning maximisation model, but the costs still have to be accounted for.

Support from UK Sport is now solely for Olympic sports and disciplines. Within British Gymnastics only artistic gymnastics and trampolining receive this support. Rhythmic gymnastics has been removed from the World Class Programme (British Gymnastics, 2005). Hence, inclusion in the Olympics has been necessary to secure this source of funding for elite trampolining. However, funding is not just handed out – it is given as part of a contract with clear conditions. For example, in 2006 British Gymnastics needed two trampolinists to rank at least in the top four to
eight at the Trampolining European Championships for funding to continue (UK Sport, 2006a). This is a clear example of incentive contracts being employed. It is also linked to the idea that efficiency is needed for public sector investment and in the case of elite sport best value is seen as medal count.

In economic theory it is argued that in the absence of monitoring, contracts generally are specified to account for principal-agent relationships, where the principal is the party whose interest are served and the agent the party who acts on behalf of the principal (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). So in the case of British Gymnastics receiving funding from UK Sport to produce world class elite level gymnasts, the former is the agent and the later the principle. British Gymnastics are required to achieve certain rankings in international competitions in order to receive funding. A key characteristic of organisations, such as British Gymnastics, is their independent legal identity which enables them to enter binding contracts in their corporate name, as opposed to as separate individuals from the organisation (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). Contracts are “meant to protect people by aligning incentives” (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992, p.133). A complete contract specifies what each party is to do under all possible circumstances. Gratton and Taylor argued that tightening up on contractual agreements attached to grants has involved “very demanding information requirements in specification, selection and monitoring” (1991, p.182). In sport it is plausible to assume that many if not all of those working with elite level athletes would like them to reach the highest level possible and so motivations are already congruent, but it is still possible for people to become complacent without incentives / sanctions being involved.

According to economists “to provide incentives, it is desirable to hold employees responsible for their performance” (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992, p.207), and this is reflected in the funding by performance contracts between UK Sport and NGBs. However, this does result in the agent
facing risks due to “uncontrollable randomness” (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992, p.208). This can be exemplified by the fact that “winning a sporting contest, such as a match or a league championship, depends on relative, not absolute performance” (Szymanski, 2003, p.469). Another form of randomness is the fact that “outside events beyond the control of the employee may affect his or her ability to perform as contracted” (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992, p.208). British Gymnastics could use all the possible techniques to generate medal winning trampolinists, but they may not have athletes to work with who posses sufficient inherent natural ability. Consequently British Gymnastics may fail to meet the targets set by UK Sport and break their side of the contract through no fault of their own. Gratton and Taylor conclude that:

- a simple listing of medals, competitions, etc recently won is a poor substitute for a proper evaluation of excellence achievements and their relationship to Governing Body activity (1991, p.184).

Furthermore, Milgrom and Roberts (1992) assert that when employers do several things in their job, they are likely to give more attention to the aspects that will receive incentives. With respect to NGBs this may mean they focus on elite athletes at the expense of grass-roots level.

There are differences to the labour force in sport (and possibly the arts) from that in other industries. Firstly, a proportion of the labour force consists of volunteers. Volunteers in sport provide many benefits in kind and their services may not be included in economic appraisals, indeed for some it is “even regarded as consumption [of sport] rather than work for those providing it” (Gratton and Taylor, 1991, p.163). Davies claimed that in terms of voluntary work in sport “research on its contribution to sport-related activity is limited” (2004, p.347). Secondly, NGBs have a certain amount of monopsonistic powers over coaches and participants in their sport since they are “the sole buyers and users of the services rendered” (Li et.al., 2001, p.141) and so have power over employment opportunities in the field. It would not be possible for a rival governing body to be set up as the Olympics only deals with one NGB per country. Finally,
investments can also be seen in a different, non-monetary, light. “Investments in education can create an extremely important asset, human capital” (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992, p.135) – this is likely to be an important factor in coach education programmes.

In addition to funding, sponsorship is another source of income to trampolining. Some sports (including judo, volleyball, weightlifting, and wrestling in Britain) have an inherent disadvantage in attracting sponsorship due to a lack of public interest in the sport and “a perceived inappropriateness of the sports for any potential sponsor’s image” (Gratton and Taylor, 1991, p.75). Interestingly for gymnastics too: “sponsorship has proved difficult to secure during the last 4 years and no significant corporate sponsors have been found” (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.21). No separate data for the discipline of trampolining was given. Nevertheless, sponsors of the Olympics “believe that their brands are enhanced through their alliance with the games” (Cole, 2005, p.227) because they can “link their names and their products with all the glory of the Olympic Games” (Mariani, 1995, p.11). So it possible that admittance to the Olympic programme could have enhanced trampolining’s sponsorship potential. Indeed Cassidy (2002) notes that sponsorship of snowboarding has increased since it became an Olympic sport, but unfortunately no data is given.

Within sports, sponsorship is generally focussed on events and only individuals at the very top of the performance structure simply because it generates a greater return for the sponsors (Ferrand, Torrigiani and Camps i Povill, 2007). This is problematic since it could be “damaging to the production of excellence if top participants are ‘overexposed’ in too many events” (Gratton and Taylor, 1991, p.160) and individuals just below this level may have more urgent financial needs. But then conversely, it could be argued that NGB funds which might have been focussed on these areas can now be used to fulfil other needs. Moreover, Gratton and Taylor argue that if in fact sponsorship is used more widely, say to fund
grass-roots programs, “its volatility could upset long-term development programmes” (1991, p.159). In addition, clubs may have their own small-scale sponsorship deals with local businesses.

This section has covered economic theory which Chapter Two implied would be relevant to the empirical work in this thesis. From an economic point of view, for elite trampolining the likely implications of trampolining becoming an Olympic sport are that it retains World Class funding subject to satisfactory performance and could generate more sponsorship income. These two points will have wider ramifications in the sport than purely financial due to the need to meet targets. Sport England funding is used to fund community sporting opportunities so theoretically whether a given sport is in the Olympics or not is irrelevant under this remit. Sport England’s targets are based around participation levels (Sport England, n.d.). However, it is important to investigate if in practice the inclusion of a sport in the Olympic programme encourages Sport England to fund it at grass-roots level. Furthermore, because sponsorship is often focussed on elite performers and events there is unlikely to be much impact at the recreational level of any overall increase in sponsorship. At this stage there is no evidence to suggest that Olympic inclusion will have any economic influence on school trampolining.

3.4) Policy Theory

A policy can be considered “an attempt to define and structure a rational basis for action or inaction” (Parsons, 1997, p.14). Key government policy documents on sport were detailed in section 2.6. One important aspect of policy for this study is that relating to the balance between elite sport and ‘sport for all’. This can be exemplified by “policy shifts throughout the sport with the clear aim of producing sustained medal-winning
performances at the highest level” (Green and Houlihan, 2004, p.396) as explained in Chapter Two.

According to Marsh “all authors see policy networks as a key feature of modern politics” (1998, p.3). The idea of ‘policy networks’ (although not the name itself) emerged in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s. It:
- emphasised regular contacts between individuals within interest groups, bureaucratic agencies and government which provided the basis of a sub-government (Marsh, 1998, p.3).

The model was developed by later authors, for example the notion of an ‘iron triangle’ between the central government agency, the congressional committee and the interest group. Slightly different understandings emerged in the Britain and the United States. British literature drew more strongly on interorganisational theory, for example there is an emphasis on the structural relationships between political institutions rather than the interpersonal relationships between individuals at the institutions being the crucial element in a policy network (Marsh, 1998). Nevertheless, there is concern that the concept as described so far is actually only a metaphor and not an explanatory device. Marsh and Rhodes (1992) developed a more illuminating approach. The three key features of this are: 1) a diminished importance of the role of agents and an emphasis on the structural aspects; 2) the structure of the networks effect policy outcomes; 3) factors exogenous to the network lead to change in both the policy network and the policy outcome. While the policy network approach does acknowledge the role of both structure and agency, it does privilege structure over agency. There are a variety of types of policy networks which feature different policy communities and issue networks. See table 3.7 for details of these. The policy network has provided a fundamental input into later theories to describe and explain policy formation and implementation.
Table 3.7 – Types of policy networks (Marsh, 1998, p.16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Policy community</th>
<th>Issue network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants</td>
<td>Very limited number, some groups consciously excluded</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of interest</td>
<td>Economic and / or professional interests dominate</td>
<td>Encompasses range of affected interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of interaction</td>
<td>Frequent, high-quality, interaction of all groups on all matters related to policy issue</td>
<td>Contacts fluctuate in frequency and intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Membership, values and outcomes persistent over time</td>
<td>Access fluctuates significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>All participants share basic values and accept the legitimacy of the outcome</td>
<td>A measure of agreement exists, but conflict is ever present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of resources within network</td>
<td>All participants have resources; basic relationship is an exchange relationship</td>
<td>Some participants may have resources, but they are limited, and basic relationship is consultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of resources within participating organisations</td>
<td>Hierarchical; leaders can deliver members</td>
<td>Varied and variable distribution and capacity to regulate members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a balance of power among members; although one group may dominate, it must be a positive-sum game if community is to persist</td>
<td>Unequal powers, reflecting unequal resources and unequal access; it is a zero-sum game</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Houlihan (2005) assessed the adequacy of four major meso-level analytic frameworks - the stages model, institutional analysis, multiple streams model, and the advocacy coalition framework (ACF) – in terms of their internal coherence and applicability to the study of the process of sport policy formation. The strengths and limitations of these four proposals have subsequently been considered in this section as possible theoretical lenses to look through. There are numerous other policy frameworks (including rational choice theory, a punctuated equilibrium model and socio-economic approaches such as Marxist accounts) but only the four
The first of these theoretical approaches considered for understanding policy is the stages model. The model is “based on a division of the policy process into a series of discrete stages” (Houlihan, 2005, p.168) and “policy emerges from the interrelationships between intentions and actions of political participants” (John, 2000, p.22). According to John’s (2000) description of the stages model: politicians create programmes for bureaucrats to implement, bureaucrats then direct low-level officials to carry out policy decisions, in turn central governments instruct local governments and so on. Hence “through many chains of cause and effect or commands and responses, policy emerges in stages” (John, 2000, p.22). So it is a fairly static representation in that it follows a predetermined chain of processes and does not consider long term flows of influence.

Sabatier deemed that “the stages heuristic has outlived its usefulness” (1999, p.7). A major criticism cited by John (2000) is that it is not viable to separate policy formation from policy implementation; the only exception being legislation since it is more formal (Houlihan, 2005). Policy decisions can also “move ‘backwards’ from implementing organisations” (John, 2000, p.29). Hence ‘bottom-up’ as well as ‘top-down’ approaches to sports policy formation are possible so “the proposed sequence of stages is often descriptively inaccurate” (Sabatier, 1999, p.7). In addition, the implicit assumption of a broadly sequential relationship “limits the researcher’s field of vision” (Houlihan, 2005, p.169). Houlihan (2005) proceeds to criticise the model for only theorising the parts rather than the whole of the process. It provides a descriptive rather than causal
explanation since it is assumed that policy implementation follows neatly from one stage to the next (Houlihan, 2005). John concludes that, at best, the stages model can only provide a “guide or a set of measures which can be the basis for further study and the generation of theories” (John, 2000, p.23).

In terms of this study, the stages model would be applicable if sports policy arose from a ‘top-down’ approach with no localised policy decisions. So looking at Figure 3.1, policies in England would follow the chain of command from the DCMS to individual clubs. While policy formation and policy implementation are seen as congruent, “through distinguishing between policy goals and outputs/outcomes, policy analysts are able to find out if policy intentions turn into reality” (John, 2000, p.22). This can be discerned by comparing written policy documents with what actors say when interviewed.

![Figure 3.1 - A diagram to show the structure of sport in England](image-url)
In an institutional approach to policy formation, power is considered to have been transferred from Parliament to policy communities of actors:

Institutions divide powers and responsibilities between the organisations of the state; they confer rights of individuals and groups; they impose obligations on state officials to consult and deliberate; and they can include and exclude political actors, such as interest groups, in public decision making (John, 2000, p.38).

Houlihan (2005) highlights that there are two broad orientations to the definition of an institution in the literature, the first emphasizing the literal idea of organizational entities and the second highlighting the notion of ‘cultural institutionalism’, which stresses shared values and beliefs. A major strength of institutionalism is that it “directs attention to both the behaviour of actors and the structures within which they operate” (Houlihan, 2005, p.170). However, it could be argued that it privileges structure over agency due to the importance given to organisations. Notably, “institutions constrain the choices open to decision makers rather than shaping the preference of those actors” (John, 2000, p.65), thus it is not consistent with Lukes’ third face of power (see section 3.5). It also recognises the significance of state institutions in the policy process, which is important given that English sports policy is influenced by UK Sport and Sport England as well as the DCMS. Nonetheless, it must be recognised that “institutions are not static” (John, 2000, p.41); they adjust according to the political climate.

One of the major flaws in the institutional approach is the assumption of global rationality above self-interest, i.e. people put universal benefits above what would benefit them personally. In reality “actors and groups often circumvent institutions in the pursuit of their interests” (John, 2000, p.49). Institutionalism also does not attempt to explain why coordination is possible between groups at some times and in some sectors but not in others, furthermore it tends not to emphasise the distinctiveness of each policy sector (John, 2000). John highlights how “institutions themselves are not an independent influence in the policy process” (2000, p.54) and depend on political choices made by politicians and bureaucrats. Hence,
“institutional effects may themselves be the result of wider changes” (John, 2000, p.52). Houlihan (2005) argues that this only defers the issue of what factors or forces cause changes in the wider institutional environment. To summarise, “institutions can explain how political systems structure policy, but they tend not to account for why policies change” (John, 2000, p.53).

In the institutional approach, state institutions play an important part in the policy process (Houlihan, 2005). Thus if this model was applicable, one would observe true partnerships in decision making when constructing sports policy and not a ‘top-down’ approach. Nevertheless, since the “state is always fragmented” (John, 2000, p.45) different institutions play different roles. John argues that “institutions create a forum within which pressure groups can legitimately argue their point of view” (John, 2000, p.40). This can be exemplified by the fact that Sport England is responsible for sport for all, so when London was awarded the 2012 Olympic Games Sport England were concerned about potential reductions in funding for grass-roots sport (Sport England, n.d.). Additionally, “it emphasises the value of placing institutions in their historical context” (Houlihan, 2005, p.171). This could be demonstrated, for example, by UK Sport reacting differently to trampolining than other more established Olympic sports; or British Gymnastics merger with the British Trampoline Federation causing conflicts of interest at some levels.

Kingdon’s (1995) notion of multiple policy streams is akin to institutionalism in that it acknowledges the importance of institutions, but it also recognises the significance of individual agents, ideas and external processes. In addition, unlike other frameworks rather than beginning from stability it “assumes continual policy change” (John, 2000, p.173). It is described in the literature as taking its starting point from the ‘garbage can’ metaphor where various problems and solutions are ‘dumped’ as they are generated (Kingdon, 1995). The agenda process may then be conceived as being composed of three separate and distinct streams:
problems, policies and politics (Kingdon, 1995). Problems can be thought of as issues which government policymakers have identified as requiring action. Policies are conceptualized as a ‘primeval soup’ within which ideas, sponsored by particular policy communities, float around and occasionally combine and rise to the top of the agenda. Politics is independent of the other two streams and comprises of elements such as the national mood, organized political forces and government; “developments in the political sphere are powerful agenda setters” (Kingdon, 1995, p.198). Moreover, the political stream sets the governmental agenda while the alternatives are shaped by the policy stream (Parsons, 1997). As Parson’s clarifies:

> if all three streams are coupled in a single package [sometimes referred to as a ‘policy window’] then the item has a high probability of reaching the top of the decision agenda (1997, p.194).

This fits with Lukes’ (2009) second dimension of power; non-decision making being a form of decision making power – the concept of ‘dimensions of power’ is discussed in section 3.5. Sometimes policy windows are predictable (for example, a schedule for legislation renewal) and at other times they are unpredictable (for example, a national disaster). Kingdon explains how the opening of policy windows creates “a powerful magnet for problems and proposals” (1995, p.204) due to their scarcity and short duration. In the multiple-streams perspective:

> individuals are viewed as less capable of choosing the issues they would like to solve and more concerned about addressing the multitude of problems that are thrust upon them, largely by factors beyond their control (Zaharidis, 1999, p.75).

While the multiple streams framework has been successfully applied to a number of policy areas, “within sport policy analysis its application has been limited” (Houlihan, 2005, p.172).

John argues that one of the fundamental problems of the policy streams approach is “it concentrates too much on agendas and not enough on how ideas feed into the implementation process and back again” (2000, p.176). The preoccupation with agendas results in the neglect of other stages,
most crucially implementation. This leads Zaharidis to question: “do solutions always follow an incremental evolution of the policy stream?” (1999, p.81). There are also weaknesses in the framework’s underlying theory of power Houlihan (2005). Additionally, there are queries over the true independence of the streams and what the precise role and nature of policy windows are (Zaharidis, 1999). The application of the policy streams approach is limited by the fact it “deals with policymaking only under conditions of ambiguity” (Zaharidis, 1999, p.74).

Rather than beginning with stability, the policy streams approach “assumes continual policy change” (John, 2000, p.173) – it can be seen if this is applicable in practise. An idea then moves rapidly onto the political agenda if there is a ‘policy window’; i.e. a new policy-problem or a new person in power. In this study trampolining joining the Olympic Games, or even London hosting the 2012 Games, could have provided the catalyst for policies to change. In terms of decision making, policy streams tries to explain how ideas emerge in terms of acceptance or rejection by the many relevant decision-makers (John, 2000). This can be demonstrated through factors such as whether policies are adopted by all. The importance given to the individual ideas, agents and institutions can be explored through trying to ascertain whether the views of different groups are being taken into account when drawing up policy. Similarly, while institutions “constitute important constraints on policy making” (Kingdon, 1995, p.230) they may be highly fragmented. Thus while there is an overall structure for sport in England (Figure 3.1) each organisation may have different goals causing disintegration, which according to policy streams is not related to power (John, 2000).

The final conceptualisation of policy formation being considered is the ACF. The ACF emerged out of an alternative to the stages model and a desire to combine the ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approaches of other models (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999). See Table 3.8 for the basic assumptions of the ACF. The ACF has much in common with policy
network theory (this theory has not been selected for investigation as explained in the introduction to this section) which emphasises the role of different types of relationships between group representatives, bureaucrats, politicians and other participants in decision-making and uses this to account for differences in policy processing (John, 2000). But “participants bargain and form alliances within networks” (John, 2000, p.169) which are called advocacy coalitions. A coalition contains actors from governmental or private organisations or both (for example from UK Sport, Sport England, British Gymnastics and sports clubs), who firstly “share a set of normative and causal beliefs” (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999, p.120) and secondly “engage in a nontrivial degree of coordinated activity over time” (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999, p.120). The ACF cites belief systems above institutional affiliation in that individuals’ views are not constrained by the organisation they work for (Sabatier, 1999). Furthermore “a defining feature of an advocacy coalition is its organisation around a tripartite hierarchy of beliefs” (Green and Houlihan, 2004, p.391) – namely ‘deep core’ beliefs (basic ontological and normative beliefs), ‘policy core’ beliefs (basic normative commitments and causal perceptions) and ‘secondary aspects’ (large set of narrower beliefs, i.e. not subsystem-wide) beliefs. However while some beliefs remain stable over time, learning takes place for coalitions to “better understand the world in order to further their policy objectives” (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999, p.123). Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith postulated that conflict between coalitions is often mediated by a ‘policy broker’, “whose principal concern is to find some reasonable compromise that will reduce intense conflict” (1999, p.122). This is a source of policy outputs and policy change. Nevertheless, in Parsons interpretation of the ACF the policy making process is “dominated by elite opinion” (1997, p.197), with the impact of public opinion being “at best modest” (1997, p.197). In Sabatier’s terms, the former group would be dubbed the ‘dominant coalition.’
Table 3.8 - Basic assumptions of the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999)

**Premises of the ACF:**

- The role played by technical information is important.
- A time period of a decade or more is required to understand the process of policy change.
- The unit of analysis is not a specific governmental organisation or programme, but rather a policy sub-system or community (actors who are concerned with the policy issue).
- The policy sub-system contains journalists, researchers and policy analysts and actors at all levels of government involved in policy formation and implementation, in addition to those in the traditional iron triangle (namely administrative agencies, legislative committees and interest groups and a single level of government).
- Theories on how to achieve their objectives are implicit within public policies / programmes.

The ACF “while a great advance on previous theorising, is not as integrative as it claims” (John, 2000, p.172); namely it neglects institutions and individual choices. In relation specifically to analysis of sport policy, Green and Houlihan cite two main weaknesses: 1) the ACF does not address “the ways in which actors ‘create’ the social and political world in which they operate” (2004, p.400) and 2) “the lack of a fully articulated theory of power weakens the ACF’s analytic capacity” (2004, p.400). Skille found a further omission in that the ACF “does not consider the process of implementation accurately” (2008, p.189). In some respects the lack of attention given to power fits with the framework’s underlying rationalist stance since “evidence from policy learning will result in policy change even if it challenges policy core beliefs” (Houlihan, 2005, p.174). John (2000) raises concerns of the applicability outside the USA, due to the size and style of group interaction and the fact that countries in Western Europe have more closed policy communities.

As discussed earlier in this section and in section 2.6, “in sport the paradigm has shifted between emphases on ‘sport for all’, social inclusion, elite development, and fitness and health” (Houlihan, 2005, p.181). This allowed distinct coalitions to occur with conflicts of interest, hence making the ACF applicable. Having two mutually-exclusive goals puts a decision maker in dilemma: “tightening up on one criterion implies slackening off on another” (Dunsire, 1993, p.29). Actors relevant to the study of sports policy in a UK context can also be classified according to structural
interest group, namely: demand groups (consumers of policy outputs), provider groups (the deliverers of services), direct support groups (such as NGBs) and indirect support groups (such as local authority services and commercial sponsors) (Houlihan, 2005). Policy brokers would have to be identified to fully support the ACF model. According to the ACF model the impact of public opinion on policy decision making is negligible, so this would also have to be considered. In practice, when Green and Houlihan explored the process of elite sport policy change in swimming and athletics in the UK and Canada, they used the ACF as a tool and found it “useful in drawing attention to the notion of changing values and belief systems as a key source of policy change” (2004, p.387). They also found it valuable that the ACF:

- throws into sharp relief the part played by the state in using its resource control to shape the context within which debates on beliefs and values within NSOs/NGBs takes place (Green and Houlihan, 2004, p.387).

In a sense this gives the use of the ACF in this study peer validation.

From analysis of four possible frameworks (the stages model, institutional analysis, multiple streams model and the ACF) it can be seen that all of them offer some useful insights. They confer different ways of looking at policy change so a full perspective of what has occurred can be developed and thus assist in investigating the implications of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England. However, it must be acknowledged that:

- frameworks organise enquiry, but they cannot in and of themselves provide explanations for, or predictions of, behaviour and outcomes (Schlager, 1999, p.234).

Furthermore in terms of policy, theories may offer schemas to explain how policies are implemented but provide no insight into the content of those policies.
3.5) Power Theory

The fact that “political scientists remain divided by the common language of power” (Hay, 2002, p.168) is “perhaps testimony to the centrality of the concept to political analysis” (Hay, 2002, p.168). There is disagreement over the definition of power, its conception, how it should be studied and whether measurement is possible (Lukes, 2005). Furthermore, “there is not even agreement about whether all this disagreement matters” (Lukes, 2005, p.61). At a basic level, all definitions concur with the notion that power means that person A in some non-trivial manner affects person B. According to Hay (2002), in the post-war period one of the most fundamental debates over the nature and definition of power is the ‘faces of power’ controversy. This will be discussed in this section, as will Foucault’s and Arendt’s notion of power. Specific examples relating to power in organisations will also be discussed. There is also debate between those who perceive analysis of power to be only one potentially useful tool when examining the political; and those for whom “power is to politics what time is to history” (Hay, 2002, p.169). In the context of this study it is important to remember that “domain of power is not confined to the political realm” (Goldman, 1972, p.156); for example employers have power over employees. Thus there are links with organisational, economic and policy analysis which is why power theory has been considered.

The first face of power is the ‘one-dimensional’ view championed by classical pluralists such as Dahl (1968). Fundamentally, A has power over B to the extent that they can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do. There is clear reference to the study of actual successful behaviour modification; this “being the difference between potential and actual power, between its possession and its exercise” (Lukes, 2005, p.17). Actors are assumed to be in possession of perfect information and be aware of their real interests (Hay, 2002) and these interests are assumed to be congruent with policy preferences. Hence, as a result of
A’s power, B modifies their behaviour regardless of whether it is contrary to their own genuine interests (Lukes, 2005). An example of this would be a coach being forced to focus on the elite within their club due to pressures from the surrounding sport development system despite having an underpinning personal belief that through offering opportunities to all recreational trampolining is important. Another example of this would be a PE teacher who is required to follow the National Curriculum for PE but might think an alternative framework would better suit the needs of their particular pupils. Pluralists are opposed to suggestions that interests could be unarticulated or unobservable or that people may be unsure about their own interests (Lukes, 2005). Since the ‘one-dimensional’ view conceives power as an interpersonal and zero-sum phenomenon, Hay (2002) considered it actor-centred. Additionally, an instrumentalist theory of the state is implied – the state is viewed as an instrument rather than a set of structures (Hay, 2002).

On a practical level, changing behaviour is a contested concept. What counts as a change in behaviour? Some changes may be the result of successful requests or convincing advice. On a more philosophical level, Lukes argued that the ‘one-dimensional’ view of power yields “elitist conclusions when applied to elitist decision-making structures” (Lukes, 2005, p.16) and “pluralist conclusions when applied to pluralist decision-making structures” (Lukes, 2005, p.16). Hence it inevitably echoes the biases of the system being observed and does not consider the ways in which the agenda is controlled.

While decision-making is a power relation, the situation is more complex according to neo-elitists. Power is also exercised in what they termed ‘non-decision making’; power is exerted when setting the agenda for the decision-making process. As Lukes explains, “so-called non-decisions which confine the scope or decision making are themselves (observable) decisions” (2005, p.22). This agenda setting is termed the ‘second face of power.’ Hay argued that this second dimension of power, “though
couched in the language of power, was essentially a dispute about the boundaries of the political” (2002, p.175); given that the art of politics was steer the agenda away from issues where the desired outcome could not be guaranteed. However, by controlling the agenda, the bias of the system is mobilised when it is determined which issues are debated - those which threaten the interests of the powerful are excluded (Lukes, 1986). This typology of power (the second face) “embraces coercion, influence, authority, force and manipulation” (Lukes, 2005, p.22). Hence, a satisfactory analysis of two-dimensional power involves examining both decision-making and non-decision making. Within the context of this research this might mean for example whether English Gymnastics can get issues relevant to them onto the decision making agendas of organisations such as Sport England and County Sport Partnerships.

Although the two-dimensional view of power offers a deeper insight than the one-dimensional view – it considers the ways in which potential issues are kept out of the political process – Lukes (2005) still views it as being inadequate on several counts:

● It is still too committed to behaviouralist principles, i.e. it only considers the study of overt behaviour rather than underlying beliefs.
● Power is only associated with actual, observable conflict.
● Its insistence that non-decision making power exists only where there are grievances which are denied entry into the political process.
● It lacks a sociological perspective within which to examine, not only decision-making and non-decision making power, but also the various ways of suppressing latent conflicts within society.

Lukes argued for a “view of power (that is a way of identifying it) which is radical in both the theoretical and political senses” (2005, p.14) and therefore introduced a third dimension. Power is also exercised in preference shaping or influencing. Hays explained that by introducing this third face of power Lukes draws “the distinction between subjective or perceived interests on the one hand, and actual or 'real' interests on the
other (2002, p.179)" and power involves undermining the latter. For example, for the majority of members of British Gymnastics using their membership fees to subsidise the needs of the elite does not represent their best interests, they would be better if the money was invested into support for recreational and club-level gymnastics. Moreover, this dimension of power may work against people’s welfare interests due to the propagation of unhelpful attitudes and expectations (Lukes, 1986). What exists here is latent conflict - a “contradiction between the interests of those exercising power and the real interests of those they exclude” (Lukes, 2005, p.28). This conflict may never be actualised and observable conflict may have been averted. These structural forms of power “often exhibit a low level of visibility” (Layder, 1993, p.153) since they represent patterns of domination which are not continuously active.

Lukes (2005) himself highlights some shortcomings in his three-dimensional model of power:

- It focuses on the exercise of power.
- It concentrates entirely on the use of ‘power over,’ thereby implying dependence.
- It equates such dependence-inducing power with domination, thereby neglecting the positive effects of power.
- Assuming that power adversely affects the interests of those who are dominated, it offers little description of such interests and assumes they are homogenous.
- Finally, it assumes simplistic binary power relations between A and B.

Hay also identifies the concern that power is seen as “a purely pejorative concept” (2002, p.184) – from this it is then assumed that power cannot be exercised responsibly or legitimately. Similarly, there are questions raised about the assumption of responsibility and culpability of actions (Hay, 2002). In a different vein, Hay queries Lukes’ distinction between real and perceived interests which conjures “the social subject as an ideological dupe” (2002, p.179). In the three-dimensional conception of power it is
assumed that the individual is incapable of perceiving their true interests due to indoctrination by those possessing more power and it is only the enlightened academic who is able to discern the true interests of others. By most “such as formulation is now seen as both logically unsustainable and politically offensive” (Hay, 2002, p.179). Even in a situation where complete information is available, ascertaining ones perceived interests is not totally objective or logical. Part of this problem is due to the way that Lukes fails to differentiate between “analytical questions concerning the identification of power within social and political settings” (Hay, 2002, p.184) and “normative questions concerning the critique of the distribution and exercise of power thus identified” (Hay, 2002, p.184).

From Lukes (2005) writing it can be seen that when power is not coercive, it requires the compliance of willing subjects. According to Lukes, Foucault’s “massively influential work” (2005, p.88) addresses the topic of the mechanisms by which that compliance is secured. Primarily, Foucault addressed the topic in an innovative manner proposing that there is a “deep and intimate connection between power and knowledge” (Lukes, 2005, p.88). Furthermore, Foucault (1976a) related the mechanisms of power to two limits – rules of right, which delimit power; and the effect of truth, which produces, transmits and reproduces power. He described the result as “a triangle: power, right, truth” (Foucault, 1976a, p.229). According to Foucault (1976a), the social body is established, consolidated and implemented by manifold relations of power, and these are based on a discourse of truth. In respect to the relations between right and power “it has been royal power that has been provided the essential focus around which thought has been elaborated” (Foucault, 1976a, p.230). Foucault (1976a) viewed the monarchy as a referee and the law a representation of this power.

Arendt has a different conception of power - she believes power is “not the instrumentation of another’s will” (Habermas, 1986, p.77) as endorsed by Lukes and Foucault, but rather “the formation of a common will in a
communication directed to reaching agreement” (Habermas, 1986, p.77). I.e. power is “the ability to agree on a common cause of action in unconstrued communication” (Habermas, 1986, p.77). She further distinguishes power from force and defines force as “the disposition over resources and means of coercion” (Habermas, 1986, p.77). Moreover, “power is never the property of an individual” (Arendt, 1970, .44) but rather “it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together” (Arendt, 1970, p.44). So for example, when the British Trampoline Federation was in operation it was in control of trampolining in England but now it is disbanded it no longer has any power. Habermas proceeds to explain how this means “power cannot be stored up and kept in reserve for emergencies” (1986, p.79). It is similar in this respect to violence which only exists in actualisation. In other theorisations of power the public-political realm is viewed as a generalisation of power, whereas Arendt argues that the public-political realm can only produce legitimate power providing it has structures of communication within it (Habermas, 1986). Relating to this, for power to be legitimate “the action structures through which it is exercised are not essential” (Habermas, 1986, p.85) but rather “legitimate power permits the occupants of positions of authority to make binding decisions” (Habermas, 1986, p.86).

Theoretical conceptions relating to organisational power more specifically will now be considered. Most organisations are “based on the exercise of power where legitimate power – authority – is hierarchically ordered” (Mansfield, 1973, p.478). Mintzberg alludes to the different definitions of ‘power’ and whether it differs from influence, control or authority and concludes institutional power is “the capacity to effect (or affect) organisational outcomes” (1983, p.4). He considers politics a subset of power (informal, illegitimate power) and also authority as a subset of power (formal power, vested in office). Sources of individual power are: legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, referent power and expert power (Slack, 1997). Astley and Sachdeva (1984) believed research on organisational power had become fragmented and saw intra-
organisational power as the joint product of three sources of power: hierarchical authority, resource control and network centrality. According to Mintzberg’s (1983) model of power there are ten groups of possible influencers. The external coalition comprises of: 1) owners, 2) associates, 3) employee associations, 4) publics, 5) directors. And the internal coalition consists of: 1) the chief executive officer, 2) operators, 3) line managers, 4) analysts of the technostructure, 5) support staff. The passing of power into the internal coalition comes from the external coalition to the board, then through the chief executive officer to the internal coalition (Mintzberg, 1983). However, “as soon as the CEO [Chief Executive Officer] delegates any of his formal powers the problem of control arises” (Mintzberg, 1983, p.116). There are four basic systems of influence that can be used by the various participants in the internal coalition: the system of authority (consisting of personal and bureaucratic controls, which views the internal influencers as ‘superiors’ and ‘subordinates’); the system of ideology (which views them as ‘members’); the system of expertise (which views them as ‘experts’); and the system of politics (which views them as ‘players’). In British Gymnastics for example, there are also outside sources of influence such as UK Sport and Sport England, but these appear to be more separate than Mintzberg’s (1983) notion of the external coalition. In addition, British Gymnastics exerts power on individual clubs which could also be viewed as separate organisations in their own right. When utilising it in the empirical chapters of this study, it is important to remember that Mintzberg’s (1983) model is based on the idea and structure of commercial organisations rather than those in the public sector.

When analysing changes in a society or organisation it can be interpreted in terms of changes to the distribution of power among individuals, groups or other units. Hence a prerequisite is identification of leaders and consideration of how power is allocated to different strata – power may be relatively concentrated or diffused (Dahl, 1968). When looking at power through the lenses discussed it is crucial to remember each view has an
evaluative character: “each arises out of and operates within a particular moral and political perspective” (Lukes, 2005, p.29). Thus use is based on an implicit given set of value assumptions which may or may not be explicitly acknowledged. Consequently, the concept of power is “what has been called an essentially contested concept” (Lukes, 2005, p.30).

3.6) Conclusion

This chapter has discussed concepts from organisation, economic, policy and power theory which might be useful in explaining the implications of trampolining joining the Olympic programme. A number of hypotheses have been formulated on the basis of this, as discussed in this section.

Theoretically, admission of a sport to the Olympic programme will have organisational impacts. There will be implications on the structure, power and conflicts within the NGB for trampolining (formerly the British Trampoline Federation and now British Gymnastics) and implications on the partnerships with national sporting bodies (such as UK Sport) and individual trampolining clubs. For example, there is likely to be increased formalisation, use of targets and requirements for reporting.

Financially, there may be improvements for the sport of trampolining. It will retain World Class funding (subject to satisfactory performance) and could generate more income from sponsorship. However, these are not guaranteed sources of income – the former depending on satisfactory performance and the later may be withdrawn at the whim of the company. As highlighted by Gratton and Taylor (1991), sponsorship tends to be targeted at medal winning performers thereby further affecting the balance between the conflicting interests of sport for all and elite sport.
The conflict between elite sport and sport for all is likely to be exacerbated by Olympic inclusion (if there was no pre-existing conflict then it would be created), with the balance swinging more towards medal winning performers. This has subsequently been investigated in respect to trampolining using power and policy formation theories. The issue of participation in trampolining and other Olympic sports has not been considered from a theoretical perspective since there is no body of literature which gives clear insights. Participation rates are likely to be altered by the above consequences. Wieting and Lamoureux (2001) claimed the popularity of curling increased since it became a sport in the Winter Olympics – though neither the figures nor the sustainability of this enhanced participation is mentioned. Increased funding and changes to the NGB could potentially raise participation, yet if the balance between sport for all and elite sport swings too much towards higher level performers this may decrease net participation. The effect of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in schools has primarily been considered from an empirical perspective; though investigations were influenced by aspects of power and organisational theory.

Hence this study involved investigating all these ideas of adjustment more specifically in relation to trampolining in England.
Chapter Four - Methodology

4.1) Introduction

In a narrow sense, methodology refers only to “the collection of methods or rules by which a particular piece of research is undertaken” (Somekh and Lewin, 2005, p.347). Somekh and Lewin (2005) then broaden this definition to include “the whole system of principles, theories and values that underpin a particular approach to research” (Somekh and Lewin, 2005, p.347). This chapter presents the methodological foundation of the research.

Bryman (2004) highlighted the major factors which bear on research in the social sciences, as displayed in Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1 - Influences on social research (Bryman, 2004)

In this chapter the ontology, epistemology, use of theory and practical considerations affecting the approach taken to investigate the effects of trampolining being included in the Olympics on trampolining in England
will be discussed. Section 4.2 will present the ontological and epistemological stance taken. Section 4.3 will discuss the use of theory in this study. The justification for adopting a case study approach is explored in section 4.4. Data collection strategies are then considered. Section 4.5 looks at interviewing and section 4.6 the use of written sources. Finally in section 4.7 an overview of the interview process is given. The chapter is drawn together in the conclusion (section 4.8). Issues of validity and reliability are covered in sections 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 with respect to the methodological technique being discussed.

4.2) Ontological and epistemological stance

How the researcher understands ‘being in the world’ (ontology) and the nature of knowledge (epistemology) will fundamentally shape both the observation process and analysis of data collected (Jones and Somekh, 2005, p.141).

This section discusses the philosophical positions that inform the methodology of the research. In particular ontology and epistemology are discussed and a justification is given for the critical realist stance taken.

Ontology is “a discipline that concerns itself with what exists” (Kivinen and Piirainen, 2004, p.321). Ontology “refers to the claims or assumptions that a particular approach to social enquiry makes about the nature of social reality” (Blaikie, 2003, p.6); i.e. whether there is one external reality or whether reality is an individual construction. According to Blaikie (2003), ontological positions can be categorised as being broadly realist (incorporating positivism, critical rationalism and critical realism) or constructivist (incorporating interpretivism, critical theory, structuration theory and feminism), although boundaries between these categories may be blurred.
Realism assumes that "social reality exists independently of the observer and the activities of social science" (Blaikie, 2003, p.202). In addition, "this reality is ordered, and that these uniformities can be observed and explained" (Blaikie, 2003, p.202). By contrast, constructivism supposes "social reality is produced and reproduced by social actors" (Blaikie, 2003, p.203) and "it is a preinterpreted, intersubjective world of cultural objects, meaning and social institutions" (Blaikie, 2003, p.203). Thus, in a given social situation there may be multiple realities. Further differences between the two ontological stances are summarised in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 - Beliefs of opposing ontological positions (Blaikie, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Realist position</th>
<th>Constructivist position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of reality</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting point</td>
<td>Theory, technical language, outside</td>
<td>Observation, lay language, inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of language</td>
<td>1:1 correspondence with reality</td>
<td>Constitution of social activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay accounts</td>
<td>Irrelevant, corrigible, trans-situational</td>
<td>Fundamental, authentic, situational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science accounts</td>
<td>Generalisable across social contexts</td>
<td>Specific in time and space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Subject-to-object, detached, outside expert</td>
<td>Subject-to-subject, involved, reflective partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Absolutist, static</td>
<td>Relativist, dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of truth</td>
<td>Correspondence, political</td>
<td>Consensus, pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim of research</td>
<td>Explain, evaluate</td>
<td>Understand, change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many respects critical realism tries to straddle the dichotomy between the two positions. The fundamental premise of critical realism is that "reality exists independently to theorists’ conceptions about it" (Peacock, 2000, p.320). Critical realists focus on both observable and unobservable events and acknowledge that while processes such as power may not be observed directly, their consequences often can be seen. Unlike naïve realists, critical realists recognise the distinction between the objects of enquiry and the language used to describe and understand them; i.e. the categories they employ to comprehend reality may be temporary (Bryman, 2004). And while realists focus on uniformities, critical realists consider more subtle tendencies too.
Epistemology “refers to philosophical questions relating to the nature of knowledge and truth” (Somekh and Lewin, 2005, p.345). In terms of research, this concerns “what is (or should be) regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline” (Bryman, 2004, p.11). Moreover, in a sense it can be thought of as a ‘theory of knowledge’ since an epistemology distinguishes between what is awarded the status of ‘knowledge’ in a domain as opposed to ‘beliefs’ (Blaikie, 2003). The main difference between epistemologies relates to whether the social sciences can (and should) be studied in the same manner as the natural sciences in terms of research design and methods. According to Bryman (2004), the four main epistemological positions are: positivism, empiricism, interpretivism and realism. Furthermore, critical realism is not just an epistemology but also has a distinct ontology.

Positivism “advocates the application of the methods of the natural sciences to the study of social reality and beyond” (Bryman, 2004, p.542). It treats ideals or standards of what is acceptable in data collection and analysis in the natural sciences and social sciences as being synonymous. Empiricism takes a similar approach to research and suggests “only knowledge gained through the experiences and the senses is acceptable” (Bryman, 2004, p.539). By contrast, interpretivism “requires the social scientist to grasp the subjective meaning of social action” (Bryman, 2004, p.540). Thus implying there is some richer or deeper meaning to social interaction than merely that which can be observed by the senses. Finally, realism goes further away from the natural science paradigm to acknowledge “a reality independent of the senses that is accessible to the researchers’ tools and theoretical speculations” (Bryman, 2004, p.543). Critical realism develops this stance to assert that “the study of the social world should be concerned with the identification of the structures that generate that world” (Bryman, 2004, p.538). It lies in stark contrast to positivism, since it is accepted that the underlying structures will probably not be detected by the senses. The prefix ‘critical’ is used “to describe engagement with assumptions and meanings beneath the surface”
(Somekh and Lewin, 2005, p.344) and may imply a degree of opposition to authority.

This study has adopted and been guided by a critical realist epistemology and ontology. In critical realism a clear distinction is made between the ‘intransitive’ objects of science (‘reality’ itself) and the ‘transitive’ dimension of knowledge about those objects” (Peacock, 2000, p.320). As a result critical realism circumvents positivist and interpretivist theories’ “many pitfalls by distinguishing sharply between the obdurate reality of the world and what scientists say about it” (Harvey, 2002, p.163). Positivists fail to fully acknowledge that while “the objects of analysis of the natural sciences cannot attribute meaning to events and to their environment” (Bryman, 2004, p.279) people do. Unlike positivism, critical realism also considers individuals’ thought processes and interpretations (akin to interpretivism). Nevertheless, critical realism recognises the “fallibility of knowledge” (Downward and Mearman, 2006, p.12) and warns against the indirect correlation between reality and our knowledge of it. Critical realism acknowledges that how an event appears to observers will differ according to the perspective of the observer, while still accepting one true reality.

Furthermore, from an ontological perspective the intransitive dimension in critical realism is stratified. Reality consists of three distinct layers:

- The real – mechanisms of causes, structures and powers, which make events happen and exist independently of our understanding of the world.
- The actual – what happens when powers and causes act, i.e. events which may or may not be observed.
- The empirical – experiences where the real and actual are observed.

These layers are “neither synchronised with, nor reducible to, one another” (Peacock, 2000, p.320). This critical realist ontology “implies that social reality is neither equal to nor explainable exclusively in terms of the empirical” (Wuisman, 2005, p.368). Hence, “explanation of social phenomena necessitates a search in the underlying layers of reality”
(Wuisman, 2005, p.368). This differs from the positivist or empiricist approach (reality is all that is empirically observable) and the constructivist or interpretivist approach (reality is tantamount to symbolic meaning) which appear to facilitate only a more superficial understanding of social reality (see Table 4.2). Therefore, adopting a critical realist approach to this study will offer deeper insights since it fully acknowledges the underlying organisational, economic, policy and power mechanisms (as discussed in Chapter Three) as playing a real part in the empirical experience of trampolining becoming an Olympic sport. I.e. structures are changing, power influences matter, and straightforward cause and effect relationships are too simplistic to explain what is going on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layers of reality</th>
<th>Positivist / empiricist approach</th>
<th>Interpretive / constructivist approach</th>
<th>Critical realist approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Empirically observed characteristics</td>
<td>Symbolically expressed meanings</td>
<td>The empirical (experiences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The actual (events)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>The real (mechanisms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 - The ontological conception of social reality (Wuisman, 2005, p.368)

According to Lewis, central to critical realist analysis “lies its account of the relationship between social structure and human agency” (2000, p.249). Critical realists believe that the social world has a hierarchical structure in the sense of differing rights and obligations. In this study there is a hierarchy of power and resource dependency between non-governmental sports organisations (for example UK Sport, Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust), British Gymnastics and individual trampoline clubs. However, the processes involved “are not reducible to the unique individual per se” (Downward, 2005, p.307), but rather are persistent transcending relationships of configuration. For critical realists the temporal aspect of structure / agency interactions is crucial since individuals confront pre-formed social structures which are the product of past actions. Structure and agency are viewed as being recursively
related: “people constantly draw on social structures in order to act and in acting they either reproduce or transform those structures” (Lewis, 2000, p.249). This can be seen diagrammatically in Figure 4.2. Hence critical realists reject the claim that “social structure is merely the voluntaristic creation of agency” (Lewis, 2000, p.251). While the meaning of social structure is unobservable to the senses, it is known to be real because it can be observed in human behaviour – this is known as a causal criterion for existence. This is un-reconcilable with the views of positivists since the knowledge about the world is gained through deduction rather than through purely sensory data. Similarly critical realism rejects constructivist and objectivist ontologies since while social phenomena are produced by real mechanisms, these “are not directly accessible to observation and are discernable only through their effects” (Bryman, 2004, p.19).

Figure 4.2 - The critical realist conception of the social structure / agency relationship in Bhaskar's transformational model of social activity (Harvey, 2000)
In critical realism the purpose of using theory to guide investigations is to “contextualise observable behaviour by using theory to infer the underlying structures of a particular social and political situation” (Green, 2004, p.380). In this study organisational theory, economic theory, policy theory and power theory will be used to this effect (see Chapter Three). In the natural sciences it is possible to discover the underlying structures using various pieces of apparatus, but in the social science “inaccessible mechanisms require the building of hypothetical models of them and a search for evidence of their existence” (Blaikie, 2003, p.88). In this study theory is used for this purpose. Blaikie argues that critical realism:

rejects the possibility of prediction because the social world cannot be experimentally closed in the way that is possible in some natural sciences; decisive test situations cannot be devised (2003, p.204).

While it is not feasible to perform highly controlled investigations in the domain of social science, following Green’s (2004) reasoning, hypothesising on the basis of theoretical understanding is still attainable.

Downward (2005) contends that critical realism provides a sound philosophical framework for research in the areas of policy and management since an implicit assumption about the generality of insights may be made. Furthermore, a major strength of critical realism is that it provides ontological and epistemological justification for mixed methods research and triangulation. No epistemological or ontological approach lacks critics since “there is not neutral ground from which it is possible to make ‘objective’ evaluations” (Blaikie, 2003, p.127). A critical realist commitment was adopted for this piece of research for reasons of appropriateness and applicability including:

- Acknowledgement of a reality separate from the researchers descriptions of it.
- Embracement of the different nature of the natural and social sciences and offers a research strategy which reflects this.
- Depth of insight offered – it recognises transitive and intransitive structures, layers of reality and also the role of agency.
Possibility of generality of insight due to persisting transcending relationships and that the processes involved are not reducible to unique individuals.

“Critical realism imposes some clear guidelines upon the nature of research design” (Downward, 2005, p.303) and this has been born in mind while conducting this study. Bryman postulates that the connection between research strategy and epistemological and ontological stance “is not deterministic” (2004, p.442). While this may have limited resonance, there are still clear expectations of approach, and research which is incompatible with its philosophical standpoint would hold little strength of argument. Subsequent sections of this chapter consider the methods used and it was ensured that they were congruent with the premises of critical realism.

4.3) Use of theory

“Characterising the nature of the link between theory and research is by no means a straightforward matter” (Bryman, 2004, p.5). Theory can be used in a study in a deductive, inductive or retroductive way. Deduction means “the process of using established theories as a framework to develop hypotheses” (Somekh and Lewin, 2005, p.345); i.e. the theory guides the research. This is broadly subjectivist or critical rationalist. By contrast, induction means “constructing theories from empirical data by searching for themes and seeking to make meanings from evidence” (Somekh and Lewin, 2005, p.346); i.e. the theory is an outcome of the research. This fits with a positivist approach. Figure 4.3 shows the interplay between the approaches of induction and deduction and is contextualised by an example in Figure 4.4. The notion of retroduction is central to critical realism. Retroduction is:

a mode of inference in which events are explained by postulating (and
Thus retroductive reasoning refers to the idea of formulating a theory to account for the cause of events leading to some observed phenomenon. Redduction is often connected with abductive reasoning. This is concerned with using individuals' everyday accounts of social life to derive a more coherent ‘expert account’ or to consolidate the meanings of concepts (Blaikie, 2003).

This study has adopted a retroductive stance fitting with its critical realist ontology and epistemology. In Chapter Three the areas of organisational theory, economic theory, policy theory and power theory were reviewed. The theories help suggest how the impacts of Olympic inclusion on trampolining may initially be understood. This then guided the investigation. Bryman highlights that in some cases “the literature acts as a proxy for theory” (2004, p.7). In this piece of research the relevant background literature has also acted as an impetus to help define what should be investigated. To a certain degree, theory is implicit in this literature. The theory discussed in Chapter Three was later used in Chapter Eight to identify mechanisms capable of producing the events described by interviewees.
Figure 4.3 – Combining inductive and deductive strategies (Blaikie, 2003, p.157)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Deduction</th>
<th>Induction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All animals are mortal</td>
<td>Rule / law (1)</td>
<td>Rule / law (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats are animals</td>
<td>Case (2)</td>
<td>Case (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats are mortal</td>
<td>Result / observation (3)</td>
<td>Result / observation (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4 – The difference between deduction and induction (adapted from Wuisman, 2005)
4.4) Case study

“Case studies take as their subject one or more selected examples of a social entity which are studied using a variety of data collection techniques” (Hakim, 2000, p.59). Examples of social entities cited included: communities, social groups, organisations, events, life histories, families, work teams, roles and relationships. The key feature of a case study is intensive investigation into a specified unit or sometimes multiple units. In addition, the case study is “the method of choice when the phenomenon under study is not readily distinguishable from its context” (Yin, 2003a, p.4). Investigating the effects of including trampolining in the Olympics on trampolining in England could be thought of a case study into the effects of including a sport in the Olympics on the nature of the sport in England (or even a given locality). There is the underlying premise that the study of an occurrence or response to an event in one sport constitutes a case study of the wider phenomena as opposed to a complete study of an aspect of that sport. As with all methods of investigation there are advantages and disadvantages of using a case study to explore a phenomenon. This section discusses why a case study methodology was adopted and aspects of the case study used.

According to Yin a case study is ideal when “a ‘how’ or ‘why’ question is being asked about a contemporary set of events, over which the investigator has little or no control” (Yin, 2003b, p.9). Investigating the effects of including trampolining in the Olympics on trampolining in England fits into this idea. A researcher has no ruling into when trampolining was admitted into the Olympics and how this would be intercepted by trampolining in England. This also links to critical realism. Also in case studies there is an allowance for something coming about through a series of steps, it does not necessitate that the result happened all at once: “a process or narrative analysis has a story to tell” (Becker, 2000, p.226). Historically, case study research (particularly qualitative) is linked to cultural anthropology – in this context it made sense to want to
gain a picture of a unique tribe (Ward Schofield, 2000). Today, case studies are still highly valuable to provide a full and thorough knowledge of the particular. Case studies are used to gain “holistic understanding of a set of issues” (Jones and Gratton, 2004, p.97) and “how they relate to a particular group, organisation, sports team, or even a single individual” (Jones and Gratton, 2004, p.97). Hakim (2000) highlights too, how case studies can make a unique contribution to knowledge because of the depth of insight gained.

In terms of selecting a case, Stake recommends to “choose that case from which we feel we can learn the most” (2005, p.541). This may be for reasons of typicality, being a strong example of the phenomenon of interest, convenience or access. In addition “some degree of prior knowledge may be necessary for suitable cases to be selected” (Hakim, 2000, p.62). This is particularly pertinent if focused sampling is used – i.e. sampling is planned rather than random. Part of the rationale behind selecting trampolining as the case study sport were reasons of prior knowledge and access; for example an understanding of the nature of the sport and awareness of key actors in the field. Additional points of justification are: it is a sub-discipline of the established Olympic sport of gymnastics so there is an element of internal comparison and trampolining is a fairly mainstream sport (for full details of the selection of trampolining see section 1.2).

Yin highlights how once the case study has been selected “no issue is more important than defining the unit of analysis” (2003a, p.144). He takes this to mean more than the organisations or agencies involved in the sense that for example there might be blurred cross-agency relationships which may need to be considered. In this study ‘trampolining’ has been taken to mean the sport practised formally, that is broadly within the remit of the national governing body (British Gymnastics, English Gymnastics and the former British Trampoline Federation) and also including school trampolining, since it was felt most of the impact would have occurred at
this level. This definition thereby excludes ‘back garden trampolining’ which does not come under the jurisdiction of the NGB. It has also been crucial to consider certain features outside of narrow remit of trampolining but which impinge upon it (such as UK Sport directives and government funding) since “the case to be studied is a complex entity located in a milieu or situation embedded in a number of contexts or backgrounds” (Stake, 2005, p.449).

Due to practical considerations, it was also necessary to develop a case study within the case study of trampolining. Stake (2005) termed this further subdivision as an embedded case or mini case. It was felt that it would be clearly impossible within the time constraints to study grassroots trampolining in depth throughout England. Hence trampolining was studied from the top, channelling down to grassroots in the East Midlands, looking at County Sports Partnerships, the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee (not all regions have an equivalent body) and clubs in the region. It was selected for reasons of convenience – because of being based in Loughborough it made repeated visits to key personnel and frequent observations possible, thereby strengthening the study. The investigation of sub-units and use of more than one unit of analysis (such as interviews, questionnaires and documentary evidence) meant that an embedded case study was produced; as opposed to a holistic design which examines only the global nature of a case study.

Stake (2005) identified three broad types of case study: 1) an intrinsic case study (when you want better understanding of a particular case); 2) an instrumental case study (to provide insight into an issue, redraw a generalisation or for other reasons of external interest); 3) a multiple case study or collective case study (where interest lies in the examination of trends and comparisons rather than in the particular case). The primary reason for investigating the effects of including trampolining in the Olympics on trampolining in England was as an intrinsic case study since it formed the “study of a valued particular” (Stake, 2005, p.448).
addition, it may also have tentatively forayed into being an instrumental case study and could be used for this purpose by another researcher in the future. Hakim (2000) also subdivided case studies. Her classifications were: 1) individual case histories; 2) community studies; 3) studies of social groups; 4) studies of organisations and institutions; 5) those concerned with specific events, roles relationships and interactions. This categorisation did not appear particularly useful as this study could have fitted into several categories and ultimately the use of the categories would not have enhanced research construction or evaluation. Research can also be descriptive, explanatory, exploratory or illustrative. As can be seen in the results and analysis sections of this study, one investigation can contain aspects of these different modes of research.

Yin is a proponent of multiple-case studies (comparing and contrasting two or more cases) since with single cases there are “fears about the uniqueness or artificial conditions surrounding the case” (2000b, p.54). However he does also specify rationale for using a single case: 1) it represents a critical case in testing well-formed theory; 2) it represents an extreme or unique case; 3) it represents a representative or typical case; 4) it is the revelatory case (one that was previously inaccessible); 5) it constitutes a longitudinal case. Trampolining is not a critical case as there are no widespread existing theories relating to the effect of including a sport in the Olympics. Neither does it form a longitudinal case since while the study is looking at how the sport has changed over time, there is only retrospective comparison between before and after trampolining became an Olympic discipline rather than repeated observations over a period of time. Given that there is a limited number of sports who have joined the Olympic programme and also there is limited research into the field, trampolining could be considered a revelatory case. In some respects trampolining may represent a typical case of a new sport joining the Olympics; for example mapping changes in UK Sport support received. However, in other ways it is more unique; as exemplified by the fact that the FIT was subsumed within the FIG prior to trampolining joining the
Olympic programme and this was the first time in Olympic history that two international federations had merged (Lokendahle, 1999). Hence trampolining was an illuminating example to pick. Nevertheless, the main reason for not using a comparative method (i.e. comparing two or more case studies) was the difficulty of finding ‘control sports’ which have either not been admitted to the Olympics or have been longstanding Olympic sports, but still have the same key characteristics such as approximate number of participants, average age of participants, location and nature of facilities, NGB structure and relation and development between grassroots participants and elite performers. In this situation it would be impossible to find “naturally occurring cases that will provide the necessary comparative leverage” (Hammersley, Gomm, and Foster, 2000, p.239). Thus it would have been inappropriate if comparing sports to decide what was due to inherent natural differences and what differences were due to trampolining being recently admitted to the Olympics. Despite the difficulties in finding a suitable comparative case, it was possible to introduce an element of comparison into certain areas of the study by highlighting differences between trampolining and disciplines such as sports acrobatics or tumbling as the latter two also come under the auspices of British Gymnastics but have not yet been included in the Olympics. This allowed some assessment of what changes in trampolining in England were due to its inclusion in the Olympics and not due to concurrent universal changes in English sport, strengthening the argument for selecting trampolining as the case study sport.

According to the title of Lincoln and Guba’s article, with respect to case studies “the only generalisation is there is no generalisation” (2000, p.27)! So one could not blindly use the findings from this study to say with conviction what the impacts of including any sport in the Olympics are on the nature of that sport in England or elsewhere in the world. Conversely, it does depend what one wants from a generalisation. There is the notion of naturalistic generalisation: “take the findings from one study and apply them to understanding another similar situation” (Ward Schofield, 2000,
p.75). While this does necessitate individuals using explicit comparisons, it also requires them to use tacit knowledge to decide which aspects are transferable. Hammersley, Gomm and Foster (2000) criticise the notion of naturalistic generalisation or transferability since how is one supposed to know what part or pattern of events is stable; and also much of the onus is with the reader not the researcher. It is also possible to carry out analytic generalisation from a case study. In this type of generalisation, attempts are made to link findings from a particular case study to a theory or multiple theories. This can then become the vehicle for generalisation to other cases that have not been studied.

For any form of generalisation or transferability to occur, the original case study must be robust in terms of validity (i.e. a method of investigation which actually measures what it claims to measure) and reliability (i.e. consistency of measurement). This is also a prerequisite for the study even to be a true representation of the situation investigated. “The principle weakness of case studies is that results can be shaped strongly by the interests and perspectives of the researcher” (Hakim, 2000, p.63). According to Ward Schofield, in case studies validity requires the production of a:

coherent and illuminating description of, and perspective on, a situation that is based on, and consistent with, detailed study of that situation (2000, p.71).

Thus internal validity is more important than external validity. To improve content validity (i.e. the extent to which a measure represents all facets of a given social construct) and reliability Yin (2000b) highlights the need for a chain of evidence (explicit links between the questions asked, data collected and conclusions drawn) and multiple sources of evidence which converge. In this study the notion of test-retest validity and inter-observer consistency would not be feasible. Triangulation of evidence (using multiple perceptions or using a combination of interviews and documents) will be important to “clarify meaning, verifying the repeatability of an observation or interpretation” (Stake, 2005, p.545). This also embraces a
mixed methods approach. It must be acknowledged that conflicting sources of evidence do not necessarily imply low content validity and poor reliability; from a critical realist perspective it may be that different actors perceive the realities of the situation in differing ways.

The case study has “long been stereotyped as a weak sibling among social science methods” (Yin, 2003b, p.xiii). This section demonstrates how researching the case study of trampolining is an appropriate method to gain insight into the effects of including a sport in the Olympics on the nature of that sport in England. While the single case study cannot prove anything, it “can still suggest important clues to possible cause and effect relationships” (Yin, 2003b, p.69) and also provide a valuable first exploration of the area to highlight important aspects of the situation for further investigation. It can also confirm or dismiss initial hypotheses.

4.5) Method - Interviewing

This section addresses issues of data collection and explains and justifies the procedures used. The topics focussed upon are possible strategies, the justification for using interviews, type of interviews, sampling, recording, analysis and issues of validity and reliability. It is linked to the case study design.

According to Gratton and Jones (2004) there are four main research methods employed in sports studies: questionnaires, research interviews, unobtrusive methods (i.e. observation and content analysis) and ethnography. Questionnaires generally yield quantitative data, and the later three qualitative. For this study observation or participant observation (as employed in ethnography) would not have been appropriate because observation is “generally more suitable for descriptive research rather than for explanatory research” (Gratton and Jones, 2004,
p.160). And is only appropriate when the “phenomenon under investigation can be directly observed” (Gratton and Jones, 2004, p.160). The key benefits of questionnaires are that they increase accessibility, potentially reduce bias, allow anonymity and produce structured data which can easily be analysed. Regardless of any benefits of using questionnaires and the subsequent quantitative analysis, there were simply too few individuals at any level of the sport / trampolining structure to make this feasible. Furthermore, from a critical realist perspective it is important to consider the experiences of individuals and how they interpret events and this is best done with a qualitative approach. Thus for this study, the most valid and reliable form of data collection was interviews. Interviews allow the exploration of subjective experiences and the meanings people attach to them thereby fitting with a critical realist stance.

In literature there is debate about the validity of qualitative methods. For example, Devine cites how it can be thought that “qualitative research produces soft, unscientific results” (2002, p.204). In terms of policy theory, Devine has argued that “what is a valid method depends on the aims and objectives of a research project” (2002, p.205) and this stance has been adopted. The use of qualitative material in political science has made important contributions to “our understanding of political phenomena and explanations of them” (Devine, 2002, p.197). She proceeds to discuss an example of how qualitative techniques would be most appropriate to explore the meaning of voters’ attachment to a political party; this would offer a more in depth and revealing picture than merely the frequency of particular views and opinions which would have been collected if quantitative methods had been used. This also fits with a critical realist perspective. According to Smith, qualitative research is:

… more than method (techniques, procedures etc). It is about methodology (the principles and philosophy on which researchers base their methods, and to the assumptions that they hold about the whole nature of the research they carry out) (2007, p.5).
Weed (2007) discusses ways of evaluating qualitative research quality since the concepts of validity, reliability and generalisability are not synonymous in qualitative and quantitative research. At the micro-level one evaluates the internal consistency, validity and quality in a piece of research (Weed, 2007). And then at a macro-level one evaluates the significance of the research question, the appropriateness of the methodologies and the contribution of the research to the field (Weed, 2007). These ideas will be referred to and explained further during this section.

Similarly, concern may be raised over the interpretation of qualitative material. While the analysis of qualitative material is different to the discovery of relationships between variables in quantitative data, “all empirical material, be it quantitative or qualitative in kind, is subject to different interpretations” (Devine, 2002, p.206) and so “there is no definitive interpretation that is the ‘truth’” (Devine, 2002, p.206).

An interview can be thought of as “a conversation with a purpose” (Berg, 2007, p.89). There are feminist concerns about the practice and use of interviews due to reasons of power, exploitation and the one-way exchange of information. May (1997) categorises interviews in social research as being structured, semi-structured, unstructured / focussed or group. This nomenclature has been adopted by authors such as Hall and Hall (1996) who made use of some of May’s earlier work. Structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews form a continuum of formality, as illustrated in Figure 4.5.
structured or standardised interviews | semi-structured or semi-standardised interviews | unstructured or unstandardised interviews
---|---|---
- Most formally structured.
- No deviations from question order.
- Wording of each question exactly as written.
- No adjusting of level of language.
- No clarifications or answering of questions about the interview.
- No additional questions may be asked.
- Similar in format to a pencil-and-paper survey.
- More or less structured.
- Questions may be reordered during the interview.
- Wording of questions flexible.
- Level of language may be adjusted.
- Interviewer may answer questions and make clarifications.
- Interviewer may add or delete probes to interview between subsequent subjects.
- Completely unstructured.
- No set order to any questions.
- No set wording to any questions.
- Level of language may be adjusted.
- Interviewer may answer questions and make clarifications.
- Interviewer may add or delete questions between interviews.

Figure 4.5 - The continuum of formality in interview structure (Berg, 2007, p.93)

The predominant data collection strategy used in this investigation was semi-structured interviewing. Questions used in a semi-structured interview can reflect an awareness that individuals interpret the world in different ways, thus fitting with a critical realist ontology and epistemology. According to Bryman the advantages of a totally structured interview are “reducing error due to interviewer variability” (2004, p.110) and “accuracy and ease of data processing” (2004, p.111). However, in this study standardisation was not such a crucial issue since there was only one researcher and often individual actors were interviewed with slightly differing focuses according to their position. Also, using totally structured interviews would have impinged on any flexibility to follow up points of interest raised by the interviewee. Nevertheless, it was felt that some structure was required and hence unstructured interviews were not used. It must however be acknowledged that unstructured interviews can provide:

qualitative depth by allowing interviewees to talk about the subject in terms of their own frames of reference (May, 1997, p.112).

Reasons for this need for structure included the necessity of ensuring full coverage of the topic (in terms of ascertaining if the hypotheses were
correct) in one encounter since often follow up interviews would not have been possible, and to re-address the potential power balance. Some of the interviews produced a somewhat unusual situation since Hall and Hall (1996) imply that authority is normally perceived as resting with the interviewer, whereas when individuals with influential positions in sports organisations were interviewed they had more power over the situation and may have led the interview away from the intended direction. An example interview schedule can be found in Appendix Eight.

As discussed previously in this chapter (section 4.4), a case study approach has been utilised; focusing on the effect of Olympic recognition on the sport of trampolining within England with the sub-case of the East-Midlands region. Purposeful sampling was conducted when selecting candidates for interview, i.e. actors were selected on the basis on their relevance to the research question. Throughout the period of interviewing, data was analysed for key themes. Ideas which emerged in the early interviews subsequently influenced the focus and content of later interviews. Hence there was an iterative process between sampling, interviewing and theoretical reflection. Sometimes the sample size of actors was limited by the number of available individuals with a given role – in some cases only a single person. However, ultimately data collection was concluded when theoretical saturation occurred, i.e. further data collection would not have offered any new insights. All of the interviews fitted Flick’s notion of ‘expert interviews’:

the interviewee is of less interest as a (whole) person than in his or her capacity of being an expert for a certain field of activity (1998, p.92).

Additionally, the individual is viewed “not as a single case but as representing a group” (Flick, 1998, p.92). Thus the choice of sampling methods is no less important in qualitative methods than quantitative methods but it follows a different logic. The purpose of qualitative research is to attempt to understand human experiences rather than making predictions over future behaviour (Devine, 2002). Qualitative methods are connected with epistemologies that emphasise “the dynamic,
constructed and evolving nature of social reality” (Devine, 2002, p. 201); hence there are no universal truths. There are different realities of the effects of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England dependant on individual actors own beliefs and values. Nevertheless, Devine (2002) argues that it would be rare for a sample of interviewees to be so unrepresentative that wider conclusions would be totally spurious. A later section of this chapter (4.7) provides a summary of the interviews conducted and justification for the choice of actors.

Wherever possible interviews were conducted face-to-face, though one was conducted over the telephone for logistical reasons. Berg (2007) discusses the importance of message transfer through non-verbal channels (e.g. body language, gestures and phonemic sounds). However, it is possible for incorrect interpretations to occur. It must also be acknowledged that the interviewer may add bias as a result of their, often unconscious, non-verbal and verbal reactions. For example, nodding at a certain response implies it is ‘right’. It is very difficult to totally eliminate this, since some form of interviewer response may be needed to show they are listening and in acknowledgement that what the interviewee is saying is important. Qualitative researchers “neither subscribe to the view that research can be objective, nor do they seek objectivity in field relations” (Devine, 2002, p. 207). Devine (2002) proceeds to argue that researchers acknowledge this when collecting data and consider its effects on findings so rigour is maintained.

There is debate whether interviews are recorded by taking written notes or making an audio-tape / digital recording (for example Bryman, 2004, Gratton and Jones, 2004, May, 1997, and Hall and Hall, 1996). Table 4.3 summarises the advantages of each. The primary method of recording was by using a digital recorder, since in a semi-structured interview “the interviewer is supposed to be highly alert to what is being said” (Bryman, 2004, p. 329) to allow prompting, probing, follow up of interesting points and the drawing of attention to any inconsistencies. This enhanced
reliability since the exact words and tone of voice were recorded and used in later analysis. Post-interview all recordings were transcribed verbatim. The use of a digital instrument rather than an audio-tape recorder offered a better recording quality and allowed the files to be stored directly on a computer. Also, paper was available to note down emotions and body language to supplement the recording. Hall and Hall suggested that this might “help the interviewer maintain control of the interview by reminding the informant that there is an agenda being followed” (1996, p.164).

Table 4.3 - A summary of the advantages of each method of recording interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of audio-tape / digital recording</th>
<th>Advantages of taking notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Offers a record of the exact words and phrases used.</td>
<td>● Does not involve technology which might malfunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Tone of speaker is recorded.</td>
<td>● Negates the need for subsequent transcription which is time consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Permits repeated, thorough examination of answers.</td>
<td>● Reduces amount of information to sift through since only key points are recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● There is also a full record of the interviewers own speech.</td>
<td>● Less likely to provoke anxiety in interviewee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Interviewers full focus is on the conversation.</td>
<td>● Interviewee less likely to refuse the request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Makes it possible to maintain eye contact throughout.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Does not affect the pace of interview.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The data can be reused for different purposes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Allows public scrutiny, thereby countering accusations of bias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gratton and Jones (2004) raise four problems or questions in relation to validity in interviews:

● Will the interviewee interpret the question correctly?
● Are interviewees able to verbalise their thoughts to say what they actually feel?
● Is the interviewee giving a response that is applicable only to that moment in time, or are his or her views more long term?
● Will the interviewee’s own values affect the response? I.e. will they provide what they think is the correct response rather than reflecting their own attitudes?
The first issue was addressed in this study through careful consideration of the wording of the questions and pre-prepared prompts; also since a semi-structured format was used questions could be adapted as necessary. The next two concerns are more difficult to remedy, but the interviews were structured so that key themes were addressed through a number of questions; thus introducing a form of within-interview triangulation to enable assessment of consistency in responses. The last potential problem is not so crucial in this study since, as already mentioned, the actors interviewed are not being considered as individuals but rather representatives of their organisation; equally if they say things based on their own attitudes rather than organisation rhetoric then this too will be interesting. During analysis it was possible to assess the internal validity and reliability of the account by observing internal consistency and ensuring analysis is coherent with identified themes. External validity can be ascertained by triangulation and comparing findings with other research, but it must be remembered that each actor may have a different perspective and understanding of the situation.

Interviews were subsequently analysed using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis “offers an accessible and theoretically flexible approach to analysing qualitative data” (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.77). Thematic Analysis is a method of data analysis which involves the creation of themes or ‘codes’ and the subsequent classification of data under these headings. It is then possible to consider different instances of datum under an umbrella term and use this for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns. See table 4.4 for the benefits of using thematic analysis. In this study (as with most applications of thematic analysis) some themes were pre-identified from the literature and theory discussed in Chapters Two and Three. Within the interview schedules, questions were devised around these constructs (see section 4.7 for more details of this). For example, Amis et.al. (1995) suggested that the four main sources of conflict within sports organisations are organisational change, sub-units, volunteers and elite sport versus sport for all. Each of these
was considered a separate theme. Also “themes just seem to float up from the data” (Gomm, 2004, p.189). An example of this would be other forms of conflict. With thematic analysis a final decision on “the range of interesting responses is decided after the interview data are available” (Gomm, 2004, p.189). Thematic analysis differs from grounded theory in that theory is used to guide potential themes rather than in the case of grounded theory, theory is built from the data. In thematic analysis, the process of writing up the analysis and the results of the analysis is actually still part of the analysis process and it is likely that there will be amendments to the analysis in the course of writing it up. According to Braun and Clarke one of the main disadvantages of thematic analysis is that it “has limited interpretative power beyond mere description if it is not used within an existing theoretical framework” (2006, p.97). In this study theoretic constructs will be used to explain empirical findings thus negating this issue.

Table 4.4 - Advantages of thematic analysis (adapted from Braun and Clarke, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively easy and quick method to learn, and do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible to researchers with little or no experience of qualitative research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results are generally accessible to educated general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful method for working within participatory research paradigm, with participants as collaborators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can usefully summarize key features of a large body of data, and/or offer a ‘thick description’ of the data set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can highlight similarities and differences across the data set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can generate unanticipated insights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for interpretations of data from different theoretical perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be useful for producing qualitative analyses suited to informing policy development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The computer software programme NVivo was used when coding and analysing the interviews. NVivo supports the analysis of qualitative data through assisting in managing data, managing ideas, querying data, making graphical models and reporting from the data (Bazerly, 2007). NVivo is based on the concepts of nodes: “nodes become points at which concepts potentially branch out into a network of sub-concepts or dimensions” (Bazerly, 2007, p.83). Interviews are entered into the
programme as complete files and the relevant passages are copied into the respective node or nodes but also still remain in the original file. It has advantages over cutting up copies of the interview or electronically cutting and pasting the documents because:

- The source always remains intact;
- Information about the source and location of a quote is always preserved;
- It is always possible to view the coded passage in its original context;
- Changes to the document are reflected in the text viewed through nodes;
- Passages can be coded at multiple nodes, with queries able to find passages coded by co-occurring nodes (Bazerly, 2007).

The use of NVivo does not add rigor to the analysis process per se but allows the analysis to be more methodical and thorough:

> as much as ‘a poor workman cannot blame his tools,’ good tools cannot make up for poor workmanship” (Bazerly, 2007, p.3).

Reflecting the thematic analysis approach adopted in this study, initial nodes reflected the themes which emerged from the literature review and guided the interview content. Interviews were coded after transcription and then an iterative process ensued whereby new nodes where created for any additional common themes which emerged. A separate set of nodes were used for each domain of the sport delivery system (i.e. elite, recreational and school trampolining) but the majority of the titles were the same.

To summarise, data has been collected using semi-structured interviews with key informants. See section 4.7 for details and justification of the interviews conducted. These were recorded using digital methods and subsequently transcribed verbatim and analysed. Some supplementary information was gathered from official documents – for more details and justification of this see section 4.6. Lavallee and Robinson (2007) used a similar semi-structured interviewing technique to explore women’s
retirement from artistic gymnastics, as did Wright, Trudd and Culver (2007) in their investigation of ice hockey coach education. Both studies generated rich person centred data and offer external support to the reliability of the methods adopted in this research. According to May, interviews are “a resource for understanding how individuals make sense of their social world and act within it” (1997, p.129). Hence it is important to consider the interview as a ‘practical production’; “the meaning of which is accomplished at the intersection of the interaction of interviewer and respondent” (Fontana and Frey, 2000, p.664) which fits with the critical realist stance taken.

4.6) Using Written Sources

In this piece of research written sources have formed the literature review, have been used to inform the methodology and have been analysed in conjunction with interviews when drawing conclusions. McCulloch (2004) distinguishes between items that have been produced without any direct involvement of a researcher (i.e. produced for other purposes) and those that are deliberately produced by researchers. However, no terminology is introduced for this distinction. McCulloch (2004) also makes a division between private (e.g. letters and diaries) and public documents (e.g. policies). Bryman (2004) goes further to define documents as materials which can be ‘read;’ have not been specifically produced for the purpose of social research, are preserved and are relevant. This definition has been adopted since it gives vocabulary to articulate the distinction McCulloch (2004) discussed. Bryman (2004) proceeds to discuss the range of different documentary sources that could be used in qualitative research: personal documents in both written forms (such as diaries and letters) and visual forms (such as photographs); official documents deriving from the state (such as public enquires); official documents deriving from private sources (such as documents produced by
organisations); mass media outputs; and virtual outputs, such as internet resources. The predominant type used was ‘official documents deriving from the state;’ but all the other types were also referred to (to a greater or lesser degree). A large body of journals and books were also consulted. General texts were considered first and then on the basis of this more specific searches for additional literature were carried out and also if specific reference was made to other sources these were used too. The use of these types of written sources will be discussed as well as methods of analysis and validity/reliability.

Documents can offer “a behind-the-scenes view of many aspects to a phenomenon that might not be revealed through observations and interviews” (Tenenbaum and Driscoll, 2005, p.599). For example, programmes may be implemented differently than planned; as staff change the oral history gets blurred; and actions and events which occurred before the research started might be forgotten about but may be recorded in minutes of meetings or other documents (Tenenbaum and Driscoll, 2005). The documentary sources of evidence have been used primarily to consider “discrepancies between ‘official’ and actual aspects of a programme or event” (Tenenbaum and Driscoll, 2005, p.600) and put the interviews in context.

Knowledge does not exist in a vacuum, and your work only has value in relation to other people’s. Your work and your findings will be significant only to the extent that they are the same as, or different from, other people’s work (Jankowicz, 1995, p.128-129).

Thus the literature review provides an overview of the current state of knowledge in the topic; motivation for the study; and a conceptual or theoretical grounding. In this study the first two remits have been covered in Chapter Two - Review of literature, and the last as a separate chapter, Chapter Three - Theoretical perspectives. A wide range of types of literature has been consulted including books, journals, policy documents, internet sources and media sources. When selecting literature to use and commenting upon it, factors such as the authors, their expertise, the
source and whether it has been referenced elsewhere, were considered. Obviously, academic literature undergoes “some sort of quality control” (O’Dochartaigh, 2002) through peer-reviews or an editorial process, but this does not guarantee that it is necessarily high quality. The literature review “has been transformed beyond recognition by the development of the Internet” (O’Dochartaigh, 2002, p.10) - by affording easier access to a range of sources it makes the decision on how widely to extend a search more important.

According to O’Dochartaigh (2002) the main types of material the internet is particularly good for is: the new (post 1993); the old (after copyright has lapsed); the academic (within limits); the far-away; the activist (the internet gives them an opportunity to spread their message widely); the not-for-profit; government and officialdom; the marginal (they are able to make materials available world-wide with limited resources); news and business; archives (either the full collection or a catalogue); statistics; and the lonely, the deluded and the obsessive (e.g. personal homepages)! Websites have been used intensively to find out about sports agencies (such as Sport England) and their policies; research the history and development of trampolining; and access government policies and journal articles. The last of these, utilised the internet for ease of access to printed material and so should not be considered as a virtual source per se:

in the long term it may well be that the greatest contribution which the Internet makes to research is to provide easier access to achieves (O’Dochartaigh, 2002, p.220).

With respect to actually using information from websites, a valuable one “contains unique, substantive content relevant to your research” (O’Dochartaigh, 2002, p.124). This was true of those written by sports organisations about themselves – much of the information does not exist in any other form. Whilst O’Dochartaigh warns against websites which “copy or distil information” (2002, p.124), sites of this nature were used with a caveat when trying to construct a history of trampolining simply
because no other more scholarly sources of this information could be located. A further issue is the lack of permanency of websites:
not since the days of single-copy hand-written manuscripts has it been so easy for a document to disappear from the face of the earth for ever (O'Dochartaigh, 2002, p.12).

A number of official state documents have been used. These were generally sports related policies from the DCMS (or past governments’ equivalent departments) but also curriculum and other school policies. The policy documents were used in the literature review to provide contextual background and also to contribute to analysis of empirical findings. Nevertheless, “it cannot be assumed that the information provided in such reports is always accurate” (McCulloch, 2004, p.83) and hence they were used in conjunction with other forms of data collection. Furthermore, data generated from bureaucracies “may tell us more about the way the bureaucracies operate than about whatever it is that the data are supposed to stand for” (Gomm, 2004, p.140), for example what counts as sufficient participation in sport. Generally theoretical ideas were gleaned from government documents rather than numerical findings. Codd argues it is necessary to deconstruct the official document as “cultural and ideological artefacts to be interpreted” (1988, p.243). McCulloch (2004) explains how this means one has to understand the policy document as being socially constructed.

In addition to official documents deriving from the state, official documents deriving from private sources were also used. These were mainly from non-governmental sports organisations such as British Gymnastics and the British Olympic Association. “A great deal of the collective knowledge of organizations is stored in documents” (Salminen, Kauppinen, and Lehtovaara, 1997, p.644) – for example, organisations use documents as a means of information management. It is important to acknowledge that the authors of the documents may have particular viewpoints or biases which underpin what they write. There is also a distinction in content and
honesty between the information given in those documents that are in the public domain (for example mission statements, press releases and advertisements) and those which remain closed within the organisation (for example company newsletters, minutes of meetings and memos). As with government policies, the documents may reflect an ideal version of reality. For example, in an empirical study Ahmed (2007) found that most university documents that expressed a commitment to promoting racial equality were just rhetoric rather than reflected in practice.

To a lesser extent, newspaper reports (an example of a mass media output) were consulted when assessing literature in the field. Bryman (2004) cites authorship and credibility as being issues when using this type of document. The former concern was prevalent when trying to ascertain the authorship of editorials. The latter problem was addressed through considering the newspaper’s known biases, whether evidence was given to support points made and what other sources said about the same issue.

The last types of document used were memoirs and letters – a selection of Coubertin’s and Diem’s were combined in books. While it must be acknowledged that the editors must have had reasons why certain items were included and others left out; “they provide compelling witness accounts by the people involved” (McCulloch, 2004, p.102) in contrast to “the bland official statements commonly encountered in committee minutes” (McCulloch, 2004, p.102).

Discourse analysis refers to “a variety of different approaches to the study of texts” (Gill, 2000, p.172) which originate from different theoretical perspectives and disciplines. According to Gomm (2004) there are three main possibilities: 1) discourses have an existence independent of individuals; 2) discourses are evidence of ways people interpret the world; 3) discourses are the words and their arrangement. These perspectives share “a rejection of the realist notion that language is simply a neutral
means of reflecting or describing the world" (Gill, 2000, p.172). In terms of qualitative methods for interpreting documents, the main strategies are:

- Qualitative content analysis – searching for underlying themes;
- Semiotics – the analysis of symbols in everyday life;
- Hermeneutics – interpreting the meaning of a text from the authors’ perspective (Bryman, 2004).

In this study, qualitative content analysis was implicitly used when reviewing literature in Chapters Two and Three. A deeper or more mechanical approach was not adopted because documents were used to supplement literature and empirical findings rather than as the main source of data. Nevertheless, it was still important to consider factors such as the domain, the role of the document on the domain, the needs of actors and the method of communication (Salminen et al., 2000).

An important concern when appraising and analysing documents is their reliability. In terms of literature, this relates to issues of “truth and bias, but also the availability of relevant source material” (McCulloch, 2004, p.42). For a single source, evaluation could consist of consideration of the authority, accuracy, objectivity and currency – whilst O'Dochartaigh (2002) wrote this in relation to internet sources, the characteristics apply more widely. To overcome possible problems relating to reliability and bias “it is necessary to make use of a wide range of different kinds of documents” (McCulloch, 2004, p.44) which will then “represent alternative viewpoints and interests” (McCulloch, 2004, p.44). While “researchers do not say that they conducted ‘data triangulation’ among the written sources” (Gomm, 2004, p.270) it is plausible to assume they did pay attention to what concurred and what differed. When there are several discrepant possibilities it is not enough to simply go with what the majority agree on; it is also necessary to consider which authors were in the best position to know the truth and report it accurately (Gomm, 2004). There is also the issue of ‘researcher reliability’: “whether another researcher would extract the same information from the available documents” (Shipman, 1981, p.119). However, individual researchers could select different information
to support whatever point they were making and so differing interpretations may not necessarily be wrong. Given that sources are read in different contexts, “there is not ‘original’ or ‘true’ meaning of a text outside specific historical contexts” (Hodder, 2000, p.704). In terms of validity, it is important “to try to understand documents in relation to their milieux” (McCulloch, 2004, p.6); i.e. consider the context in which they were produced. “Documents are social and historical constructs, and to examine them without considering this simply misses the point” (McCulloch, 2004, p.6). Furthermore, it cannot be assumed that practices are only influenced by policies and congruent to them. This is why interviews were used too in this study.

The use of literature, in the form of journals and books written by academics, in a study is standard. McCulloch contends that in recent years there has been “a distinct lack of interest in the use of documents in educational and social research” (2004, p.11). Yet documents are an ideal medium to observe the continuity, change and development in society with relation to ideals and practices in the government and non-governmental organisations. In this study a sense of methodological pluralism has been obtained through using documents as well as interviews.

4.7) Interview overview

This section gives an overview of the interview process by considering the interviewees selected and the design of the interview schedule.

The overall research question of how trampolining in England has been affected by Olympic inclusion has been considered through investigation of a number of sub-questions. The two key dimensions are ‘level of
trampolining’ and ‘aspect of change.’ The questions are detailed in Table 4.5 (repeated from section 1.1.).

Table 4.5 – Key aspects investigated to consider how Olympic inclusion has affected trampolining in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of trampolining</th>
<th>Aspect of change</th>
<th>Organisational structure</th>
<th>Funding and support</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elite trampolining</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of elite trampolining and the relationship between agencies?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the funding and support of elite trampolining?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the interpretation and development of policies relating to elite trampolining in the organisations that are part of the delivery system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational trampolining</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of recreational trampolining and the relationship between agencies?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the funding and support of recreational trampolining?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the interpretation and development of policies relating to recreational trampolining in the organisations that are part of the delivery system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School trampolining</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the organisational structure of school trampolining and the relationship between agencies?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the funding and support of school trampolining?</td>
<td>How does Olympic inclusion affect the interpretation and development of policies relating to school trampolining in the organisations that are part of the delivery system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relating to the dimension of ‘level of trampolining,’ there is frequently an implication in literature that what actually constitutes ‘elite’ sport is unproblematic and a universally shared concept. For example Green and Houlihan (2005) give no tangible definition of what constitutes elite sport on their book on the subject. UK Sport defines British elite athletes as those “competing at the highest levels of sport for the United Kingdom or Great Britain” (National Audit Office, 2005, p.1) and on their World Class Performance Programme. However this narrow classification could be as a direct result of their remit to support this specific target group. Bramham, Hylton, Jackson and Nesti (2001) refer to a sports development
continuum instead. This consists of four stages: 1) foundation; 2) participation; 3) performance; and 4) excellence. This is perhaps a more realistic representation of the situation than an arbitrary division between elite and recreational sport. For the purpose of this study a broader view of elite trampolining has been adopted where appropriate than that used by UK Sport. In practice this translates to those trampolinists competing at FIG A, FIG B and National C, corresponding to the old Grade 1 and Grade 2 in England. Athletes at these levels are competing internationally or nationally, are at a high level in the sport of trampolining and within their club setting may be considered elite. Essentially they have invested a much bigger commitment in trampolining than recreational participants who train once a week. Taking this slightly broader view of elite sport will allow a more coherent picture to develop.

The structure of the sports system in England was discussed in Chapter Two and reproduced as Figure 4.6. Figure 4.7 then highlights the parts of the system most relevant to elite trampolining, Figure 4.8 highlights the parts of the system most relevant to recreational trampolining, and finally Figure 4.9 highlights the parts of the system most relevant to school trampolining. Thus to ascertain how Olympic inclusion affects elite trampolining in England actors were interviewed from UK Sport, the British Olympic Association and British Gymnastics. An individual was also interviewed from the EIS because while the organisation could be considered a subsidiary of UK Sport it does fulfil a slightly different role. Also elite trampolinists and other elite gymnasts were interviewed to gain a participant perspective. To ascertain how Olympic inclusion affects recreational trampolining in England actors were interviewed from Sport England, County Sport Partnerships, English Gymnastics and coaches from clubs. An individual was also interviewed from the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee because the organisation plays a part in recreational trampolining in the region. To ascertain how Olympic inclusion affects school trampolining in England actors were interviewed from the Youth Sport Trust, School Sport Partnerships and the BSGA. An
individual was also interviewed from the AfPE because the organisation also plays a role in school sport although not as major as the aforesaid organisations. This is summarised in Table 4.6. However it must be acknowledged that while the focus of the interview was on the sector of the sport delivery system the interviewee is based in, they may also have interesting insights into other areas and these were also considered in analysis.

Table 4.6 – Groups from which individuals were interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elite trampolining</th>
<th>Recreational trampolining</th>
<th>School trampolining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• UK Sport</td>
<td>• Sport England</td>
<td>• Youth Sport Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The EIS</td>
<td>• County Sport Partnerships</td>
<td>• School Sport Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The British Olympic Association</td>
<td>• English Gymnastics</td>
<td>• The BSGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• British Gymnastics.</td>
<td>• East Midlands</td>
<td>• The AfPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elite trampolinists</td>
<td>• Trampoline Technical Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elite gymnasts</td>
<td>• Coaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.6 – The English sport delivery system

Figure 4.7 – The English sport delivery system with that most relevant to elite sport highlighted
Figure 4.8 – The English sport delivery system with that most relevant to recreational sport highlighted

Figure 4.9 – The English sport delivery system with that most relevant to school sport highlighted
Within the organisations interviewees were generally selected on the basis that they were felt to be the most appropriate person for reasons of seniority, experience or role. In the large majority of cases individuals contacted were willing to be interviewed. The use of personal contacts and snowballing helped here. When individuals were unwilling to be interviewed ‘second choices’ within the organisation were selected. For example, a member of the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee was interviewed rather than the Chair of the committee as initially hoped for. To ensure anonymity but still allow multiple interviewees from the same organisation to be identified a coding system was used in the analysis chapters. This is displayed in Table 4.7, along with more details of the interviewees where appropriate.

Table 4.7 - Pseudonyms and details of the interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Date of interview</th>
<th>Details of role (if necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport Official A</td>
<td>4th August 2009</td>
<td>Performance Partnerships Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Sport Official B</td>
<td>12th August 2009</td>
<td>Performance Advisor with responsibility for a number of sports including gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS Official</td>
<td>23rd May 2008</td>
<td>Athlete services manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA Official</td>
<td>29th June 2009</td>
<td>Senior level official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Gymnastics Official A</td>
<td>22nd May 2008</td>
<td>Senior level official with responsibility for the World Class Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Gymnastics Official B</td>
<td>22nd May 2008</td>
<td>Senior level official with responsibility for trampolining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Gymnastics Official C</td>
<td>1st July 2009</td>
<td>Senior level official with responsibility for Olympic disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trampoline Technical Committee Member A</td>
<td>7th July 2008</td>
<td>This role also falls within the remit of British Gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trampoline Technical Committee Member B</td>
<td>29th July 2008</td>
<td>This role also falls within the remit of British Gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Trampolineist A</td>
<td>12th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Trampolineist B</td>
<td>15th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Trampolineist C</td>
<td>18th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Trampolineist D</td>
<td>18th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Trampolineist E</td>
<td>20th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Trampolineist F</td>
<td>20th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Trampolineist G</td>
<td>8th July 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Gymnast A</td>
<td>10th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Gymnast B</td>
<td>11th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Gymnast C</td>
<td>12th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Gymnast D</td>
<td>18th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Gymnast E</td>
<td>19th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Tumbler</td>
<td>19th June 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England Official A</td>
<td>14th May 2008</td>
<td>Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England Official B</td>
<td>4th June 2008</td>
<td>Senior official with a responsibility for LTAD and coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England Official C</td>
<td>1st October 2008</td>
<td>NGB support officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire CSP Official A</td>
<td>8th May 2008</td>
<td>Senior official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire CSP Official B</td>
<td>6th June 2008</td>
<td>Senior official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire CSP Official A</td>
<td>4th February 2009</td>
<td>Senior official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire CSP Official B</td>
<td>9th February 2009</td>
<td>Senior official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Gymnastics Official A</td>
<td>17th June 2008</td>
<td>General Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Gymnastics Official B</td>
<td>19th February 2009</td>
<td>Regional Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member</td>
<td>1st April 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A</td>
<td>21st May 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B</td>
<td>21st May 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A</td>
<td>13th February 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B</td>
<td>24th February 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YST Official A</td>
<td>25th February 2009</td>
<td>Senior official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YST Official B</td>
<td>1st April 2009</td>
<td>Senior official with interest in the UK School Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire SSP Official A</td>
<td>8th July 2008</td>
<td>School Sport Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire SSP Official B</td>
<td>8th July 2008</td>
<td>Partnership Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach</td>
<td>19th May 2009</td>
<td>A peripatetic coach that visits schools in the county and is employed by School Sport Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire SSP Official A</td>
<td>23rd April 2009</td>
<td>Partnership Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire SSP Official B</td>
<td>1st June 2009</td>
<td>Competition Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSGA Official</td>
<td>8th April 2009</td>
<td>Member of trampoline subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFPE Official</td>
<td>1st June 2009</td>
<td>Board member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When constructing the interview schedules the dimension of 'aspect of change' was considered. The broad themes were organisational change, economic change and policy change. However from both theory and empirical literature sub-themes within these areas were acknowledged as being important. These are detailed in Table 4.8. Broadly speaking, all interviewees were asked about all aspects but related to their anticipated sphere of knowledge. The main exception to this was sponsorship, and only British Gymnastics officials, elite trampolinists, elite gymnasts, English Gymnastics officials, the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee member and coaches were asked about this for reasons of relevance.

Table 4.8 - Themes asked about in interviews linking to the research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational aspects</th>
<th>Funding and support</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Partnership and power</td>
<td>• Funding</td>
<td>• Directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisational change</td>
<td>• Other support</td>
<td>• Policy formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priorities</td>
<td>• Contracts</td>
<td>• Balance between elite sport and sport for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceptions</td>
<td>• Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competition structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isolating the impact of Olympics inclusion on trampolining from other changes was an area of potential difficulty and exacerbated by the amount of concurrent changes in the sporting landscape. This can be exemplified by the change in NGBs, and also concurrent unrelated changes, such as changes in the local delivery of recreational and school sport through the creation of County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships. The interview schedules were carefully designed to try to minimise the issue of isolating the impact of the Olympics from other changes. For example, when interviewing County Sport Partnership staff and School Sport Partnership staff care was taken to identify how the support of trampolining varied from non-Olympic sports or non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics and also to what degree Olympic recognition influenced their decision making.
Hence this section has offered an overview and justification of who was interviewed and what topics appeared on the interview schedule. For a sample interview schedule see Appendix Eight.

4.8) Conclusion

Referring back to the diagram at the beginning of the chapter (Figure 4.1) most of the influences (as highlighted by Bryman, 2004) on this research project have been identified, as can be summarised in Figure 4.10.
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**Figure 4.10 - Influences on the investigation into the effect of including trampolining in the Olympic programme on trampolining in England**

The only one of Bryman’s (2004) influences on the study of the social world which has not been addressed in this chapter is ‘values.’ From a natural science paradigm one would anticipate that researchers were value free and objective in their research. However, there is now
recognition that “it is not feasible to keep the values that a researcher holds totally in check” (Bryman, 2004, p.21). For example, “data are not collected, but produced” (May, 2001, p.28) – the medium through which facts are gathered and interpreted will affect the conclusions. Ultimately, even the research question itself has been guided by values. This can be exemplified by the fact that Taylor argues that evaluation should “be seen as socially located and understood as politically contested” (2005, p.603). So to conclude, the notion of ‘values’ has influenced the choice of what approaches have been adopted in this chapter and indeed the whole focus of the study.
Chapter Five - Elite trampolining

5.1) Introduction

This chapter will look at the affects of the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympics on elite trampolining in England. Section 5.2 will briefly review the organisations relevant to elite trampolining with the addition of empirical data and information about how they are conceptualised. As with Chapter Three when discussing theoretical perspectives, analysis of how trampolining has changed since it became an Olympic discipline will be considered in terms of organisational aspects (5.3), economic aspects (5.4) and policy aspects (5.5) with elements of power considered where appropriate. This reflects the research questions. This will be followed by an overall conclusion (5.6).

To avoid unnecessary repetition between analysis chapters, this chapter will consider references to the Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD) model. Because the elite participant will reach the top of the player pathway it is most applicable in this context rather than in Chapter Six (Recreational trampolining). Issues relating to the balance between elite sport and sport for all will be addressed in the chapter on recreational trampolining (Chapter Six) since during interviews it emerged as more of a cause for concern at that level.

5.2) Structural overview

As discussed in Chapter Four and highlighted in Figure 5.1, The key organisations involved in elite trampolining in England are British Gymnastics, the BOA, UK Sport and the EIS as a subsidiary of UK Sport (as discussed in Chapter Two). The sport of trampolining would not have
any contact with the BOA, UK Sport or EIS if it was not an Olympic discipline.

Operationally, UK Sport receives funding from the Government and “provide money for the high performance divisions” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). British Gymnastics is assigned a Performance Advisor and “that person is then the liaison for us with UK Sport” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). Then within British Gymnastics there is an Olympic sub-committee and a representative from UK Sport sits on that. There is clear consensus from individuals within British Gymnastics that there is a heavy power imbalance in their relationship with UK Sport and UK Sport is seen as “being rather big-brother” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). This is due to a hierarchy of resource control: “if you are the paymaster then you make the decisions” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008).
The EIS is a “wholly owned subsidiary” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) of UK Sport. Each region has a number of lead sports – the lead region for trampolining and gymnastics is the West-Midlands. The West Midlands “negotiates terms or the relationship between the EIS and the sport” (EIS Official, May 2008) and this is then delivered to the athletes via their home region. There are separate agreements for trampolining and gymnastics and “sports also have to name their athletes, we have athlete lists that we work with” (EIS Official, May 2008) and the athletes are either funded at World Class Podium or Performance in their sport. There is an impression that British Gymnastics relationship with the EIS is somewhat troubled due to a difficult beginning. From British Gymnastics perspective, as an NGB they “developed many of the relationships with service providers historically” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). For example they had strong links with Loughborough University and Bangor University. So when the EIS was created “we use them for things we can get benefit from but we very much retained the original relationships we had” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). However there were still difficulties because the EIS has a “very specific remit that they have to deliver and are very interested in the performance athletes and the funded athletes but our sport is wider than that” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). The fact that trampolining and gymnastics are early specialisation sports (i.e. elite participants are required to train for trampolining or gymnastics with the exclusion of other sports from a young age) and athletes are largely club based made it very difficult to access standardised support packages and “the EIS is still very much about providing services rather than saying to the sport what do you need?” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). Furthermore, the British Gymnastics official felt that the gymnastics family were not a priority for the EIS. From the EIS’s perspective, the early difficulties were due to British Gymnastics “not being so fully developed as a sport” (EIS Official, May 2008) compared to bigger sports like swimming and rowing who “are totally embedded within the Institute or us into their thing” (EIS Official, May 2008). The EIS Official
also emphasised the importance of individual relationships between staff of British Gymnastics and the EIS in ensuring engagement. Over its time in existence the EIS has developed its relationships with NGBs and “it is now a partnership rather than being a kind of master / servant thing” (EIS Official, May 2008) respecting the expertise of the EIS. In terms of British gymnastics specifically, “it’s a lot of scar tissue that needs overcoming” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) but “it’s probably now at the stage where really British Gymnastics just needs to get over it [the introduction of support from the EIS] and get on with it” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008).

The BOA represents the IOC in Britain and their “key role is taking the team to the Games” (BOA Official, June 2009). The BOA “work very closely with the Governing Bodies throughout the Olympic programme” (BOA Official, June 2009) and every NGB has a representative on the National Olympic Committee which in the case of British Gymnastics is the Chief Executive. The BOA is funded via The Olympic Partners (TOP) programme of sponsorship through the IOC and they also have a variety of individual sponsors each Olympic cycle (i.e. the year in which the Olympics are held and the three years preceding this). However in the current Olympic cycle (2009 to 2012), “we can’t get sponsors because we have to give the rights to LOCOG [London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games]” (BOA Official, June 2009) so “there’s an agreement between LOCOG and the BOA that they pay us a certain amount of money each year” (BOA Official, June 2009). The other major change within the BOA due to the 2012 Games being in London is that the preparation of Team GB has started in year one of the cycle (i.e. 2009) rather than the normal practice of starting after the Commonwealth Games (i.e. late 2010). This is because “with the bigger team that is going to qualify cos we’re the host nation, we’re going to have many more people going to the Games who have never been to the Games before” (BOA Official, June 2009). Also in terms of ‘home advantage’ the BOA are “looking at a whole range of aspects to ensure we can prepare more
effectively than other nations” (BOA Official, June 2009). British Gymnastics’ relationship with the BOA appears to be viewed more positively than their relationship with UK Sport and the EIS and “works well” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). According to the BOA official interviewed, “I’d consider it to be more of a partnership because they’re not necessarily giving to us and we’re not necessarily giving to them” (BOA Official, July 2009) and “it’s a relationship which is based around something which is mutually beneficial to both of us” (BOA Official, July 2009).

The BOA’s relationship with UK Sport in respect to supporting trampolining is similarly characterised by a mutual interdependence: “UK Sport provide what we don’t provide, they have the funding and guidance with that funding” (BOA Official, July 2009) and “similarly we provide what they can’t provide which is an opportunity to go to the Olympics” (BOA Official, July 2009). However there is some overlap between the function of the EIS and the services the BOA provide; namely the Olympic Medical Institute at Northwick Park and the provision of sports science and sports medicine services at the Games. There does not appear to be any active conflict and sports can access whatever suits their needs, yet it does not appear to be the most effective use of resources.

In terms of the internal structure of British Gymnastics, there are ten disciplines including trampolining that are “under the umbrella of British Gymnastics” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009), the UK Governing Body. Each discipline has a Technical Committee. In the case of trampolining this comprises of a Chair and members responsible for Coach Education, Competitions, Development, Judging and World Class Liaison. There is then a cross-disciplinary committee for World Class and also cross-disciplinary committees for areas such as finance, marketing, ethics and welfare and major events. These are all overseen by a Chief Executive Officer and other board members.
The preceding discussions will now be used as a basis to consider organisational, economic and policy changes to elite trampolining since it has been part of the Olympic programme.

5.3) Organisational aspects

This section will consider how elite trampolining has changed since it has been in the Olympics from an organisational perspective. Most of the focus will be on British Gymnastics. Items considered include: perceptions of trampolining joining the Olympic programme, reactions to the British Trampoline Federation joining British Gymnastics, changes in the governance of trampolining, the place of trampolining in British Gymnastics, changes to the competition structure, the LTAD model in trampolining and conflicts in elite trampolining. These aspects were identified in Chapter Two and Chapter Three and revealed in empirical investigations. Having reviewed the current organisational structure in section 5.2, it is important to remember that trampolining had an autonomous NGB – the British Trampoline Federation – until 1999 when it was required to join British Gymnastics under IOC regulations due to inclusion in the Olympic programme (as discussed in Chapter Two). This appeared to be the most significant organisational change caused by trampolining joining the Olympics cited by interviewees.

Looking at the reaction by the trampolining community to the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympic programme first provides some context for exploring perspectives on subsequent organisational change. It was overwhelmingly viewed very positively by the trampolining community: “it’s been fantastic for trampolining to get into the Olympics” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009). From British Gymnastics perspective “I don’t think there was any opposition to trampolining being in the Olympic Games” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008).
universal outlook among elite trampolinists was the feeling that it greatly improved the status of their sport in terms of the perception of the general public. This can be exemplified by the observation: “the fact that it’s part of the Olympics proves to everyone that isn’t part of the sport that this sport is taken seriously” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008). Another common theme to emerge was the belief that Olympic inclusion should inevitably have happened at some stage – “it’s about time I think” (Elite Trampolinist G, July 2008) and now “it would be really weird not to be part of the Olympic movement” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). Athletes from other disciplines of gymnastics also supported the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympic Games since they felt it was of benefit getting more gymnastics events in the Games and they recognised the skill and difficulty required in trampolining (Elite Gymnast B, June 2008; Elite Gymnast E, June 2008; and Elite Tumbler, June 2008). Nevertheless from the standpoint of a tumbler (a discipline which is not currently in the Olympic programme) “there’s got to be a certain amount of jealousy in there from other disciplines” (Elite Tumbler, June 2008). It was also viewed positively by other organisations involved in elite sport. For example the BOA saw it as “good news” (BOA Official, July 2009) and “we welcomed them into the fold” (BOA Official, July 2009). Thus overall there was strong acceptance of the inclusion of trampolining the Olympic Games.

While Olympic inclusion was viewed as being a positive thing, the inevitable accompanying organisational change of the British Trampoline Federation merging with British Gymnastics had more mixed reactions: “some of the changes associated were difficult and may not have been viewed quite as positively” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). One official described the “history of somewhat hostility” (English Schools Gymnastics Association Official, April 2009) between the British Trampoline Federation and British Gymnastics prior to the merger. It was made absolutely clear by many interviewees that joining British Gymnastics only happened to allow British trampolinists to compete in the
Olympics: “because we wanted to be in the Olympics we just had to say ok that’s it we surrender!” (English Schools Gymnastics Association Official, April 2009). In fact some British Trampoline Federation members would have “preferred to stay as the British Trampoline Federation than join the Olympics” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009) but this was overruled largely by clubs that had elite performers and so had more of a personal interest. One of the issues was the perceived loss of status, autonomy and identity: “we’ve got our own community, everyone’s together with trampolining” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008). There was also the concern that trampolining had little in common with the rest of gymnastics and so needed its own NGB to reflect this. Specifically, being “a minority sport in an umbrella Governing Body” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) was seen as a problem particularly because of the perceived focus on artistic gymnastics by British Gymnastics. Some former British Trampoline Federation officials were so opposed to the merger that they refused to become British Gymnastics members and were “cast aside” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) because they were no longer insured. One elite trampolinist felt that joining with British Gymnastics may also have alienated some boys because “they felt a bit more macho doing trampolining rather than gymnastics” (Elite Trampolinist G, July 2008). Overall it “was quite a painful time for a lot of people” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2009) although the interviewee felt that given that the merger now happened over ten years ago a lot of the initial animosity has now disappeared.

By contrast, a member of the Trampoline Technical Committee said “for me it was absolute bliss because we were sort of a 1960s organisation run from a little room in the upstairs over a shop and we joined a professional organisation” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). This then in turn forced trampolining to create “a more professional system through which people can evolve” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). One British Gymnastics official felt this professionalisation (i.e.
the transformation of coaching into a role of the highest integrity and competence, emphasizing the role of qualifications) may not have been welcomed by all involved and while none of the individuals interviewed corroborated this idea it may have been down to the role and nature of those selected in the sample. Several coaches and elite participants alluded to the benefits of being part of a bigger organisation. For example “I think you can get more support” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009) and England hosted the Trampoline World Cup Final which “I don’t think we would have got if we weren’t with British Gymnastics” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008). Furthermore the structure of British Gymnastics has been able to deal with concurrent changes in sport such as child protection requirements. The British Trampoline Federation “run on a strictly amateur basis could not have dealt with the current legislation which has affected us” (English Schools Gymnastics Association Official, April 2009). Another specific area which has benefited from joining British Gymnastics is coach education: “coach education has been put on a professional footing basically” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2009) and “a lot if things I’d wanted to put into coaching courses became normal” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). And “being in the Olympics made that happen” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008)! The coaching structure and award structure has also become a lot more homogenised with the rest of British Gymnastics (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2009). This all suggests that an increase in the level of professionalism occurred due to the merger with British Gymnastics. In terms of whether Olympic inclusion affects the professionalization and formalisation of a discipline’s governance, another British Gymnastics Official felt “I wouldn’t say it’s necessarily the Olympic / non-Olympic split that dictates that” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) but “really more the development of the discipline” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). I.e. some of the non-Olympic disciplines may be well managed yet “some of the Olympic disciplines maybe have stages to develop in terms of professionalization” (British
Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Nevertheless, in terms of management, in the Olympic environment “the levels of expectation increase massively” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). There is “a little more pressure on the governance of a discipline that becomes Olympic to match standards in other Olympic disciplines” (BOA Official, July 2009) indicating a greater degree of formalisation.

While it has been argued that Olympic inclusion “made the sport change very quickly” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) there is still the feeling that the merger of Governing Bodies has had less of an impact than anticipated. There were examples given of British Gymnastics being slow to fully embrace trampolining such as the unmet expectation they would “apply their expertise and come in and help develop the sport” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). Many interviewees felt trampolining was still not seen as part of gymnastics. Part of the reason for this is that “culturally it was a very different sport whereas I think the disciplines within gymnastics are probably closer to other disciplines” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). This official felt that this would result in fewer issues for these other disciplines if they subsequently were added to the Olympic programme in the future. Furthermore there is still the feeling that trampolining is the “poor relation” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) or a “weaker link” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008) within British Gymnastics and “it is definitely viewed with a slight snigger” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009).

Several coaches and elite trampolinists and artistic gymnasts feel that within British Gymnastics “artistic is the glory one” (Elite Gymnast C, June 2008). Part of the cause for this is British Gymnastics “is known for the artistic type thing” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). This leads the individual to feel “rhythmic and general gymnastics and perhaps trampolining; certainly we are seen as perhaps the second tier” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Similar
problems are cited within the different disciplines of swimming and athletics which again come under an umbrella NGB (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). There is also evidence of disharmony between the World Class funded disciplines versus the non-funded disciplines: “the haves and the have nots” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). While the funding is ring-fenced (as discussed in section 5.4), this spills over to a feeling that “unless you’re Olympic, they [British Gymnastics] are just not interested” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Two of the gymnasts opinions take a very market-driven view of British Gymnastics in regards to prioritisation of Olympic disciplines: “in terms of running a business I would assume they should do” (Elite Gymnast A, June 2008) or “I’m pretty sure it all comes down to who is going to win the most medals, that’s what they’re bothered about” (Elite Gymnast B, June 2008). Achievement in non-Olympic disciplines is not seen to be as well acknowledged by British Gymnastics. This can be exemplified by an elite tumbler talking about his friends who won the Tumbling World Championships: “they’re the best in the world at what they do and got minimal… [acknowledgement]” (Elite Tumbler, June 2008). In terms of media coverage of competitions and success (both mainstream and within British Gymnastics publications), again there is a hierarchy of artistic gymnastics, other Olympic disciplines followed by the non-Olympic disciplines (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009; Elite Gymnast C, June 2008; Elite Gymnast E, June 2008; and Elite Tumbler, June 2008). A further example of differences between artistic and the other disciplines of gymnastics is the competency on which national competitions are run and the crowds which they draw (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009; Elite gymnast E, June 2008; and Elite Tumbler, June 2008). Hence there seems more evidence of perceived prioritisation of artistic over other disciplines rather than an Olympic / non-Olympic split. This is likely to be due to the historical role of British Gymnastics and also because “most people tend to come and work with gymnastics with a bias towards a discipline” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and due to “the size of the artistic
disciplines a lot of people have an artistic bias” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009).

One elite trampolinist felt there is an impression that British Gymnastics as an organisation is trying to bridge the gulf: “certainly on their website they try and make it look like they’re equal… but I don’t know if that’s just to be PC” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). From a British Gymnastics perspective, the lack of affinity of trampolining to gymnastics is “a challenge to me and my staff” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Internally within British Gymnastics there seems to be less conflict between paid staff in the funded and non-funded disciplines because they have more understanding of the rationale behind decisions (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). However when men’s artistic failed to reach the targets set by UK Sport and its funding was withdrawn this “created a lot of internal conflict” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008).

Another British Gymnastics official feels that due to the difficulties discussed regarding trampolining coming under the governance of British Gymnastics and the nature of the Olympic cycle, “it will probably be a sixteen year journey I suppose before we really see the benefits” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). Due to the inclusion of cheerleading in British Gymnastics in 2008, trampolining is no longer the newest discipline.

Currently, responsibility for trampolinists on the World Class Programme (i.e. the elite athletes receiving funding from UK Sport) falls to the World Class staff and anything below this to the Trampoline Technical Committee. Unfortunately “the reality is it hasn’t been particularly well structured” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) with lack of communication between the two groups leading to an “us and them situation” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) with a lack of partnership. More recently there has been a greater degree of shared responsibility and “it is becoming much more of a seamless pathway now” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) where “everybody
is buying into the one model rather than us all just shooting off and doing our own bits and pieces and hoping things work out” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Another change which has effected World Class is initially it was managed horizontally with separate managers for World Class Start, Potential and Performance; whereas now it is managed more vertically and managers oversee whole disciplines (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008).

There are also tensions between the Trampoline Technical Committee and other British Gymnastics officials because members of the Trampoline Technical Committee are all volunteers. This leads to difficulties because “while they are well meaning, does that mean they know the direction of sport?” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). A British Gymnastics official raised a concern shared by the wider coaching fraternity in that the Trampoline Technical Committee “isn’t particularly representative of the people that know or have produced quality trampolinists themselves” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and there is the expectation that to know what is needed for World Class level one has to have experience of delivering it. There is no place for “historical baggage” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and “you can’t talk in the context of the good old days because things move on” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). This concern with volunteers reluctance to move with the times and resultant conflict was shared by other sports officials (for example YST Official A, February 2009). The new direction is not shared or understood by previous volunteers; i.e. more formalised goals are not being met by structures. Another challenge is if volunteers have come through a particular route they are naturally likely to have an allegiance to that and “it’s a real challenge to ask them to look beyond their own discipline” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Similarly in decision making they may side with what protects their own interests. Particularly since trampolining has been included in the Olympics there is a need for volunteers to be highly capable if they are responsible for organising and managing elite level programmes (British
Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Also, people working in a voluntary capacity in elite trampolining “have been superseded by people who are now in place professionally to drive the sport” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). This creates “levels of animosity” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) as some people are being paid and not others. The reasoning behind employing some staff is down to increased levels of accountability in the governance of the sport due to increased levels of funding since trampolining has been in the Olympics (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). In terms of sports science and medicine there is a heightened need for a service that can react quickly to the needs of the performers and not rely on when volunteers are free (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). There is immense pressure on these paid staff because “you can’t be a nine-to-five professional, you have to be seen to be absolutely dedicated to the core and match the enthusiasm of the volunteers” (BOA Official, July 2009). However it is also likely that the vast majority of the paid staff have put in many hours of voluntary work earlier in their careers (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). So it is almost like the system is slowly becoming more professional.

After trampolining had been in the Olympic programme for several years UK Sport and British Gymnastics conducted a review of the trampoline World Class Programme. As a result of this, a new British Gymnastics subcommittee was formed – the Olympic disciplines subcommittee (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). The aim was to “provide quick and efficient management of Olympic disciplines” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and make the committee structures for those disciplines “more professional, more streamlined, to allow for swift decision making in heavily funded programmes” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). This British Gymnastics Official also acknowledged there was some organisational prioritisation for these disciplines.

There is a concern within British Gymnastics and more widely that trampolining is still “pretty amateur, they don’t really have sufficient work
The BOA official cited an example of how this manifest at the holding camps for Athens 2004 and Beijing 2008 where artistic gymnasts trained three hours per day and trampolinists only one hour per day and “when our trampolists train as long and as hard as our artistic gymnasts standards might fly” (BOA Official, July 2009). One British Gymnastics official felt this lack of dedication was demonstrated throughout the four year Olympic cycle and “people have tried to get a World Class result on a part-time commitment and that’s not a good mix at all” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). The British Gymnastics officials feel the structures are in place since the British Trampoline Federation merged with British Gymnastics to allow a fuller commitment, but it is down to the athletes and coaches because “as the saying goes, you can take a horse to water but you can’t make it drink” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Part of this is believed to be down to the culture of trampolining which one British Gymnastics official feels “is very much still set in its recreational roots” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). And while it has a large recreational base the numbers that compete at an elite level are very low. Another British Gymnastics official draws a parallel with surfing:

It’s a bit of a hobby, it’s a bit of a recreation, and they’re pretty good at it so they practice a bit and they go and compete and throw a few tricks and it’s great (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008).

As discussed previously, the elite performers themselves are keen for trampolining to be taken more seriously as a sport. The fundamental issue appears to be lack of understanding of what it takes to get a result at Olympic level in terms of commitment (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) but also in terms of technical skill development (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). To compound the problem “a sport going into the Olympics raises its standards hugely” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Unfortunately “for the first time ever we’ve realised we’re not a top nation in trampolining” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) so previous practice is no
longer sufficient. One coach mentions the error of not supporting trampolinists to undertake full-time training soon enough (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). The Chinese and Japanese in particular are providing strong opposition. Interestingly “they didn’t do anything in trampolining until it became an Olympic sport” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) and the Olympics “have certainly been the thing that’s had the reasons to allow these countries to become powerful” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) due to increased Governmental support and prioritisation. Also, prior to Olympic inclusion trampolining was more of a “niche sport” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). The relative decline of standards in English trampolining is also attributed to the merger with British Gymnastics by one coach (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) but none of the other interviewees corroborated this. In respect of the London 2012 Games “in terms of the men’s competitions worldwide, they are getting pretty dammed good and it’s not going to be easy to break in” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). By contrast in women’s trampolining if someone was given the right support “they could make a significant impact on London 2012” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) because “the playing field just isn’t that tight” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009).

One of the ways trampolining and British Gymnastics more widely has responded to this need to raise standards was to change the internal competition structure within England and the rest of the UK in the 2008 / 2009 season. They “focussed on the key areas of weakness at the higher level and how to correct that and worked back from there” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). The particular concern was that at World Age Group level the UK did relatively well but then failed to translate this success into senior international level (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). Interestingly the Olympics was not explicitly mentioned as an end goal but rather ‘world standard’ yet it was felt “the Olympics was probably what they were always talking about”
While there are equivalencies between the old and the new categories (see Appendices Seven and Nine for details of the routines) and British Gymnastics have a plan to manage transfer, there is a belief that “everything has changed” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009).

The new competition structure is designed to “be much more developmental than it was before” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) and “it’s very good graduated learning from more or less front summersaults up to multi-summersaults” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). To that end British Gymnastics have made clear links to the LTAD model in terms of stages of competition (see Table 5.1). British Gymnastics have also introduced a log-book which if made compulsory would mean “you couldn’t move onto the next Grade before you’d passed through the log-book” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). The log-book is designed to ensure coaches “won’t be able to miss things out and they’ll have to concentrate on things being of a good standard” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). It also integrates the award schemes with the competition structure (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). There is concern from some coaches that British Gymnastics “are trying to do coach education through competition structure”(Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) when it should be addressed as a separate issue. Running coach education through the competition structure will “just constrain performance” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). The new competition structure also engenders an increased “fear of demotion and promotion” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) due to relative rather than absolute qualifying standards. For athletes this “will probably be the biggest increase in pressure” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008).
Table 5.1 - Links between the new competition structure and the LTAD model (British Gymnastics, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competition Grade</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>LTAD stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Club I</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Jump start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club H</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Jump start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional G</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Learning to Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional F</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Learning to Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional E</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Learning to Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional D</td>
<td>National League</td>
<td>Training to Compete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National C</td>
<td>National League</td>
<td>Training to Compete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG B</td>
<td>National League</td>
<td>Training to Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIG A</td>
<td>National League</td>
<td>Training to Win</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the new competition framework for trampolining is designed to fit with LTAD principles, there is still concerns that within trampolining there is not a very clear LTAD pathway due to lack of “definition in what it takes to get good in trampolining” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). For example there is nothing which says “at this age the recommendation is you should be doing this number of hours supported by conditioning, flexibility, core work or whatever it is, with these testing protocols” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Furthermore, this British Gymnastics official praised the clearly defined LTAD models adopted by sports such as swimming. However sports like trampolining and gymnastics do have a challenge in that they are early-specialisation sports and “the Fundamentals element kicks in almost from pre-school” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Another British Gymnastics official argued that especially now trampolining too is a discipline of gymnastics, it would be possible for clubs to begin teaching children every discipline. Then “as the children start to mature and start to demonstrate specialisation” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) they can then “have the opportunity from that same place to branch into wherever they are best suited” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). This would require some “long-term strategic thinking and management at the very highest levels of British Gymnastics” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008).
More widely, whether a sport is in the Olympics or not does not appear to have a significant effect on the degree to which the talent development programme is developed (English Institute of Sport Official, 2008; Sport England Official C, October 2008; and Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). There are “some non-Olympic sports that have good talent ID systems” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009) and equally “there are probably some Olympic sports that don’t have very effective talent systems” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Fundamentally “an Olympics is just one of the international arenas where you go and play” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and there are excellent talent development programmes in cricket and netball (BOA Official, July 2009). However Olympic sports generally have more money to invest in such programmes and “if you haven’t there is still that element of luck” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009).

There will now be a focus on the impact on the athletes. The fact that trampolining is now in the Olympics has changed the ultimate ambition in the competition pathway for all of the elite trampolinists interviewed regardless of whether competing in the Olympics is a realistic goal for them. One of the attractions of Olympic success over achievement in sports specific competitions is the universality of it: “it’s more transferable I think if you tell people” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008) and “it’s something everyone can grasp” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). Also again it almost confirms the status of trampolining:

if you say I won the World Championships in trampolining, that maybe wouldn’t be as impressive as winning it in something people might consider a more socially accepted sport (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008).

Furthermore, “the Olympics is everything though isn’t it to athletes” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008) and “that’s the dream, the Olympic dream” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). The prestige of the Olympics is furthered by the fact it is only held once every four years, its media coverage and the glory that “you’ll go down in history as being an Olympian” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008). Due to its status, one elite
trampolinist felt “anyone would settle for a Bronze Olympic medal instead of a Gold [at a World Championships]” (Elite Trampolinist E, June 2008). Despite this, “I don’t think the World Championships have become any less important now” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008) and “it’s almost like a new level has come along with the Olympics” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008); i.e. the World Championships are still viewed with the same importance but there is now an additional layer above this in the form of the Olympics. Several coaches argued that in fact the status of World Championships has been raised because as a country getting a place in the Olympics is “based on your position in the world rankings and how you competed in the World Championships” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2008). Moreover, “the selection is so small” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008) for the Olympics (a very maximum of two males and two females) so elite athletes have a more realistic chance of representing Great Britain in World Championships, World Cups or European Championships when a team of four or five of each gender is taken. Artistic gymnasts also exalted the importance of the Olympics for them in the competition structure. For gymnasts it may have more implications for talent identification since “they’re looking for the kid that will turn sixteen in the Olympic year” (Elite Gymnast E, June 2008) and not the one that is fifteen and so has to wait for the next Olympic cycle to compete. In trampolining ones age is not considered quite so crucial. Only one interviewee was critical of the Olympics and felt “the World Championships are the pinnacle of achievement” (BSGA Official, April 2009) because “the Olympics is just a circus, a political circus to promote the country not promote the sport” (BSGA Official, April 2009).

Since trampolining has been in the Olympics, at an elite level there have been more competitions: “there’s no closed season, so where does one recover?” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). In terms of pressure induced by competing at the Olympic Games, one elite athlete said “if you are going to be at World’s there’s going to be the same sort of pressure there” (Elite Gymnast C, June 2008). Conversely the
Olympics “gives people a goal to carry on longer” (English Gymnastics Official, June 2008). One elite gymnast talks of being advised to pick artistic gymnastics over trampolining as a child as he displayed talent for both but trampolining at the time was not in the Olympics (Elite Gymnast B, June 2008). Also in terms of the LTAD, elite gymnastics and trampolining provide a good grounding for later transition to other sports. Diving is the obvious example of a sport to transfer to after retiring from competitive trampolining, but a member of the Trampoline Technical Committee gave the case study of a Scottish national standard rugby player who was a former trampolinist (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). There is the concern that “a lot of Governing Bodies pay lip-service to LTAD” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). For example “they say that they’re following LTAD principles but they’re not” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). Indeed one high level interviewee from British Gymnastics when asked about LTAD talked about things like athletes having notebooks to record what they have done in sessions and seemed unaware that it was a specific model.

Further to the sources of conflict discussed previously (i.e. organisational change, different disciplines and volunteers), a concern specifically related to elite trampolinists was ‘organisational stress.’ At a basic level for many athletes this was manifest as the almost inevitable “coaches that don’t get on with each other” (Elite Tumbler, June 2008) and “they’ll get jealous cos they’ve all got their protégés” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). Two more senior athletes displayed concern over structures within British Gymnastics: “it might happen in every sport, but I think trampolining is very political” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). This is displayed through reportedly inequitable selection policies for major competitions. Despite a more professional system and set criteria there are claims of cases where:

if someone’s out of favour with British Gymnastics, the Governing Body themselves, they won’t pick then for competitions even though they’ve beaten people (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008).
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Another athlete echoed this: “British Gymnastics is renowned for changing its mind” (Elite Gymnast A, June 2008) and it’s down to “the people with the powers and the powers to be and what they decide to be fit at that time” (Elite Gymnast A, June 2008). This is viewed as a particularly serious problem now by the athletes due to the end goal of being able to represent Team GB in the Olympics. The athletes felt their only option was to “take a step back and get back to training and concentrate on training and competing as well as you can” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). Since “if you don’t like it you’ve got no real say to be honest” (Elite Gymnast A, June 2008) and you “have to basically fit in with how they do it or leave” (Elite Gymnast A, June 2008). It is evident to such a degree that a coach of elite trampolinists even commented that they are “under immense pressure as they get almost no backing from their own sport” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). There is also sometimes conflict within the structures of British Gymnastics in terms of the Governing Body, National Head Coach and club coaches having conflicting views over what is right for a trampolinist which is likely to cause stress for the athlete too (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008).

At an elite level the importance of the Olympics and the focus given to it now has resulted in the decline of synchronised trampolining: “if it was an Olympic sport a lot of people would do synchro but at present very few people do synchro” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). While there are still competitions at a national and international level, they are “poorly attended” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Since trampolining has become an Olympic discipline, in synchronised trampolining “the standard has gone backwards rather than forwards” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Within England “people used to go out of their way to travel to train with their partner, they don’t now” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) and if people still do synchronised trampolining they pair up with someone from their home club. This member of the Trampoline Technical Committee was the only interviewee that spoke at
length about synchronised trampolining and they felt themselves “it
doesn’t bother anyone else” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A,
July 2008). This further demonstrates how Olympic centred the
competition programme has become in England.

Trampolining has undergone significant change to its governance due to it
being included in the Olympic programme - the most fundamental of these
being the British Trampoline Federation joining British Gymnastics. While
this has brought some benefits to the sport such as increased
professionalisation, it has not been without immense difficulties and some
costs. Trampolining also now has to interact with the BOA, UK Sport, and
the EIS. Again all these relationships have offered benefits, but
interactions with the latter two organisations have been characterised by
unequal power rather than partnership. Further sources of conflict or
concern which emerged during interviews were the apparent prioritisation
of certain disciplines; the lack of cooperation between the Trampoline
Technical Committee and the World Class Team; volunteers (particularly
the Trampoline Technical Committee); and organisational stress for elite
athletes. Another important change for participants which has occurred
since trampolining has joined the Olympics and motivated to a certain
degree by Olympic inclusion, are significant changes to the internal
competition structure. While elite trampolining feel the status of
trampolining has improved since it has been in the Olympics, there is
concern from some quarters of British Gymnastics that it still has an
amateur philosophy.

5.4) Economic aspects

Prior to Olympic inclusion and when trampolining was governed by the
British Trampoline Federation (i.e. pre-1999), trampolining “didn’t get any
subsidy from the Government, you made your own money, spent your own
money, you were on your own” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Today elite trampolining receives financial and / or other support from UK Sport, EIS and the BOA (the first two of which receive Governmental funding). There have also been concurrent dramatic increases in the funding elite sport receives since the introduction of the National Lottery and the decision to spend some of it on elite sport:

pre-1997 I think the total that any Sports Council had to invest in sports was about five million pounds a year and now we are running at pretty much a hundred million pounds a year (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

This section will cover both direct financial benefits that elite trampolining now receives and also other support as this other source of assistance can be considered benefits in kind and so is still most appropriately considered from an economic point of view. Changes in sponsorship will also be discussed.

When deciding how much money to allocate to each sport, UK Sport begins by looking:

at who’s winning medals now on a world stage; who’s sitting in the wings with the potential to do that, their performance profile suggests they have the make-up to go all the way (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

They then use an investment model which “basically awards athlete places to a sport based on results” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). A sport gets four Podium funded places for every medal won in the last Olympic Games and an additional one place for every fourth to eighth finish. They then get this number plus another third at development level (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). Each discipline is considered as a sport in its own right. However while “a lot of what we do is very objective” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) there still “has to be an element of subjectivity” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). This allows trampolining still to receive support despite having not yet won a medal at an Olympic Games and also explains the pattern of distribution of support between the three tiers in British Gymnastics. Part of the reason why trampolining is relatively well supported is because internationally only sixteen trampolinists qualify for the Olympic Games and so there is a “chance of
winning a medal just by virtue of making it there” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). Also as a nation England “are very good at synchro” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) and although synchronised trampolining is not currently in the Olympic programme “it might at some point” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). UK Sport try to make funding criteria “as open and transparent as it can be and so everyone knows why we say no when we say no” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

When World Class funding was introduced in 1997 “it was much broader, so acrobatics and tumbling also received World Class funding” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). Now it is “specifically targeted at Olympic disciplines, it has to be directed at those disciplines” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Furthermore despite being an Olympic discipline rhythmic gymnastics does not currently receive support:

in terms of where it is at this moment in time, it’s not world class and our funding is primarily focussed at those sports and disciplines that can be world class (UK Sport Official B, August 2009).

Nobody from Great Britain qualified for the Beijing 2008 Olympics in rhythmic gymnastics and only one competitor for the Athens 2004 Olympics (BOA Official, July 2009). So British Gymnastics could understand UK Sport curtailing the funding for rhythmic gymnastics given that “we were unlikely to be returning in rhythmic, we weren’t going to see medals, we weren’t going to see finalists in London” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Thus the only disciplines of gymnastics to receive World Class funding are trampolining and artistic gymnastics and this is a direct effect of Olympic inclusion.

UK Sport “offer funding to the sport and then we help the sport to optimise that resource” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009). The basic areas in which they offer support are coach development, talent identification, transfer between sports, research and innovation (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). The designated Performance Manager for British Gymnastics from UK Sport then uses “a process with the sport to
determine what are some of their key issues where they specifically need support” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009). They then help “foster that solution to a particular issue” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009) which may or may not involve direct support. A specific issue for trampolining has been coaching and performance structures around that and UK Sport have “worked with some of their coaches within the sport to look at how they could develop” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

In the funding award period 2005 to 2009 (i.e. the Beijing Olympiad) British Gymnastics received £9,036,000 from UK Sport (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). This compares to an average of £8,707,519 per sport, however it is worth noting that the amount given to a sport ranges from £26,513,000 in the case of athletics to £1,686,000 for weightlifting. British Gymnastics award is then divided into £2,018,000 for Podium athletes (those with the potential to win medals at the next Games), £6,276,000 for Development athletes (four to six years away from winning Olympic medals), and £741,000 for Talent athletes (a more sports specific and less defined group). Within British Gymnastics the levels are known as Performance, Potential and Start respectively. Trampolining had two Podium athletes and eleven Development athletes compared to three Podium and forty Development for artistic gymnastics. Money for Talent athletes is not so clearly allocated to individuals. Thus as a discipline trampolining received approximately £2,161,000 for the 2005 to 2009 period in theory. Whilst UK Sport designate a certain amount of British Gymnastics’ World Class budget to trampolining, “in practice with our resource we in effect make a decision to how much we give each of the disciplines” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). British Gymnastics has in the past “made a significant investment in trampolining” but it “hasn’t really seemed to give us the desired result” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Hence the British Gymnastics official decided to give a smaller proportion of the money to trampolining and cut the number of supported athletes from twenty-four to about twelve. These athletes then receive “a bespoke level of support” (British Gymnastics Official C,
July 2009) with the hope “we will give ourselves a better return in the future” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). The only other source of funding for elite trampolining and gymnastics is membership fees but this is not so significant, hence British Gymnastics is “hugely reliant on the money that comes from UK Sport” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Without this “our programmes just wouldn’t function at anything like the form that they do at this point in time” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). From a trampolinist’s perspective: “since it was Olympic they’ve brought in World Class Programmes and that and that’s helped I think” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008).

Some of the money goes directly to the athlete “to support their performance” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). Their club also receives some funding “for supporting their development” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009); and while this may be used towards coaching or equipment the athlete’s personal coach does not receive money directly. Podium funded athletes receive a hundred pounds a month and Development athletes fifty pounds a month. Beyond that “what they receive is a direct consequence of the results they achieved the year before” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). This means that “a gymnast like Beth [Tweddle] who has achieved world results will be getting significantly more” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) than others on the same level of the World Class Programme who have not had the same success. However it is “very much supposed to be considered an award not a reward” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008).

The proportion of the funding which is retained centrally by British Gymnastics is used to provide things like monthly training camps, access to competitions, coach development, medical support and sports science support (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008; British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008; British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Moreover “the cost doesn’t make it happen, it facilitates it, so it
smoothes the pathway if you like” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). With London hosting the 2012 Olympics, “there seems to be more funding available” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). This is used towards trips and training camps “so maybe not direct cash funding but you are getting more of a lifestyle bonus in a way which is quite good” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). From some trampolining coaches with athletes on the World Class Programme there has been some concern and “I don’t think it’s been effective funding spending” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009).

The BOA Official interviewed felt that the real benefit of the World Class Programme from lottery funding is “not only the simple amount of money available to help prepare those athletes for the Games" (BOA Official, July 2009) but also “the fact that that money is ring-fenced for that purpose” (BOA Official, July 2009). However this is not seen so positively by all in British Gymnastics. For example, one Trampoline Technical Committee member felt “money from UK Sport is quite helpful but only for very few” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) and “it only helps the top echelon, nothing filters down to the rest of the guys” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). This clear designation of funding can get taken to extreme lengths as illustrated by a story told by an elite trampolinist interviewed (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). They had previously received World Class funding but been taken off the programme as they had not been able to compete for two seasons due to injury. Despite this they managed to qualify to represent Great Britain in the European Championships but because they were not on the funding programme did not receive the full kit which the funded members of the team had. This made the individual feel “left out and excluded for very little reason or point” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). While UK Sport admit “we are fairly blinkered in the way we will work with sports” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009); it is still necessary for sports to demonstrate how the work they do based on UK Sport funding “relates to the wider activities of the sport” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) so “it
kind of leads somewhere, that it is not isolated out there by itself and that there’s some wider benefits to the sport” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

From a British Gymnastics perspective “the funding is very simple, if you don’t hit your target you don’t get your funding” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). So for example for a period “men’s artistic was not a lottery programme because they couldn’t, apparently couldn’t, demonstrate targets for success” (British gymnastics Official B, May 2008). In order for British Gymnastics to access funding from UK Sport “they have a funding agreement which they have to sign up to” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009). Within the funding agreement there is “a set of performance targets which are discipline specific” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009). Initially British Gymnastics is asked to suggest “a key target for each of the disciplines per year” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Obviously in Olympic years this will be related to Olympic performance, but in the intervening years success in World Championships will be assessed. For the first time National Governing Bodies have been asked to predict and range of medals: “a ‘should get’ target and a sort of stretch target as well” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). There are also performance related milestone targets to check whether you are on target for Olympic success, such as European Junior medals or tariff scores (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). UK Sport may then “challenge a particular target” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009). For example, for some sports “we might feel in relation to their past performances and level of resources that they might be conservative” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009). Despite this, UK Sport still feel the targets are “owned by the sport, not us” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009); a perspective not shared by British Gymnastics. Targets will then be reviewed annually by UK Sport. If there is a non-delivery of a target UK Sport will want to ascertain if it is “just a particular blip at that moment in time or some more fundamental cause” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) which will effect Olympic performance. Also UK Sport feel it is important for National Governing
Bodies to remember funding “is a privilege and not a right, you have to earn it” (UK Sport A, August 2009).

There is a fundamental message that “if you accept lottery funding [from UK Sport] you consent to try and win medals and realistically win medals” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and “they’ve made it clear that’s what they’re after and if you’ve not got a hope they don’t want to know you” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). However, how British Gymnastics chooses to work to achieve these outcomes “is done by presenting a plan and in consultation with UK Sport” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). An example of this was UK Sport’s insistence upon “bringing in someone from outside into the sport to take it forward” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). And whilst this was viewed positively by British Gymnastics, there was also the sense that although it wasn’t explicitly said “if you don’t do that you won’t get your money, but that’s what they meant” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). So far “there’s not been an issue where we’ve had such a massive disagreement in the direction forwards that the relationship has been tested” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). This official also highlighted the importance of regular dialogue between British Gymnastics and the UK Sport Performance Advisor and said that “currently our conversations are very very fluid and very very regular” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Yet despite current good relations “if we were not to perform particularly well in London... we wouldn’t get funding moving forwards” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) so “from that point of view it is probably a bit of a one-sided partnership” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009).

In preparation for success at the London 2012 Olympics, ‘Mission 2012’ looks at every sport along three key dimensions (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). The ‘athlete dimension’ (i.e. how they are performing) is the aspect traditionally focussed on by UK Sport; but they are now looking more closely at ‘the system’ (i.e. coaching, sports science, sports medicine
and training) and ‘the climate’ (i.e. how the athletes are feeling). Sports essentially carry out a self-review into the areas every quarter; their findings are discussed with UK Sport and support given where necessary. The underlying principle is to identify “the things that if you do not deliver you are unlikely to deliver at the end of the day” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) and work in partnership to remedy them. There is “not a direct relationship between this process and funding and it is something we think should be working for them” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). Associated with ‘Mission 2012’ is some additional funding to support sports but it is not as great as had been hoped due to the current economic climate (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). Clearly it is only Olympic sports / disciplines which go through this review process.

Interviewees from British Gymnastics felt the individual with the most responsibility for “making sure the trampolining programme delivers its objectives” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) is the Director of Trampolining (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008; British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008; British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009; Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) and “their head would be on the rope” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008)! The World Class Programme Manager and Olympic Sub-committee would also have some responsibility. In the past “targets didn’t get discussed with the athletes on the floor” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) but “there was almost a silent expectation because the targets do go down on selection policies” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). However “that has been voiced this year” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). This is “creating more pressure” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) and elite athletes are “doing it partly to fulfil someone else’s targets rather than just their own” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). The most serious implication of this is a coaches’ concern that there has been a transition “from doing an extreme and potentially dangerous sport and knowing their barriers” (Northamptonshire
Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) to “sometimes stretching beyond their barriers and sometimes being a bit unsafe due to a bit of money” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009).

One British Gymnastics Official acknowledges that because their targets are extremely focussed on medal return “it means I have to be incredibly brutal at times about how I prioritise my time as well” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Resources are similarly prioritised: “people who have the best chances are the people we will resource the best” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). For example, coaching and facilities will be geared around their needs (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). While there is transparency and clarity, “there is no equity in the system as far as that is concerned” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). This has caused upset and disengagement in gymnasts who while elite only have an outside chance of being on Team GB for 2012 and are consequently only given very limited attention from British Gymnastics (Elite Gymnast A, June 2008 and Elite Gymnast B, June 2008). This focus and the issues it may cause have also been acknowledged by members of the Trampoline Technical Committee: “they talk about Olympic medals, medals, medals, and if you are not in that potential you go somewhere else” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). The British Gymnastics official justifies this as “it happens in all sports” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and gives the example of football players being sold for millions of pounds and players in the same team receiving different wages. In trampolining and gymnastics “we don’t so much have the value in the market place but we do have the value to the programme of athletes and we resource them accordingly” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). For some staff within British Gymnastics “it’s been a relatively uncomfortable journey” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and “people are finding it a little bit difficult to comprehend” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Despite the analogy of football being given, the discomfort may be due to gymnastics traditionally being an amateur sport and also the Olympics is
associated with a certain level of purity and freedom from the market. To a certain degree British Gymnastics Officials B (May 2008) and C (July 2009) are comfortable with the funding decisions as they feel they are employed to improve Team GB’s performance in trampolining and artistic gymnastics. Whilst “we want to be seen as helpful and not obstructive to the development of gymnastics per se” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) because “our funding is for World Class, the expectation is that we’ll get a return in 2012 so that’s where all the focus in gymnastics has to be” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009).

The fact that elite sport is now well resourced and recreational sport much less so “can cause challenges within the Governing Body in terms of their overall management of that” (UK Sport A, August 2009). From interviewee comments it appears that from a recreational perspective there is a misunderstanding of the ring-fenced nature of World Class funding and that it cannot be used to fulfil other objectives (for example Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009; Sport England Official C, October 2008; Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). If “UK Sport are focussed entirely on winning medals, then they’re going to want to see the investment programme that reflects their ambition” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) and that “in a sense forces the hand of the governing structure which might prefer to do other things with that money” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). Nevertheless, there is still a justifiable concern that the need to achieve medals may influence British Gymnastics internal funding decisions. A UK Sport official argued that in fact the converse is true since “the funding they get allows them to appoint and recruit staff to manage these programmes” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009) and hence does not compromise the Governing Body’s other objectives such as increasing participation.

The “fact that it’s [the next Olympic Games] in London does sharpen the focus” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and “it would be flippant of me to say it’s not 2012 focussed almost exclusively because it is” (British
Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Also “the public’s perception of London 2012 won’t be as to whether it’s a fantastic spectacle, it will be whether Team GB wins lots of medals or not” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). This has distorted the Government’s distribution of funding for sports, not just British Gymnastics focus, towards elite sport (Sport England Official A, May 2008). In elite sport there is a concern over “what comes after 2012” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and whether the infrastructures now created are sustainable once extra funding is reduced.

There is also a worry within British Gymnastics that the Government has introduced more targets relating to ethics and welfare, such as child protection and equality, and while these are important there has not been a corresponding increase in funding. So “it’s the same people just dealing with additional work and something has to go” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) and “it’s a case of balancing everything and still trying to achieve your performance targets” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2009).

Since trampolining has been in the Olympics, through UK Sport it has also received support from the EIS. The EIS only support Olympic sports (except netball, cricket and women’s football since these are viewed as being culturally important in England) and within these sports only disciplines which are in the Olympics (EIS Official, May 2008). Their role is to “support athletes to get Gold medals at Olympic Games and Paralympic Games” (EIS Official, May 2008) through offering a range and strength and conditioning, physiology and physiotherapy services. The EIS have “relationships and agreements with the sports” (EIS Official, May 2008) over what is delivered. Post-Athens, UK Sport introduced a framework for core-level service to each sport (based partially on what they had accessed prior to the Games) and then sports could buy in extra if they wished. The interviewee felt that “sports science support into gymnastics was quite minimal” (EIS Official, May 2008) possibly due to the
historical reasons discussed in sections 5.2 and 5.3. In all sports support is very focussed on individuals within the World Class Programme:

it's not just about trampolining, it's about trampolinist A, trampolinist B,

Working with their coach and building up a kind of personal profile

(EIS Official, May 2008).

Hence work with EIS is solely focussed on a few elite performers. Assistance from EIS is on the basis of the sport / athletes being on the World Class Programme and their appears to be no further specific conditions or contracts for the entitlement other than those required to remain on the World Class Programme. Thus trampolining receiving support from the EIS is a direct impact of Olympic inclusion.

As discussed in section 5.3, the BOA “don't provide funding for programmes” (BOA Official, July 2009). They do issue accreditations for the Games; provide kit for Team GB; take the team to the Games; source and plan holding camps for the Games; provide support services through the Olympic Medical Institute at Northwick Park; offer educational programmes for athletes and leaders in the sports; and run an ‘Olympic passport’ scheme which provides free access to local gyms (BOA Official, July 2009). “In theory we [the BOA] are a membership organisation” (BOA Official, July 2009) and all thirty-three Olympic sports “get equal shares” (BOA Official, July 2009). However the BOA “share the objectives of UK Sport and the public in general and want there to be the most successful British team in London” (BOA Official, July 2009) so “more of our support goes to the larger sports and the more successful sports” (BOA Official, July 2009). This is often demonstrated through the allocation of accreditation passes for the Games. Conversely, after lottery funding was introduced “for the sports that didn’t receive lottery funding we [the BOA] offered a variety of programmes and special support” (BOA Official, July 2009). Baseball and softball specifically benefitted from this. The support given to trampolining is “no different from any other sport” (BOA Official, July 2009) and “they would get the same proportional support as every other sport” (BOA Official, July 2009). When selecting a location for the
pre-Games holding camp the specific demands of trampolining and gymnastics would be considered. The only conditions for sports like trampolining receiving BOA support is “they have to be on the Olympic programme” (BOA Official, July 2009). Non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics are not supported, but the BOA official felt they may benefit indirectly by virtue of them being under the same Governing Body. Hence trampolining receiving support from the BOA is again a direct impact of Olympic inclusion.

World Class funding, EIS support and BOA support are only given to trampolining and artistic gymnastics and to a much lesser degree rhythmic gymnastics: non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics are not eligible for these sources of assistance. This means there are “three disciplines or parts of three disciplines that are extremely well resourced” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and:

there are seven other disciplines and parts underneath World Class within the three supported disciplines where money is just incredibly tight

(British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009)

So “there is a real sense of the haves and have nots” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). As a result there is the impression that “unless you are Olympic they [British Gymnastics] are not interested” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). The British Gymnastics official did highlight the need to educate people and be honest that “it’s a choice we make to take the money, but it’s not a choice we take to invest in the three disciplines” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). British Gymnastics has “pledged to provide some financial support, I won’t say similar because I think it is disproportionate, but some financial support to the non-targeted disciplines” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). In terms of support services the British Gymnastics official argues “within the limits of funding we do try and treat all the disciplines as equally as we can” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). So for example the medical staff “try to support all the disciplines in the same way” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). However in practice this means “we
can provide the bells and whistles for say artistic and trampolining where they have the funding” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) and then “provide a minimum standard for all the others” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). Olympic disciplines also have more professional paid staff but again “that’s a funding issue rather than anything else” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). From a UK Sport perspective, while non-Olympic disciplines do clearly receive less funding and support “there is some associated benefit” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) to them of being in a Governing Body that has Olympic disciplines. This can be exemplified by “economies of scale” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009), i.e. “in terms of the structures and the systems that are in place to support the athletes, there are some that no doubt will spread onto the non-Olympic disciplines” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

When asked about what degree non-Olympic disciplines suffer from not receiving World Class funding and other support, one British Gymnastics official said “I don’t know if suffer is the word you would use” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and then proceeded to discuss how “people played sport for ever and not got paid for it or had their training paid for” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Also while trampolining and artistic gymnastics have the funding, equally “they have the pressures of the targets” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). As discussed in relation to trampolining in Section 5.3, “when something becomes an Olympic sport the stakes get raised and potentially the expectation get raised” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). On the basis of recent medal winning performances “the British tumbling team is evidently among the best in the world” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and so “the British tumbling programme is evidently among the best in the world and they don’t have lottery funding” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). However if tumbling became an Olympic sport “the challenge of winning medals would also become harder” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Nevertheless, for elite performers in Olympic disciplines funding is available for them to go to competitions and
participate in camps and “the reality is with the unsupported disciplines they’re having to pay for a lot of it themselves” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). For example, tumblers pay themselves to go to World Cups and to attend National Squads:

you can imagine a full senior programme is very, very expensive and so they end up paying five to ten thousand pounds a year just to represent Great Britain (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008).

One of the elite trampolinists interviewed talked about a friend who did not go to the tumbling World Cups in America, Canada and China despite being in the top five worldwide: “there was a tumbler I knew who was moving house, he’d just bought a house for himself” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008) and so “he couldn’t afford flights and stuff, he just couldn’t afford to go” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). A member of the Trampoline Technical Committee echoed this concern: “we do not just want someone who has money to represent Great Britain” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). This indicates clear direct benefits for trampolining being in the Olympic programme.

According to the One Stop Plan, one of British Gymnastics’ key strategic aims is to “establish world class national training facilities for each discipline” (British Gymnastics, 2005, p.7). Artistic and rhythmic gymnastics “have Lilleshall which is an awesome centre and an awesome place to be” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). There is not currently an equivalent for trampolining. The lack of a national training centre for trampolining in comparison to the other Olympic disciplines use of Lilleshall might be indicative of British Gymnastics apparent lack of prioritisation of trampolining as discussed in Section 5.3. Elite trampolinists do have training camps one weekend a month for “short sharp training” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) with the focus on “activities governed by the EIS and perhaps nutrition courses and strength courses” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) rather than skill-based training. The elite trampolinists interviewed were supportive of the idea of a permanent national training
centre for trampolining: “some of my best training and some of my most inspirational moments of my entire career were when you get people from all over the country who come together to train for a weekend” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). A common theme to emerge was the idea of “training with someone who is better than you is a really good inspiration” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008) and “it does feel like you’ve got to up your game a bit” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). Most of the trampolinists interviewed did not always have this in their club environment as they were among the oldest and most able. A further issue for some of the trampolinists was concern over the facilities available in their home club, such as lack of rigs and landing pits, which had detrimental effects on their training. Another trampolinist said that while “I’m alright cos I’ve got quite good facilities at home” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008) other clubs they knew of struggled to get hall time despite having some able performers. There is still the hope that Olympic inclusion “will produce a high performance structure that will look like national training centres” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008).

In addition to support from UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA, another form of assistance elite trampolining receives is sponsorship. There are general sponsors of British Gymnastics and some individual sponsors for certain disciplines. For example, LG “invest reasonably heavily into rhythmic gymnastics” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). It often depends on “what their particular brand is, what they’re trying to promote and where it sits within the gymnastics disciplines” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). “A lot of sponsors are interested in the Olympic disciplines because of the high profile nature of them” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) but “we work hard to ensure all the disciplines are supported” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). However, for trampolining even since it has been in the Olympics “sponsorship is not great” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). National competitions are sponsored in that “the equipment is all provided by one company and the leotards for the teams are provided by another...
company” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). All disciplines get their kit given to them by Milano (a major gymnastics apparel company based in Preston, Lancashire). Yet members of Olympic disciplines “in national squad get paid to wear their Milano gear or support Milano clothes when they’re competing and things” (Elite Tumbler, June 2008) and “I don’t think any tumblers would get that” (Elite Tumbler, June 2008).

Also all Olympic NGBs are partnered with a major company through the BOA. The objective is “to share experience from the company to the Governing Body” (BOA Official, July 2009) and “it’s certainly not a sponsorship opportunity” (BOA Official, July 2009) thought they do clearly receive benefit in kind. Overall there is the feeling “it has been a very successful programme” (BOA Official, July 2009).

There are some cases of individual trampolinists gaining sponsorship. Sponsorship from large companies is limited to those actually competing in the Olympics. For example Jamie Moore who competed in the Sydney 2000 Olympics managed to raise about twelve thousand pounds through sponsorship to support her training and allow her coach to go to the Olympics with her. Also Kirsten Lawton was sponsored by Barclaycard when she competed in the Athens 2004 Olympics (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). According to one trampolinist, even at an elite level “there is no one looking to sponsor trampolining so you’ve got to approach the companies yourself” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). Despite representing Great Britain on numerous occasions but not in the Olympics, the only sponsorship this elite trampolinst has managed to obtain was very limited support from a family friend’s business. A similar situation is painted by the artistic gymnasts interviewed (specifically Elite Gymnast A, June 2008; Elite Gymnast B, June 2008; Elite Gymnast C, June 2008; and Elite Gymnast E, June 2008).
There is the impression from interviewees that trampolining joining the Olympic programme has not had a significant impact on sponsorship levels in England: “the performers are not getting a great deal of sponsorship income” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and “the events are not heavily sponsored or endorsed when you go there” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Part of the problem is “sponsors of a sport don’t have any rights in the Olympics so it’s a little bit of an act of faith” (BOA Official, July 2009), i.e. “they have to get their exposure value in events prior to the Olympics” (BOA Official, July 2009). The nature of Olympic rights means that the rings logo and even the word ‘Olympic’ can only be used by certain major sponsors.

American gymnasts Nastia Liukin and Shawn Johnston did appear in a commercial for Adidas shown in America, but it was felt “you wouldn’t have that with a trampolinist” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). This is mainly because “Liukin is a big role model for a lot of little girls in America” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008) and unfortunately in trampolining “we don’t really have anyone famous in our sport” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). So “until you get household names you’re not going to get sponsorship” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). One factor which effects this lack of knowledge of trampolining is “Great Britain is probably one of those countries where the coverage of trampolining itself was always very poor” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). For example, when the trampolining World Cup was held in Birmingham in 2006 British Gymnastics “actually had to pay the BBC to come in and film it” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). This lack of media attention is clearly going to deter potential sponsors of trampolining.

A further difficulty in attracting sponsors to trampolining and gymnastics more widely is “people don’t wear very much so how are you going to be able to advertise” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee member, April 2009)?! Also with trampolining apparatus there is little room for branding (Elite Trampolinist E, June 2008). One elite performer
highlighted how in trampolining and gymnastics there are issues over the appropriateness of certain brands: “I don’t know if British Gymnastics would be so accepting if a gymnast came in with ‘Fosters’ written across the chest” (Elite Gymnast E, June 2008).

Despite inherent difficulties such as lack of role models in the sport, low levels of publicity and issues of kit, one British Gymnastics official felt the sponsorship of trampolining and other disciplines of gymnastics “doesn’t seem to have been capitalised” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). They proceeded to explain this by saying trampolining has forty-thousand registered participants, the majority of which are children, and “there must be a market that says forty-thousand kids, captive market, go sell to it” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). They also compared British Gymnastics to the British Triathlon Federation as both are similar sized NGBs and “sponsorship in triathlon was pretty tiny until they took on a Commercial Manager whose role was simply to sell sponsorship” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). The Commercial Manager added a 2000% increase in sponsorship over two years.

Since being in the Olympics, elite trampolining has benefited from significant World Class funding and also support from UK Sport, the EIS and BOA. Because funding is very ring-fenced there has been a significant skew in focus towards elite trampolining. There is very little trickle-down of this funding and support to lower levels of the sport. There has also been a small increase in sponsorship but maybe this has not been fully capitalised upon yet. So it would be fair to say that Olympic inclusion has not significantly altered the sponsorship of elite trampolining in England. Several trampolinists and gymnasts talk about the difficulties in funding the expensive stage in their career prior to being on the World Class Programme and how they relied extensively on their parents and often coaches too. For example: “my parents did a lot which was good of them” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008) and “it’s definitely not a sport for people in financial hardship” (Elite Gymnast A, June 2008).
Policy and decision making permeate areas of organisation structure and economics, so many aspects of policy relating to elite trampolining, such as UK Sport’s funding programme, have already been discussed in sections 5.2 to 5.4. In this section the main relevant policy changes associated with each organisation (i.e. British Gymnastics, UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA) will be discussed further but with the focus on the underlying decision making and implementation process.

Policies relating to British Gymnastics will be considered first. The merger of the British Trampoline Federation with British Gymnastics was solely due to the policy of the IOA as discussed in section 5.2 and 5.3 and a direct impact of Olympic inclusion. Consequences of this, such as the organisational change and the resultant conflict have already been covered. When questioned about Game Plan and A Sporting Future for All in terms of the implications of the twin-track approach of increasing international success and increasing participation, it was made clear that “the ‘international success’ bit is the remit of British Gymnastics” (English Gymnastics Official, June 2008) and “the ‘increasing participation’ is the remit of English Gymnastics” (English Gymnastics Official, June 2008). There is then a Sport England Official whose role is to “make that link between participation and performance programmes” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). A major policy document in this respect is the British Gymnastics One Stop Plan (all NGBs were required to produce such a document). It was commissioned by UK Sport in 2005 and “was supposed to be quite global, quite broad, some participation work, and into this pyramid across the whole country and whole sport” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). However in practice “most people see the One Stop Plan document and the One Stop Planning process as a complete white elephant” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). And while the document was written and has been referred to, “it was clumsy and never really came into reality” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008).
The process of constructing a One Stop Plan would have been undertaken regardless of whether trampolining was in the Olympics or not, but naturally some of the policies are focussed on this goal. There is still concern that below the World Class Programme “there’s been some structure but it’s been relatively uncoordinated” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). When UK Sport and British Gymnastics conducted a review of the Trampoline World Class programme in late 2006 seventeen recommendations emerged such as the need to have a new Olympic disciplines sub-committee and to alter the numbers and structure of the World Class Programme for trampolining (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Since trampolining has been in the Olympics there has been a number of other policy changes, such as the revamp of the internal competition structure and an improved coach education programme, which have already been discussed in sections 5.3 and 5.4. There has also been reference to some policies initiated due to concurrent national changes in requirements such as child protection (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008).

There is much evidence of a top-down hierarchical approach to British Gymnastics’ policy making. For example “there is a National Technical Committee, the Coach Education Committee, the Competitions Committee” and “they all make various levels of decisions” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). Furthermore “the Executive Committee make major decisions without consulting the Technical Committee” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). This is also reflected in the fact that in terms of policy formation “the athletes views don’t really come into it very much” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008) and “it’s mostly based on someone high up in British Gymnastics” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). In terms of consultation “there is consultation but it’s not consultation that necessarily shapes the policy” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). When advisory groups are created one British Gymnastics official made it very clear that they have to be aware that “that group doesn’t think it can shape the policy”
(British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) and they can only “be informing decisions when it comes to shaping policy” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). In terms of exerting influence people can lobby (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) and in the past “it’s been that those individuals that shout loudest dictated the direction of the programme” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009) which is “not an overly smart way to run a department” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Elite trampolinists (for example Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008 and Elite Trampolinist G, July 2008) also raised doubts over getting any of their concerns acknowledged by British Gymnastics. Furthermore, there is very little localised decision making. This is reflected in the fact that “the rules and regulations were made consistent across British Gymnastics programmes” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Localised decision making is only over smaller issues. For example, “there’s policy being made around the country now on whether women can wear shorts or not” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) for certain levels of competitions.

Despite the prevalence of a top-down hierarchical approach to policy formation within British Gymnastics, there are also some specific examples of partnership. For example the structure of the new World Class Programme was decided upon after meetings with all the major stakeholders, namely the Chief Executive, President, British Gymnastics staff, the Technical Committees and key coaches who were involved (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). However within the Technical Department, the World Class delivery and coaching coalitions have “got different agendas and occasionally they’ll disagree” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). There are examples of this partnership in decision making extending down to the club level. For example, “there was opportunities at competitions to talk to some of the officials if you thought there was a need for change” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008) or “being such a big club we can put our opinions forward to help from time to time” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009). Nevertheless
“we may not change anything but we are able to put our opinions across to them which is good” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009). While these groups of people are involved “it is at different levels depending on kind of what the relevance is for them” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) and so unclear how much input they had. The Trampoline Technical Committee has also influenced some British Gymnastics wide policy changes: “there were subtle changes that we’ve brought in from a different perspective” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). Furthermore a number of the changes involved the sport “slowly going back to what we were doing under the British Trampoline Federation” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008).

In some cases a proposal is given to relevant groups, such as the Trampoline Technical Committee, and “they'll go away and discuss it” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) and return “to decide whether we’re going to take part in the whole programme or some parts of the programme and cost it all out” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Furthermore, the Trampoline Technical Committee has “only ever taken a vote once about a contentious issue” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) because “we normally tend to agree” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). While not everyone might not like the result of a vote “as a Governing Body you’ve got to go with the majority” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Importance is given to individual ideas within the Trampoline Technical Committee: “basically somebody has an idea and they put it forward” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) also “the TC [Trampoline Technical Committee] listens to everyone” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008).

In other cases policy within British Gymnastics changed as a result of an external event. For example, “there was always a very active group of people who wanted to reform competition” (Trampoline Technical
Committee Member B, July 2008). Trampolining joining British Gymnastics and also not performing well on an international level in the Olympics offered such an opportunity for changes to the competition structure to occur. There was opposition to this though and the belief that these people “just get in the way - they’re road-blocks!” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Changes in funding also offered a possibility for transformation in terms of performance programmes for trampolining (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). In terms of a counter-example “I’d probably say the UK Sport review [of British Gymnastics] was lead out of necessity rather than the 2012 Games” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and the outcomes of this review dictated policy.

How policies are derived in UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA and how decision making occurs will now be discussed. It is important to be aware that it is only since trampolining had been an Olympic discipline that it will have worked with these agencies and hence been affected by their policies. This is thus a direct impact of Olympic inclusion.

As examined earlier, UK Sport has clear policy on allocating funding and setting targets to monitor this (section 5.4). A more recent policy to emerge is Mission 2012:

- a process by which we work with the sports to identify any key issues across key areas in relation to performance, their athlete systems and climate (UK Sport Official B, August 2009).

Smaller policies / projects were also alluded to such as ‘Elite Coach’ (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) and their ‘Performance Refining Tool’ which “can often guide discussions so we can be quite specific in terms of shaping up the sport” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009).

Within UK Sport policy making there is clear reference to a ‘top-down’ approach where “the strategic direction of the organisation is set by the board” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009) and they “make all the policy
decisions” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). However, one UK Sport Official added that “our team of Officers headed up by our Directors will help frame these decisions” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). State institutions also play a part as exemplified by the way “we do have direction set to us by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport as our sponsor department” (UK Sport A, August 2009). Also “political direction changes over time so we’ll respond to that to an extent” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). As previously discussed there is a perceived in-balance of power in the relationship between British Gymnastics and UK Sport (see sections 5.2 to 5.4) and British Gymnastics and other NGBs play little if any part in the formation of UK Sport policy. Policy change is often preceded by changes in “the resources that we have and the wider macroeconomic environment” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009); specifically the “inception of 2012 with additional funding” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009) has resulted in “quite a changing sporting landscape” (UK Sport Official B, August 2009).

Policy within the EIS predominantly relates to the structure through which they provide support (i.e. the regional hubs, lead regions and individual contracts with disciplines/athletes) and the service level agreement or degree of support which is provided to each NGB (EIS Official, May 2008). When the EIS Official was asked about the conditions trampolining must fulfil to continue to receive EIS support, their response was “that’s not really our call actually” (EIS Official, May 2008) since many of their frameworks and modes of operation are imposed by UK Sport. In terms of policy change “there’s usually a major review post-Games” (EIS Official, May 2008). The fact that the EIS Official felt “we all had an input” (EIS Official, May 2008), “the sports were questioned” (EIS Official, May 2008) and “UK Sport has come in rather more neutral” (EIS Official, May 2008), demonstrates a certain degree of partnership.

When trampolining joined the Olympic programme the BOA “welcomed them into the fold” (BOA Official, July 2009) and “we try and build
relationships” (BOA Official, July 2009) and “we take guidance from the overall Performance Director for gymnastics as a sport as to how we should best support” (BOA Official, July 2009). Within the sports supported by BOA alliances may form. For example, “there would be natural lobby between the eight winter sports constantly demanding equality with the summer sports” (BOA Official, July 2009). Other examples of groups with shared interests are team sports and the sports that have recently received a reduction in funding (BOA Official, July 2008). Alternatively the Performance Directors may unite as a group (BOA Official, July 2009). A major policy change within the BOA is that in the 2009 to 2012 Olympiad they have started preparing Team GB in year one of the cycle (i.e. 2009) due to the larger team qualifying for London 2012 as Britain is the host nation (BOA Official, July 2009). There have also been adjustments in BOA policy due to changes within the senior structures, most fundamentally a new Chairman of the Executive Board being appointed (BOA Official, July 2009). A recent amendment in policy which might be attributed to this is that medical support services will now be delivered in partnership with the EIS rather than just through the Olympic Medical Institute at Northwick Park. This was also in part due to recognition that “the sporting landscape has changed enormously since lottery funding started” (BOA Official, July 2009).

Trampolining being under the remit of British Gymnastics (as opposed to having its own Governing Body) and working with UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA means it now follows the policies of these organisations since it has been in the Olympic programme. Both trampolining joining the Olympics and the changes in its governance has also resulted in some trampoline specific policy changes which are mainly geared around structuring the performance pathway towards the Olympics.
5.6) Conclusion

This chapter has provided a discussion of how elite trampolining has been affected by being part of the Olympic programme.

The main organisational change is trampolining is now governed by British Gymnastics and has lost its own dedicated NGB, the British Trampoline Federation. This has offered some direct benefits such as increased professionalisation of the disciplines governance and support from a bigger organisation. However the merger has not been without difficulties. Many former British Trampoline Federation officials resented the lack of autonomy this brought and feel trampolining is still not fully integrated into British Gymnastics and it is even “regarded as a weaker link” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008). Despite this, elite trampolinists believe that the status of the sport as a whole has been raised by being included in the Olympics. On a world scale the relative standard of elite trampolining in England has declined since it has been in the Olympics. A new internal competition structure has been introduced to try to rectify this – an indirect impact of Olympic inclusion. Elite trampolining also now receives input from UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA and so is influenced by these organisations’ policies because it is an Olympic discipline.

Financially elite trampolining is much better off as it receives World Class Funding from UK Sport (a direct consequence of being added to the Olympic programme) however this is dependent on meeting ambitious targets. This dictates the focus within trampolining to a certain degree and the balance between elite sport and sport for all is in danger of swinging too much towards higher level performers. The balance between elite sport and sport for all within trampolining since it has been an Olympic discipline will be discussed further in section 6.3. Trampolining has also benefited financially from slightly higher levels of sponsorship and receives support in kind from the EIS and BOA.
Hence this chapter has answered the research question in relation to elite trampolining – i.e. ‘how does Olympic inclusion affect elite trampolining?’ The domains of organisational change, economic change and policy change have all been considered.
Chapter Six - Recreational trampolining

6.1) Introduction

This chapter will look at the effects of the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympics on recreational trampolining in England. Recreational trampolining will be taken to be all those participating in the sport non-competitively and also those competing below National C level (i.e. at a regional or club level), as argued in Chapter Four. As with Chapter Five on elite trampolining, this chapter will begin with a brief review of the organisations relevant to recreational trampolining with the addition of empirical data and information on how they are conceptualised (section 6.2). Analysis will be considered in terms of organisational (6.3), economic (6.4) and policy (6.5) aspects with elements of power included where appropriate. There will then be an overall conclusion (6.6).

As discussed in the methodology (Chapter Four), within the case study of trampolining in England recreational trampolining will be considered within the bounds of the embedded case studies of the counties of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire which are both in the East Midlands.

6.2) Structural overview

The recreational sport delivery system predominantly involves Sport England, County Sport Partnerships and NGBs under the auspice of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Hence the key organisations which will be looked at in relation to recreational trampolining are Sport England, County Sport Partnerships and English Gymnastics. In the regional context of the East Midlands within English Gymnastics the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee and clubs will also be
considered. This is illustrated in Figure 6.1 and each component of the delivery system will be covered in this section. There will also be brief discussion of the regional context.

6.1 – The English sport delivery system with that most relevant to recreational sport highlighted

“UK Sport will pick up anything World Class or above” (Sport England Official B, June 2008); “Youth Sport Trust is everything in schools” (Sport England Official B, June 2008); and then “Sport England is everything in between really” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) i.e. everything in a community setting. In practice “Sport England dealt with anything up to regional level and then UK Sport would take it on beyond there” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). The relationship between UK Sport, Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust is “dependent really on the willingness of those three bodies to operate cohesively and the driver from the Government to do that” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). According
to one Sport England official “I don’t think there’s any sort of hierarchy” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) and rather “all three of us have clear targets, clear work areas, and we have to be very good at doing our own bit” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). For a period of time there was the worry that Sport England’s focus was on active lifestyles rather than sports specific development, but “Sport England’s view now is about the development of the sport, the grassroots, the participation” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Now there is “some concern that Sport England won’t focus on under sixteen which is a bit of a worry certainly for gymnastics” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). In practical terms, Sport England have lottery money and exchequer funding which they “allocate to programmes and projects that help us achieve that working together ambition” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). The focus is on “creating an infrastructure at the local level that can deliver sport” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) rather than delivering to end-users directly. Also to a certain degree “it’s really for the Governing body to decide what support they need” (Sport England Official B, June 2008).

In addition to having a national presence, Sport England has a number of regional officers in each area. They have a variety of specific remits including supporting NGBs to “develop very robust player pathways at a very local level and player pathways that will allow talent to be developed” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). And also supporting Regional Development Officers to “work together and work better with their partners” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). There is an underlying need to help the regions interpret national strategies (Sport England Official B, June 2008).

As described in the methodology (Chapter Four), both Leicestershire and Northamptonshire County Sport Partnerships were researched.

Leicestershire has a population of 940,500 (2008 estimate) and covers 2,156 km². Leicestershire is a landlocked county in central England and
boarders Northamptonshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Rutland, Warwickshire, Staffordshire and Lincolnshire. The city of Leicester was traditionally the county’s administrative centre but now the city of Leicester is a unitary authority and governed separately from the rest of Leicestershire. Major towns include Loughborough, Hinckley and Coalville and there are 34 settlements with a population over 5,000 (Leicestershire Council, n.d.).

Northamptonshire has a smaller population of 685,000 (2008 estimate) and covers 2,364 km². Northamptonshire also is a landlocked county in central England and has boundaries with Leicestershire, Warwickshire, Rutland, Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, and Lincolnshire. The county town is Northampton. Other large towns include Kettering, Wellingborough, Daventry, Corby and Rushden. A lot of the county's population is concentrated in a central North–South band with the West and East of the county being predominantly rural with small towns and many villages (Northamptonshire Council, n.d.).

Fundamentally the role of a County Sports Partnership is “to deliver national policy at a local level” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). This involves working with NGBs, Local Authorities, sports development officers, School Sport Partnerships, sports clubs and voluntary groups “to get some of the agencies and organisations to work better and join some stuff up” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and trying to “draw down national resources and deploy these resources through local partnerships” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). Ideally this results in resources being “better used at a local level rather than in a sort of sub-regional or regional level” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). To this end a number of Community Sports Networks have been set up within both County Sport Partnerships. County Sport Partnerships work also splits into two broad categories: firstly working with NGBs around sports specific development and secondly focussing on physical activity rather than sport per se. Because the majority of financial support for County
Sport Partnerships comes from Sport England “their focus is going to be our focus in a sense because of where the funding comes from” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). For example for the past four years this has lead County Sport Partnerships to prioritise increasing adult participation.

The development of County Sport Partnerships was based on the work done through Active Sports (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Gymnastics and trampolining were not selected by Sport England as Active Sports (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Part of the reason for this was that gymnastics and trampolining were not among the most “popular sports that had an impact on the nation” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). According to the Active People Survey they were both minor sports so even if they saw a ten percent growth in numbers of participants per year “the numbers you are actually going to achieve through that are relatively small” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). Also there was a feeling that as a NGB “British Gymnastics weren’t ready” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) and probably the British Trampoline Federation even less so. Furthermore, with County Sport Partnerships “while you can track evolution through, it goes far beyond what an Active Sports programme was” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). It is felt that British Gymnastics’ decision to work with County Sport Partnerships is “because so much of the funding for sport is coming down through CSPs” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009) and due to “a realisation that within the modern structure of sport you do need as much help as you can get” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009).

One County Sport Partnership official from Northamptonshire explicitly said they had a strong relationship with British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics and the Regional Development Officers in particular (Northampton CSP Official A, February 2009). In Northamptonshire the County Sport Partnership formulate their own county plan for gymnastics
linked to the work of English Gymnastics (Northampton CSP Official B, February 2009). In Leicestershire the County Sport Partnership did very little work with gymnastics until mid-2007 but also now work closely with the regional officers (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). However “while I wouldn’t say there was conflict between CSPs and NGBs there has been tensions” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) due to “lack of clarity about roles and responsibilities” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). In terms of the relationship between County Sport Partnerships and NGBs one Northamptonshire official said “I don’t think there is a hierarchy” (Northampton CSP Official B, February 2009) but admitted “National Governing Bodies definitely think they are probably more important than us” (Northampton CSP Official B, February 2009). The specifics of what support Leicestershire and Northampton County Sport Partnerships have offered trampolining and other disciplines of gymnastics and if it is affected by whether it is in the Olympics or not will be covered in section 6.4.

Focussing now on the delivery of recreational trampolining and gymnastics leads us to look at English Gymnastics. English Gymnastics has “the role and responsibility for the delivery and implementation of any policies set by British Gymnastics in the home country of England” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). Their main focus is grassroots gymnastics and raising participation: “to increase those numbers and get more kids into clubs, whether that’s working with the schools or working with the clubs” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). Specific aspects of this include working with clubs, supporting clubs, working with volunteers and work with education (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008).

English Gymnastics staff (such as English Gymnastics Official A and English Gymnastics Official B) are actually employed by British Gymnastics to work for English Gymnastics. English Gymnastics is part funded by British Gymnastics and also receives grant-aided funding
through Sport England (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Only since December 2007 has English Gymnastics had a separate Chief Executive Officer (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). One English Gymnastics Official felt that the relationship between English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics “is a partnership” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) and “at the moment we’re trying to clarify roles and responsibilities of each organisation sort of at each level” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). However they also acknowledged that certain policies will be decided by British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics will be required to implement them, “so from that point of view I guess it’s top-down” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). One interviewee explained how actually British Gymnastics now feel English Gymnastics is too powerful and “British Gymnastics have got scared of it and they’ve pulled the funding” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). So English Gymnastics in its present form will cease to exist by 2012 and instead will become ‘British English Gymnastics.’

In the East Midlands region there is an English Gymnastics Regional Development Officer serving Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Lincolnshire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). Due in part to Sport England funding there is an additional County Development Officer in Leicestershire (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). Their roles are to generally develop all disciplines of gymnastics including trampolining within the area, specifically focussing on increasing participation, increasing coaches’ qualifications and raising the number of clubs with Gym Mark accreditation. A County Sports Partnership official felt there is “a real challenge for sports like gymnastics where they haven’t got the professional capacity at a local level to deliver developmental opportunities” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). This means English Gymnastics are “very reliant on a very strong club structure” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008) and “without volunteers and clubs being well directed by the Governing Body it’s going
to be very difficult to make a strong impact” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008).

Within each area in England there is a Regional Trampoline Technical Committee. This remains in place since trampolining was governed by the British Trampoline Federation. The role of the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee is “to provide competitions within the East Midlands; to support the clubs within the region as well” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). This support includes things like providing coaching and judging courses and helping new clubs get set up. The committee is formed from local coaches and “it is done by vote, but to be honest it’s more a case of who’s prepared to do something” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). It is only mandatory for clubs to register if they want to compete within the region. Currently there are twenty-one clubs registered, with two in Leicestershire and four in Northamptonshire. There is no compulsion for clubs to register if they are more casual clubs; indeed the club run by one of the coaches interviewed is not registered. The coaches interviewed were not very positive about the role of the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee: “there’s not a lot gets done” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009) and they “go over the same old mush time and time again and never really come up with any solutions to the problems” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). Interestingly when an English Gymnastics Official who works closely with the region was asked about their relationship with the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee, they said “I know of them, but I can’t say I’ve ever worked with them” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). There appears to be more linkage between the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee and British Gymnastics. For example the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee “are constantly getting stuff through, any updates, any changes, that sort of thing” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee member, April 2009) from British Gymnastics and
“that then gets disseminated through the region” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee member, April 2009).

In terms of overall organisational structure in trampolining and gymnastics: “it’s more like tiered down, British Gymnastics, then you get the region then you get the clubs” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). Individual clubs are accountable to British Gymnastics in the sense that clubs have to be insured by them and follow their safety, welfare and coaching policies (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). Also they need “to abide by British Gymnastics’ deadlines, dates, anything to compete really” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). Because “to compete and exist as a club everything has to be done through British Gymnastics” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009), one coach interviewed felt “it’s a bit of a monopoly if you ask me” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009).

This section has offered a brief overview of the organisations involved with recreational trampolining. Organisational change will now be discussed in section 6.3.

6.3) Organisational aspects

As discussed in section 6.2, the key major organisations involved in recreational trampolining in England are English Gymnastics, Sport England and County Sports Partnerships. Trampoline clubs are also paramount in the direct delivery of the sport. Both English Gymnastics and County Sports Partnerships have no history of working with trampolining prior to it being in the Olympic programme. English Gymnastics is a subsidiary of British Gymnastics and trampolining has only been governed by British Gymnastics since it has been in the Olympics and County Sports Partnerships have been created since the
time trampolining first joined the Olympics. Hence the whole background sporting landscape connected with recreational trampolining has changed for reasons not directly related to it joining the Olympic programme. Bearing this in mind, to attempt to discern the impacts of Olympic inclusion on recreational trampolining from concurrent changes in the delivery system, the structural differences between trampolining and non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics or non-Olympic sports will be considered where appropriate rather than just before and after Olympic inclusion directly. This will still allow the effects of Olympic inclusion on recreational trampolining to be ascertained. This section will consider organisational structure; partnership and power; organisational change; participation and conflicts.

English Gymnastics are “really very clear that gymnastics is made up of all the different disciplines” (YST Official B, April 2009). They acknowledge that “their job is to ensure that all disciplines are delivered to as high as possible quality” (YST Official B, April 2009) and ultimately “everything is as good as one another” (YST Official B, April 2009). Also English Gymnastics staff work across disciplines (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). Hence trampolining being in the Olympics is apparently irrelevant in terms of English Gymnastics’ support of the discipline. When trampolining was governed by the British Trampoline Federation it was more centrally structured with less home country differentiation. Furthermore, prior to trampolining being in the Olympics and being governed by British Gymnastics regional support in the form of Regional Development Officers would not have been available. Even now coaches would like the Regional Development Officer to be more proactive: “it’s more a case of it’s left to us to do and if we need them we’ll go to them” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) or they “don’t really put in a lot” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). Thus as a result of the British Trampoline Federation merging with gymnastics, recreational trampolining is receiving more support at a recreational level. This is an indirect consequence of Olympic inclusion.
On the whole the trampoline coaches interviewed appear satisfied with English Gymnastics. For example “they’ve got some good people there, some really good people, who try and do some good things” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) and “English Gymnastics is a whole heap better [than British Gymnastics]” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). While they may inherently be pleased with the work of English Gymnastics and what it aims to achieve; part of it may also be because it is not seen as a replacement NGB for the British Trampoline Federation as there was not a previous trampoline specific equivalent. Thus it is a positive addition to the sports structure and not a negatively perceived consequence of trampolining joining the Olympics and having to fall under the governance of British Gymnastics.

When asked whether the role of the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee had changed since trampolining has been in the Olympics the view was “absolutely not at all” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee member, April 2009). So in terms of trampolining being admitted to the Olympic programme it appears to have had little direct impact on the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee and also little indirect impact as a consequence of English Gymnastics now being involved in trampolining.

Clubs will now be examined within the NGB context described above. Clubs are not set membership targets or the like since “most of them are run on a voluntary or business basis so that’s their call really” (English Gymnastics Official, June 2008). On a local level English Gymnastics officers monitor clubs through the Gym Mark scheme which considers things like coaches qualifications, ratio of gymnasts to coaches and health and safety. While it is evaluative, it is also designed to be “a supportive development tool” (English Gymnastics Official, June 2008) for clubs. From a coaches point of view: “it did make sure clubs have good practice”
The necessity for clubs to achieve Gym Mark (i.e. a Club Mark) is an example of a concurrent change in government legislation since trampolining has joined the Olympic programme and is a requirement regardless of whether a sport or discipline is in the Olympic programme or not. A similar system of organisation and accountability in terms of aspects such as coaching policies, competition entries and insurance was in place when trampolining was governed by the British Trampoline Federation but there is more animosity towards British Gymnastics because of the forced merger (as discussed in Section 5.2) and also because sometimes “things have been brought through as a generic thing for all of British Gymnastics and they don’t take one discipline into account” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) and so trampoline clubs may think “that’s not applicable to us” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). Hence the merger of NGBs has had the indirect effect of increasing the hostility towards organisational change involving quality indicators than may otherwise have been the case.

The coaches interviewed were from a range of different clubs in terms of facilities and levels of participants. One coach described their club as “more of a foundation level club” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) and works in tandem with another club to support athletes once they get to a more competitive level. Another coach talked about their club being “a club for all” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) and proceeded to talk about how they cater for the whole range of abilities from those with disabilities or special needs to those on the World Class Programme. It was highlighted that “every club does some sort of recreational” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee member, April 2009) and in fact it is more a case of “it’s where they go before they stop” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). There was this similar range of clubs before trampolining became an Olympic discipline and whether the balance or focus in the club has been affected will be discussed later within this section. Despite the
British Trampoline Federation merging with British Gymnastics, no examples of clubs were found which specialised in another discipline in addition to trampolining. It was felt “it’s quite hard to mix the two” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009) and “you have to choose one or the other once you get a bit better at it” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee member, April 2009).

The discussion will now consider relationships beyond English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics. When working with Sport England key individuals from English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics are “very good at building these relationships and getting trampolining not just gymnastics on the agenda” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). Thereby implying that trampolining might be getting more support from Sport England by virtue of being governed by English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics. On a more local level, gymnastics and trampolining have specifically benefited from an award through the Club and Coach fund to develop talent in the East Midlands region (Sport England Official B, June 2008) and the Regional Development Officer has received significant individual support. From Sport England’s perspective no disciplines of gymnastics are favoured over any others because knowledge of the different disciplines is “a technical understanding of the sport I don’t have” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). So in respect of this aspect of Sport England support, being part of the Olympic programme is probably irrelevant for trampolining. However it could be argued that the Regional Development Officer could push more for support of certain disciplines to reflect British Gymnastics’ priorities. Hence again trampolining may benefit from being governed by British Gymnastics now because some smaller NGBs “don’t have the capacity to be able to engage” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). This is another example of an indirect effect of Olympic inclusion on recreational trampolining.

At the time of interview, Leicestershire County Sport Partnership felt they had not been influenced by the 2012 Games being held in London and
“there’s not been a great deal of impact at a local level in terms of how we will support the legacy element of London 2012” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). By contrast, Northamptonshire have an Olympic Lead Officer and a priority for the County Sport Partnership is “to create a legacy in Northamptonshire after the Olympics and make sure people use Northamptonshire as training camps” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Because trampolining is in the Olympic programme it is “going to be part of that priority and policy” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009) and “the Olympic sport side is a benefit for trampolining” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). The County Sport Partnership official proceeds to explain how non-Olympic sports such as netball may suffer as “for a couple of years they might not get so much support” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Thus there is clear benefit for trampolining being in the Olympics in terms of the prioritisation given to the sport by Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership. Details of support will be expanded upon in Section 6.4 from an economic perspective.

Unfortunately it is not possible to obtain data on levels of participation in trampolining. Data relating to membership of the British Trampoline Federation prior to Olympic inclusion is inaccessible due to the closure of the organisation. British Gymnastics do not have any discipline specific information relating to participation since people just buy membership / insurance for ‘gymnastics’ as a whole incorporating all the disciplines. Despite this, the majority of interviewees qualitatively referred to an increase in participation in recreational trampolining since it has been in the Olympics. For example “it’s definitely increased in popularity” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008); “grassroots trampolining is just flying really, it really is” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008); or “in my club itself, there’s twice as many members” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008). One interviewee also mentioned that “competitions have become a lot more busy” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008) implying an increase in participation across the range of abilities.
The increase in participation is directly ascribed to the Olympics by one interviewee because “every four years we’ll have a massive boom of hundreds of people wanting to do trampolining” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). The main reason why including trampolining in the Olympic programme is believed to have increased participation is “marketing and selling of trampolining through exposure at the Olympics to young people” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). This “TV exposure to the sport might get people interested in having a go at it” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and “now it’s coming into the Olympics everyone sort of knows what it is” (County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). Many other interviewees had similar views (for example AfPE Member, June 2009; East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009; Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008; Elite Gymnast C, June 2008; Elite Gymnast D, June 2008; and Elite Tumbler, June 2008). In Northamptonshire they have had the added impact of Jamie Moore who represented Great Britain in the Olympics living and training in the county. One County Sport Partnership official from the county explicitly said “because she went to the Olympics she gets her name known among the sport or among different sports or among schools or whatever” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009) and the same would not have happened if “she just went to the World Championships” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). So “having Jamie Moore, an Olympic participant helps” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Part of the role of the Olympics is to do this:

the purpose of the elite is not just to win medals and the like and promote a feel-good factor, which it plainly does around Olympic time, but also to drive people to take up the sport by seeing role models (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

However, other interviewees felt that in trampolining demand had always outstripped supply with clubs having waiting lists and “it’s kind of we’ve always had a steady stream of performers coming through” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008). Interviewees involved in artistic gymnastics
also said “it’s been massively oversubscribed forever” (Elite Gymnast C, June 2008) and “there isn’t enough provision for it to be honest” (Elite Gymnast C, June 2008).

Even if there was clear numerical data which showed an increase in participation in trampolining since it had been in the Olympics, there is only circumstantial evidence to say it is a causal relationship. Also “outside of the Olympic year I’m not sure how much it would directly impact on grassroots level” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) and because the Olympics is only once every four years “they’re not going to remember it, so it’s not just going to be about that” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008).

Another reason cited for the possible rise in participation in trampolining in the last ten years is “the availability of garden trampolines and the cheapness of them” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). Parents or carers “get these garden trampolines then they realise they can be dangerous so they then want to get their kids to be trained” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member, July 2008). According to one coach, most children who start the sport for this reason will “only come for a couple of terms or a year, just so they’re safer on their own trampoline as opposed to going anywhere” (Leicestershire trampoline Coach A, May 2009). Garden trampolines are not viewed so positively by all involved in the sport. For example, “not that I like garden trampolines, I think that they’re a bad thing for trampolining” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008). This is because more accidents occur more commonly on garden trampolines due to the less structured nature of the activity and this then causes negative publicity for the whole sport (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008; and Sport England Official A, May 2008).

An alternative explanation for the apparent rise in popularity in trampolining coinciding with it being an Olympic sport is “the increased focus on female participation” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February
And “regional officers are using trampolining as a tool to increase participation” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) because “trampolining is more attractive of an option” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) to teenage girls than artistic gymnastics or team sports. In Northamptonshire it also features highly in the Sports Unlimited Programme to attract semi-sporty children (i.e. those that choose to participate in some extra-curricular sport but not sufficient to meet current recommendations) into doing more sport (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2008). Furthermore, in the past ten years many policies and initiatives have been introduced to increase physical activity more generally (as described in Chapter Two) so one would expect to see participation rates to have risen in all sports. At a recreational level trampolining is seen as “quite an accessible sport really” (Elite Trampolinist C, June 2008) and fun: “every child, every young person, every adult, if they see a trampoline they want to go and jump up and down on it” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008).

A further argument against trampolining joining the Olympics being the only factor involved in raising participation rates is that “most recreational trampolinists don’t even know that it’s in the Olympics unless someone has happened to tell them” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). This view was shared by a number of other interviewees (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009; Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008; Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008; and Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008). Nevertheless, the profile of trampolining as a sport could have been raised by it being part of the Olympic Games so there still could have been some indirect link even if recreational participants are not explicitly aware it is in the Olympics.

Some interviewees felt that in order for the Olympics to have more impact on increasing participation in recreational trampolining there is a need for greater coverage in the media; people “never see it on television and so people don’t realise” (Elite Trampolinist F, June 2008). If “given coverage
I think it would have to have an impact” (AfPE Member, June 2009) because “it does have a bit of a wow factor to it” (AfPE Member, June 2009). There is the hope that there will be more coverage in London 2012 especially as the live broadcast times will suit a home nation audience (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). A related issue highlighted by a Youth Sport Trust official is that currently in England there are no well-known successful role-models in trampolining, whereas artistic gymnastics has Beth Tweddle, Louis Smith and Daniel Keating, and so how do you promote “a discipline in your sport which is relatively unsuccessful?” (YST Official A, February 2009). Several interviewees gave examples of how success on the international field raised interest and participation in the sport. For example when Great Britain won Gold in hockey at the Seoul 1988 Olympics “the TV coverage of that sport at the time created a massive interest” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). In rugby union when England won the World Cup in 2003 “clubs could not cope with the amount of kids that were coming down” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) and “cricket found the same when they beat Australia to win the Ashes” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2008). A Sport England official (Sport England Official C, October 2008) highlighted that successful role models inspiring young people to want to undertake that sport is not specifically Olympic related and the examples of rugby union and cricket corroborate this. However for a more minority sport like trampolining, inclusion in the Olympics means it is more likely to be covered in the media and hence enabling any success to have an impact. A further complication is that due to licensing laws agencies like County Sport Partnerships are “unable to use Olympic branding alongside marketing and communication tools” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008).

If trampolining does receive more media coverage in the London 2012 Games or does achieve Olympic success and there is a consequential rise in interest in participating in the sport then there needs to be a sports structure in place to support this influx. Given that many clubs currently
have waiting lists, a Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership official argued that there is a clear need for more qualified coaches, more sessions, more clubs etc (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). A British Gymnastics official highlighted how there is also a need to develop the structures at grassroots level to ensure there are “the pathways in place so that the talented athletes can be directed to the right places” (Sport England Official C, October 2008).

Sources of conflict in recreational trampolining cited included organisational change; subunits within the sport (such as different disciplines); volunteers and elite sport versus sport for all. Each of these will now be discussed in turn.

A facet of organisational change that causes particular issues or conflicts for recreational trampolining is the fact that “the logic of organisational change internally within an NGB might be around funding or around elite sport” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and so “not about the thing that is important to the officer working in the region” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). This is likely to have been exacerbated since trampolining joined the Olympic programme as there are more external pressures on the sport now. On a more regional level there is the difficulty of working with short-term funding and the fact “you don’t know where the funding will come from” (YST Official A, February 2009) but have to plan for change accordingly. At a recreational or regional level difficulties associated with organisational change are compounded because “there aren’t many National Governing Bodies who communicate well from national level through to their grassroots” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and “the Regional Officers probably feel that they don’t get messages coming down to them very quickly” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). The Sport England official felt that often rather than hearing about organisational or structural changes through their own sport, Regional Officers instead found out about them through partner organisations, colleagues in other sports or other regional colleagues from

The major issues connected with the British Trampoline Federation being taken over by British Gymnastics have been discussed in the chapter on elite trampolining and there is little to add in terms of recreational trampolining other than rising costs which may be attributable to the merger. For example one interviewee described how membership / insurance for coaches had increased from fifteen pounds to over seventy and for participants from five pound to twenty pounds (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). Another said “it is becoming more and more expensive to get coaches, to train coaches and for them to go out” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). Most of the conflict was due to the fact that members and coaches weren’t seen to be getting any more for their money with British Gymnastics membership. Because of the increased costs “a lot of small clubs have merged in with bigger clubs” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). This is another indirect impact of Olympic inclusion.

In terms of conflict between subunits or different disciplines of gymnastics, cheerleading was highlighted as a discipline on the periphery rather than trampolining: “it will be ten years I guess before they are accepted as gymnastics” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Thus at a recreational level there is no evidence to suggest that trampolining receives less preferential treatment than any other discipline of gymnastics even though “there is still a little bit of trampolining and gymnastics on two separate wavelengths” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). According to another English Gymnastics official, from their perspective at a grassroots level “it starts off much more generic and getting people into gymnastics and schools rather than discipline specific” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2009). Thus trampolining being an Olympic
discipline does not appear to be an issue in terms of conflict between disciplines.

The clubs in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire are primarily run by the coaches that were interviewed themselves. One coach said there is the hope in the longer term to get parents and carers more involved and for them to take on committee roles but at the moment “it’s just the time to create the positions, to do the work behind them, setting them up” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). There is also the issue that “finding good volunteers is quite hard to do” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) because “you’ve got to rely on people’s goodwill and that can be very difficult” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009) and “everyone’s got their own busy little lives and don’t want to know” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). A Sport England official felt that also people may be put off volunteering because “they saw before how one person would hold a whole club together” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and they feel they cannot or do not want to do that. Often volunteers are parents and usually “if their kids stop you lose the volunteer” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). So at a recreational level the main issue relating to volunteers appears to be finding volunteers rather than conflict between them and paid staff. The only example of tensions given was the fact that volunteers “volunteer in sport because they have their own personal reason” (Sport England Official C, October 2008); such as wanting to improve the sport or to allow their child to get to as high a level as possible. It is then a challenge for the Regional Development Officer to move the sport forward but also “allow all these people to have all these separate little reasons for volunteering” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). It was also highlighted that “if you are for the sport and the kids you’ll just get on with what you are doing” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009) and conflict is more likely to arise if “you are in it for yourself and what you can get out of it” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009). However from a volunteers’ perspective they have felt
conflict with paid staff because they are “far more demanding” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009) whereas volunteers are “more laid back and do what’s best sort of thing” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). From the issues and perspectives discussed, trampolining being in the Olympics does not seem to have in any way exacerbated conflicts with volunteers at a recreational level.

A conflict which has been exacerbated since trampolining was included in the Olympics is the tension between elite trampolining and the notion of sport for all. This conflict can be demonstrated both strategically at a macro level within British Gymnastics and also at a micro level within clubs.

If you have an Olympic programme then this “demands that the whole sport looks at Olympic success, then that dictates distribution of funding” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) which “does create differences of opinion” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Within British Gymnastics more widely, one official felt “tensions I think grew at the time where lottery money arrived to pay for elite performance” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) in 1997. Resources are concentrated on a very small number of athletes – about twenty – and while elite success “is a cause that everybody supports, but doesn’t necessarily benefit everybody” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). Another official believes it is likely that the London 2012 Games will magnify the disharmony since there will be more focus on medals (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). There “is evidence from previous Olympic cycles that when an Olympic Games goes to a country, that country diverts resources towards medals” (YST Official A, February 2009). The official proceeds to talk about the example of Australia pre-Sydney. However, it could be argued that society wants national sporting success and especially “with something like London 2012 we would want to see our sporting teams successful” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and society needs to
make a financial contribution to increase the likelihood of this happening. Alternatively society could take a different sociological viewpoint and decide “we want free access to sport for all the population” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and we “don’t really care about success” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). The British Gymnastics official argues that we are in the first camp now and thus should support elite trampolining especially now it is an Olympic discipline. The resource tension is not even directly attributable to British Gymnastics since “in the main Government decides resource allocation” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) as discussed in Section 5.4. Hence this is another example of indirect impacts of Olympic inclusion. Furthermore a UK Sport official highlighted that “sport as a whole is enjoying much more investment and funding than it ever has done” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) and “everyone is in a better place than they used to be” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009).

At a strategic level one Sport England official feels that British Gymnastics is not just focussed solely on the needs of elite performers and exemplifies this through the fact British Gymnastics have recently taken over the governance of cheerleading: “they are showing a willingness to work on what would be a pretty much participation programme” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). While there are competitions, there is not the same degree of professionalization and formalisation in these as other disciplines and cheerleading will not be an Olympic sport for the foreseeable future. However a County Sport Partnership official claimed the converse – because British Gymnastics “don’t do a lot of work in terms of sixteen to nineteen or adult participation” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009) it could be argued “they are more focussed towards performance” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009) and developing a talent pool. Nevertheless an alternative explanation for this is the fact that the sport might not be considered so appealing to this age group. Also there are examples, albeit limited, of clubs offering
beginners recreational classes geared towards this demographic (for example as described by Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008 at their club).

Within elite performance staff there appears to be a common consensus that "I was taken on to do high performance and my personal genuine beliefs and heart or in high performance so I am not asked to do anything I don’t want to do" (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). There is a resultant disregard for the funding of recreational trampolining; “nobody really has a right to expect that anyone will pay for them to do a sport” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) and “if I wanted to go trampolining I would fully expect to pay” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). There was the impression that in general staff involved in recreational trampolining were aware of issues involved along the grassroots to elite continuum, whereas those involved in elite sport were very focussed on this to the exclusion of all else.

Ultimately “elite sport is elite sport, it cannot be sport for all” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). So “if people want to get to the top there has to be that selfishness to do it” (British Gymnastics Official C, July 2009). Although a Sport England official argued that actually if NGBs began with grass-roots and concentrated on getting the pathways right “in a certain amount of time they’re probably going to have a more effective system” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). There is also a stance that if you improve elite trampolining, it will filter back down the pathway. A number of officials mentioned this with particular respect to coaching techniques. Examples were also given of sports, such as rowing, sailing and cycling, who focussed in the short-term on Olympic success to generate bigger budgets for the whole sport and “at the end of the day they now have more money to spend on grassroots” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). Undoubtedly though there are tensions and “each end of that spectrum will naturally fight their corner” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). An English Gymnastics official felt that because the Trampoline Technical Committee has a designated person in role “they do
have more of a focus on development” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) and are “more up on the whole of the pathway” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) than other disciplines.

Striking a balance between the needs of elite and recreational participants in trampolining is more than just NGB governance and funding, the club structure is important too. Within clubs the elite trampolinists felt the focus was veering more towards high performance because “everyone wants their club to be the one which has the person which is going to the Olympics” (Elite Trampolinist E, June 2008). So “they will push the elite people a lot harder if they are near the top anyway” (Elite Trampolinist E, June 2008). In a number of clubs “even though there is room to increase participation they want to focus on their elite people” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). This is manifest in terms of things like lack of sports hall time or coaches to deliver recreational sessions and little work with those with disabilities. So there is evidence of crowding out or prioritising of resources. Clubs have always wanted to get their performers to the highest level possible but “it’s obviously more prestigious if they are in the Olympics” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). So for these clubs it is recognised that priorities are changing around the recreational level and discourse is becoming much more focussed on elite development. Despite this, for many clubs “they just focus on getting their kids qualified for National Championships” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) as they do not have a realistic chance of producing trampolinists of a standard to represent Great Britain or England due to inherent limitations in their club set-up such as access to facilities. So for these clubs Olympic inclusion is unlikely to affect the balance between elite and recreational trampolining.

While trampoline clubs see the benefit of having a wide base of recreational participants, this is still framed in terms of advancing elite trampolining. Firstly “it’s very difficult in a sport like gymnastics to have success if you don’t have participation” (Trampoline Technical Committee
Member B, July 2008) – “if you focus only on elite, where is your next lot of competitors coming from?” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). In some other sports such as rowing and cycling which are “closed loop non-technical sports” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) and you can identify talent through physiological testing, “you can get away with not having that wide base” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). However in a sport like trampolining this is not possible and it is necessary to have a wide pool of participants from which to identify talent. A member of the Trampoline Technical Committee explained how their club used to run a six-week beginners trampoline course and then “at the end of that we’d withdraw the ones we thought had made progress” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). This implies that it is only worth continuing with the sport if you demonstrate talent thereby quashing the notion of sport for all. This occurred after trampolining was admitted to the Olympics, but was not directly attributed to it by the interviewee. The second reason cited for needing a wide base of recreational performers is “to keep the coffers topped up to keep the elite side going” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009) because “the more kids we’ve got the more money we’re making” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008) and “the beginners level is the main income for any club” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). If this money is used to buy equipment to benefit the whole club then that is one thing but when it “does help subsidise” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) elite training it is more of a cause for concern. However this financial structure has always been in place in clubs and so is not a result of Olympic inclusion.

Some clubs differentiate between recreational and competitive training sessions (for example clubs associated with Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009; East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009; Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009; Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008; and Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008) while others attend mixed ability sessions with
the elite trampolinsists attending more sessions (for example Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008; Elite Trampolinist E, June 2008; and elite Trampolinist G). One elite trampolinist described how in the mixed sessions the elite group shared three trampolines between six people (i.e. three per bed) while the other thirty participants shared three trampolines (i.e. ten per bed) giving them a lot less training time which created “a lot of grumblings” (Elite Trampolinist A, June 2008) from parents. Another elite trampolinist describes a similar situation of inequity but felt “it’s actually quite well balanced” (Elite Trampolinist G, July 2008). It appeared that sessions have been arranged like this in the clubs for a significant length of time so it is difficult to determine whether it is connected with trampolining being in the Olympics.

In artistic gymnastics there is a similar focus on the elite performers in many clubs. In the words of high level gymnast: “we [the elite] were basically the most important, we got what we wanted when we wanted sort of thing” (Elite Gymnast B, June 2008) which when reflecting on it “was quite bad really” (Elite Gymnast B, June 2008). It is difficult to compare these experiences to those of the elite tumbler interviewed because the nature of tumbling necessitates a reasonable level of gymnastics proficiency before one can take up the discipline (i.e. being able to handspring, flick and summersault on floor) so it is not participated in at grass-roots level. Possibly because of this “people tend to drop out if they don’t have the talent” (Elite Tumbler, June 2008) and also because of the small size of the discipline relative to other areas of gymnastics, in terms of competitions there is “a real focus on elite and once you get past a certain age or ability you’ve got to either commit to it or give up” (Elite Tumbler, June 2008). Hence there are tensions between the needs of elite and grass-roots in all disciplines of gymnastics but they have been magnified in trampolining since it has been in the Olympic programme.

In conclusion, at a recreational level trampolining now receives some governance from English Gymnastics as well as British Gymnastics.
Support from English Gymnastics is generally seen positively. Trampolining in the East Midlands is also supported by the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee but the work of this organisation has not been influenced by trampolining joining the Olympics nor the change in NGB. Trampolining also receives support from Sport England and County Sport Partnerships. In both cases trampolining may benefit from being governed by English Gymnastics / British Gymnastics as they are larger organisations than the British Trampoline Federation was and so have more lobbying power. Under Sport England’s remit Olympic inclusion is irrelevant. Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership do prioritise Olympic sports particularly in the run-up to London 2012 yet Leicestershire County Sport Partnership do not do so currently so it is difficult to know what the situation is like throughout the country. There is some circumstantial evidence given by interviewees to suggest participation in trampolining has increased since it has become an Olympic sport but because of difficulties in collecting participation data and alternative explanations for any rise, it is difficult to draw a definite conclusion. Causes of conflict demonstrated in recreational trampolining were organisational change, particularly since being part of the Olympic programme and being governed by British Gymnastics; volunteers, though this did not appear to be exacerbated by trampolining being in the Olympics; and the balance between elite sport and sport for all. The balance between elite sport and sport for all has swung more in the favour of higher level performers since it has been in the Olympics both in terms of an elite focus within the NGB, partly due to UK Sport funding, and also a greater prioritisation within clubs. However it must be acknowledged there were still difficulties in this area prior to Olympic inclusion.
6.4) Economic aspects

This section will look at the support (both financial and non-monetary) given to recreational trampolining by Sport England, County Sport Partnerships and English Gymnastics. For each organisation, structural decisions within the organisation; practical support offered to recreational trampolining and the effects of this in terms of prioritisation will be addressed. Sponsorship of clubs will also be considered. British Gymnastics is not being considered as it does not directly support recreational trampolining and gymnastics – this is done through English Gymnastics.

“Sports are funded differently via Sport England” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) and even at a recreation level bigger sports like football, cricket, tennis and rugby “don’t depend on Sport England funding” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). When the Sport England officials were asked whether or not a sport was in the Olympics effected how they supported it, their responses were “no, no” (Sport England Official C, October 2008); “no, not at the moment” (Sport England Official B, June 2008); and “it hasn’t affected us” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). Hence because Sport England does not currently focus on Olympic Sports, one can conclude that the fact that trampolining is now in the Olympics will not have affected the amount of assistance it gets from Sport England. However one Sport England official felt that in the future there may be more pressure for them to deliver in Olympic sports and the organisation is “going to have to be quite explicit about which sports are getting supported and why” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). Then within funded sports “there’ll be a filter around 2012” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). In “the recent past” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) much more of the evaluation of sport prior to investment has been based on “their ability to increase participation rather than their ability to win medals” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). A further precursor to sports receiving support is “them being willing to work” (Sport England
Official C, October 2008) with Sport England, although this does appear to be more about capacity or ability to engage than about ‘willingness’ per se. In this respect it may have been an advantage for trampolining being part of British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics because these organisations are likely to have a greater potential to engage with Sport England than the British Trampoline Federation due to their size. Hence trampolining being included in the Olympics has had an indirect impact via the structural changes which occurred.

Because Sport England support varies between sports, “it’s more about what each sport needs (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and “we’re focussing on individual needs primarily” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). In the East Midlands region, one Sport England Official has been supporting gymnastics, including trampolining, through the Club and Coach Fund which aims to enable “Governing Bodies to have very robust player pathways” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). In the East Midlands there was a pot of 3.6 million pounds and gymnastics “got a fair amount of money” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). The Sport England Official also worked closely with the Regional Development Officer for gymnastics and gymnastics were awarded some money through the Community Investment Fund. Some of this money has been used to part-fund four coaches - clubs themselves had to put in half the money – and one of whom is based at a trampoline club in Northamptonshire. Another Sport England official worked with English Gymnastics staff in the East Midlands region in a somewhat mentoring capacity and also advised them on how “to engage better with external partners” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). As in the two previous examples, Sport England worked with gymnastics as a whole sport and not a number of separate disciplines. Sport England officials are then “not close enough to give the precise details” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) of how each discipline is then supported by English Gymnastics or British Gymnastics. While this could mean that Olympic and non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics receive the same support from Sport England,
one Sport England Official emphasises that Sport England’s work with NGBs also reflects the NGBs priorities so if English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics choose to prioritise Olympic disciplines at a recreational level then trampolining could still receive an enhanced level of support by virtue of being in the Olympics. It is also possible for individual clubs to apply to Sport England directly for funding. The clubs need to be “bona fide organisations with bank account, constitution, the normal conditions” (Sport England Official A, May 2008).

Sport England perceives English Gymnastics not “as customers but as funded partners” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) so “the relationship is actually a more contractual one” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). However the Sport England official also feels that “the conditions [to the contract] were not conditions really” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). Projects are supported on the basis of whether the NGB are “able to satisfy us they can achieve what they say they are going to achieve” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) and “what they can achieve is a priority for us to invest in” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). However it is not made clear whether Sport England funding is withdrawn or reclaimed if the NGB does not perform as expected. Sport England “make sure that our targets affect what Governing Bodies want” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) so “we’re supporting them in the right areas” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). Hence funding allocation / reporting procedures should not unduly influence what English Gymnastics focus on in terms of recreational trampolining and gymnastics especially as the criteria are reasonably wide-ranging. Participation is a key target, but underpinning this are increasing the number of clubs, getting more clubs accredited, developing the infrastructure, increasing the number and qualifications of coaches and raising equity (Sport England Official A, May 2008 and Sport England Official C, October 2008). Nevertheless, in the early days of working with English Gymnastics “there was a bit of carrot and stick” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) in terms of “if you do this, you can do this” (Sport England Official B, June 2008) or “if you help us hit
this target then we’ll…” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). This may have formed more of an incentive contract and consequentially affected what English Gymnastics chose to focus on. Sport England officials have to report to Sport England annually “to show what’s happened through my funding” (Sport England Official C, October 2008). Furthermore, Sport England itself “has been dangerously close to being a target driven organisation rather than an outcome driver organisation” (Sport England Official A, May 2008) and “you do get perverse behaviours and perverse outcomes because of the targets” (Sport England Official A, May 2008).

Moving down to a regional level, in Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership “traditionally the Olympics hasn’t been a big drive for the sports we work with (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). However in recent years they are becoming more focussed on Olympic sports, in part due to receiving money from the Community Investment Fund from Sport England to fulfil this remit (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Support from this is primarily given to Olympic sports which are not so widespread in the county (such as archery and fencing) to finance coaching and there is the hope that post-London 2012 “we will get more people taking part and there’s going to be the base to keep them there” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). There is also a member of staff in the Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership whose role is to focus on six Olympic sports (namely gymnastics including trampolining, archery, table-tennis, badminton, hockey and rowing) and “trying to get them to increase participation and the legacy following on from the Olympics” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Thus trampolining does benefit from being in the Olympic programme. In all the sports “the predominant focus will be on getting more people taking part in those activities” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009) including encouraging adults to return to the sport and “it’s not a podium type thing at the minute” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). According to one official, sometimes as an organisation Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership’s work and focus is dictated
by external pressure from Sport England. But “there has been, and increasingly more so now, greater flexibility with what you can and can’t do” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Despite the apparent Olympic focus within Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership, they do not have any greater accountability for these sports: “we’re not under any direct pressure other than to deliver on the objectives of the scheme overall” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009).

By contrast, in Leicestershire County Sport Partnership they “are aware” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) of sports that are Olympic sports, yet they are also conscious of sports which are in the Paralympics, Commonwealth Games, UK School Games, English Federation of Disability Sports or feature heavily in the school curriculum, and therefore have “a number of filters we would explore and consider” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). So the fact that trampolining has been admitted to the Olympic programme is not of such importance in this County Sport Partnership. Nevertheless, there is an impression that there may end up being more focus on Olympic sports in the future (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) – possibly relating to the London 2012 Games. In Leicestershire County Sport Partnership the ability of sports to engage fully with the County Sport Partnership is a very important criteria in deciding to work with them (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). The County Sport Partnership official cites the difficulties involved in working with smaller sports such as volleyball since they “have national officers in effect and very little regional or sub-regional infrastructure” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) and so “it becomes difficult to have the dialogue” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). In this respect trampolining may benefit from being governed by English Gymnastics since Olympic inclusion rather than the smaller British Trampoline Federation – again an indirect consequence of Olympic inclusion due to structural changes.
Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership have trampolining as “a high priority in the county” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Within their work with gymnastics, Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership spend quite a lot of time working with the trampoline side of things” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Because trampolining “is an Olympic sport we are supporting it more than we would say cheerleading or acrobatics” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Furthermore trampolining receives a higher level of support than other Olympic disciplines in terms of money and resources since within the county as a sport “they’re producing a lot of people and they’re producing a lot of good people” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009) and have Jamie Moore as a role model (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). A lot of the County Sport Partnership's support is focussed on two or three larger clubs in Northamptonshire. It often takes the form of indirect financial support such as helping them to access Sport England money. Or funding them to run specific programmes such as Sport Unlimited and lunchtime classes for adults or subsidising coach education (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009; and Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). They also fund coaches in the community; are helping to set up a fledgling club; and encourage the larger clubs to create satellite centres around the county. One of the trampoline coaches interviewed felt their club “get given quite good support from Northamptonshire Sport” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009). Another of the coaches said that they “didn’t go seeking support” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009) from the County Sport Partnership as they felt “it is best to be self-sufficient because if you are self-sufficient you can always run” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) and “if you rely on funding agencies what happens if those funding streams run out?” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009).

Within Leicestershire County Sport Partnership trampolining and gymnastics more widely do not appear to be given as much priority as in
Northamptonshire. For example, until mid-2007 they “did very little work with gymnastics and trampolining” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). However they began doing more for trampolining and gymnastics after consulting the School Sport Partnerships and Local Authority over their priorities. Leicestershire County Sport Partnership have been involved in creating a county plan for the whole sport of gymnastics, supporting it’s delivery and helping English Gymnastics secure some resources for its delivery (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008; and Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Despite having an input, one County Sport Partnership official was unsure of the details including “how big a feature of that plan the trampolining element is” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Funding was obtained from the Community Investment Fund with assistance from the County Sport Partnership. This was used to appoint a Development Officer for the county and also several full and part-time coaches – all roles being part-funded by English Gymnastics too (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). The Development Officer works across all disciplines of gymnastics and the coaches were primarily for trampolining and artistic gymnastics due the decision to build on existing provision in the county. Since its creation in April 2008, trampolining specifically featured in Leicestershire’s Extending Activities programme, which is similar to Northampton’s Sport Unlimited scheme to encourage participation of semi-sporty children. The sports selected were ‘non-mainstream’ and it was felt that if trampolining was offered “some of these semi-sporty type would take it up” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008) and “Extending Activities is an opportunity for sports like trampolining” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). On the basis of the examples discussed, it can be concluded that the support trampolining receives from Leicestershire County Sport Partnership is for reasons unrelated to it being in the Olympics.

In terms of conditions which sports or clubs must meet to receive funding or support, there are “not any special criteria” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009) but rather a broad range of characteristics
which appear to be similar in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire. Crucially “more than anything it is the support of the Regional Officer” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009), including basic pre-requisites like being forthcoming with information. The NGBs need to be efficient, effective and willing to modernise further (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). County Sport Partnerships “want to work with Governing Bodies that identify this geographical patch as important to them” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) and so therefore the NGB also “target some of their resources” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Other criteria for receiving support include ‘softer skills’, such as “their willingness and their enthusiasm and how strong their drive and their vision” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Again in this respect trampolining may benefit from being governed by English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics. Similarly the co-operation of clubs is important when working directly with them: “we need their support as much as they need ours” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Shared objectives are also of paramount importance and clubs need to have the potential for expansion (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Particularly for participating in programmes like Sports Unlimited and Extending Activities, clubs are assessed on meeting certain minimum operating standards around aspects such as coaching qualifications, child protection standards and insurance (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Ideally clubs have reached Gym Mark standard, but this is not mandatory due to limited numbers of clubs having currently done so (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Indeed part of the County Sport Partnership’s remit is to encourage and support clubs to gain Club Mark and also meet Sport England criteria for club management (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). The County Sport Partnerships themselves need to report back to Sport England on the effects of their support and investment. For example, one County Sport Partnership record how many young people the funded trampoline courses are working with and how many sessions they attend over a three month period because “it’s a condition of funding” (Leicestershire CSP
Official B, June 2008). However, County Sport Partnerships “don’t feed back figures to the National Governing Bodies as such” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). One County Sport Partnership official worries that as an organisation they are “very clearly focussed on trying to deliver those targets” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) and “sometimes you’ve got to argue if they are the right targets” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008); thereby implying they are too target driven.

English Gymnastics “support the development disciplines pretty much equally” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) and it is “on a demand led basis” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) rather than saying “oh you’re an Olympic discipline we’ll support you and not you” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). In this planning cycle English Gymnastics have consulted with each discipline “to see what their vision is and what their goals are for going forwards and how we can support” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). Nevertheless, the assistance “differs in what the needs are per discipline” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) because “some are more developed than others” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). Hence it appears that in terms of English Gymnastics support there is in fact equity rather than equal support for all disciplines. So while trampolining being an Olympic discipline will not affect the amount of support the discipline receives from English Gymnastics per se, it might affect the nature of the support since generally Olympic disciplines are inherently at a higher level of development due to the work of British Gymnastics (see Section 5.3). This could explain why when a Sport England official worked with English Gymnastics on the Club and Coach Programme “we did ask them to prioritise and they did prioritise their Olympic disciplines” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). So non-Olympic disciplines such as tumbling “weren’t prioritised and therefore they didn’t get funding” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). English Gymnastics may have felt that Olympic disciplines would benefit more from being in the Club and Coach
programme than non-Olympic disciplines which would then receive alternative support.

At a practical level, within counties or regions the development officers “try to do it as equal as possible” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009) in terms of supporting clubs. In Leicestershire the majority of clubs are woman’s artistic gymnastics so the English Gymnastics official felt “that probably does take up more of my time” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009) but only due to numbers rather than explicit prioritisation. They proceeded to give an example of how they supported trampoline clubs to get Gym Mark and set up school-club links and but also how they helped a rhythmic club do an Awards for All bid. In Northamptonshire, a trampoline club received a Community Club Development grant to substantially improve their premises from British Gymnastics through the work of English Gymnastics (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). Again in Northamptonshire there is no prioritisation by discipline of English Gymnastics support, so Olympic inclusion will have not affected the amount of support trampolining has received.

Regional Development Officers have “clear targets” (British Gymnastics Official B, June 2008) from English Gymnastics which determine home country funding. “One of the main things is Club Mark accreditation” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). Other targets are based on the number of participants, the number of new participants, the number of participants from minority groups and the number and level of qualified coaches (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009; and British Gymnastics Official B, June 2008). These are generic targets covering all the disciplines and “in English Gymnastics none of our targets are related to Olympic disciplines” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). So trampolining being an Olympic discipline is not relevant in this context. When an English Gymnastics official was asked whether the need to meet
Generally clubs are not set targets because “they’re self-motivated and self-financed” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) although they do have to be part of British Gymnastics as discussed earlier. However, one coach interviewed received extensive grants to fund redeveloping their club and a condition of this was to raise participation levels. This was not viewed as a problem because “we obviously all work as a team to raise participation levels anyway” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) so “I’ve never perceived it as a pressure cos it’s something we want to do anyway” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) and “you want to increase participation in the sport you love” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009).

In terms of support via sponsorship, all the coaches interviewed talked about the difficulties involved in gaining sponsorship: “it’s the most difficult thing ever to get” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). The most this coach had managed to get was “a t-shirt to sell in a raffle or a free activity voucher” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). Another coach gained more sponsorship but it was in “drips and drabs” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) and they had not received any for three or four years. In clubs that did receive more sponsorship “mainly the sponsorship comes from a company that is associated with the club” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009), for example their child trains at the club. A coach at a smaller club felt that “it’s only really the bigger clubs that would get sponsorship” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) so was reluctant even to try to look for it. Problems cited for the difficulty in gaining sponsorship included: the current economic climate with companies being “strapped for cash” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009) and the limited profile of trampolining which means “we can’t
offer enough really for sponsors to be attracted to” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009). An elite trampolinist said that the recreational section of their club could not be sponsored because “the club is part of a council run leisure centre” (Elite Trampolinist D, June 2008). Even for one of the club which did receive some sponsorship, the coach said “we’ve stopped trying to attract sponsors” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) because “there is so much to do for them” (Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009) and it did not prove cost effective in terms of time invested. There was the overriding impression that Olympic inclusion had no effect on the sponsorship of recreational trampolining as it was still very limited and the picture is the same in gymnastics more widely (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009; Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009; East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009; Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach A, February 2009; and Northamptonshire Trampoline Coach B, February 2009).

Trampolining does not currently receive extra funding or support from Sport England, Leicestershire County Sport Partnership and English Gymnastics above what non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics by virtue of being in the Olympics. While being an Olympic sport is not a factor which influences how much Sport England and Leicestershire County Sport Partnership assists a sport currently, there was the feeling from officials in the organisations that they may become more Olympic-focussed in the future if government directives lead them that way. Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership does direct more attention to Olympic sports so it is impossible to generalise about County Sport Partnership support across the country. While Sport England and English Gymnastics do not give trampolining more support per se because it is in the Olympics, at a British Gymnastics level trampolining is more developed which has a consequential impact on the support that is needed at recreational level and how it is deployed. Also trampolining being governed by English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics since it has been in the Olympics has
given it more capabilities to engage in dialogues with Sport England and County Sport Partnerships and consequentially affected what support it has received. To a certain degree what all the organisations focus on when offering support is influenced by the targets they are set by external funding agencies and these were often associated with participation levels. Within clubs this practice is rarer. Thus at a recreational level, trampolining being in the Olympic has not significantly increased the support it receives. Furthermore, levels of sponsorship have not improved and are still poor.

6.5) Policy aspects

Policy formation in Sport England, County Sport Partnerships and English Gymnastics with respect to recreational trampolining will be considered in this section. Some examples of the organisations' policies in action have been discussed in the preceding two sections (6.3 and 6.4). In this section further policies will be considered with a focus on the decision making and policy formation process. As in the last chapter (5.5) discussion is often around general policy formation rather than that focussed particularly on trampolining or Olympic / non-Olympic sports since these specific aspects were concentrated upon in sections 6.3 and 6.4.

As discussed in sections 6.2 and 6.3 Sport England have demonstrated a clear focus on recreational sport and their support of a sport is generally unaffected by whether it is in the Olympics or not. Hence the assistance trampolining receives will not be determined by the fact it is an Olympic discipline of gymnastics.

A key Sport England policy document is *Game Plan* (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002). This fundamentally influences the work of Sport England officials. For example, “what I do makes that link between participation
and performance programmes” (Sport England Official B, June 2008), thereby reflecting the twin-track approach of increasing participation and increasing international success endorsed by Game Plan (DCMS / Strategy Unit, 2002) and A Sporting Future for All (DCMS, 2000). So even if the balance between elite and recreational trampolining has swung away from sport for all since trampolining has been in the Olympic programme, this is not necessarily in agreement with underlying policies. Some Sport England officials feel that “Game Plan is extinct now” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and “things are starting afresh” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) but they are still awaiting a replacement policy. Nevertheless, Game Plan “helped drive the Whole Sport Plans with the sports” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) and Sport England officials still “help support the NGBs to deliver the Key Performance Indicators coming out of their Whole Sport Plans” (Sport England Official C, October 2008) so Game Plan does implicitly influence current Sport England work. Game Plan is written very much from a top-down approach with little local differentiation:

it’s a plan someone devises in a central location in London and wants to see happen in every county in the country (Sport England Official B, June 2008).

Another Sport England official said “I don’t think it’s those documents that are driving the change, I think it is political will” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). For example, there has been a government shift “away from participation for the sake of a benefit [such as better health] to participation for the sake of sport” (Sport England Official A, May 2008). For sports such as trampolining, a refocus on ‘sport’ rather than ‘physical activity’ is likely to benefit the sport in terms of specific support they receive from Sport England.

One County Sport Partnership official felt “our function as a County Sport Partnership is to deliver national policy at a local level” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). For example, until recently there has been “a big mantra, a big drive, a big push, on the sixteen plus agenda” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) because “there has been a sort
of pointer in that direction” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) from Sport England. And since “Sport England who are our corporate parent are funding CSPs” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) this direction is generally followed by County Sport Partnerships. As discussed in section 6.2, for trampolining and gymnastics in general a focus on sixteen plus participation is bad for the sport because it is traditionally practiced by younger people. This would be an issue regardless of trampolining being in the Olympics. Furthermore, Leicestershire County Sport Partnership are “expecting Sport England’s new strategy” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008) and “that’s going to give us some clear direction” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008) though “in relation to gymnastics and trampolining probably very little” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008).

In some ways County Sport Partnerships act as a coalition against Sport England. For example, despite direction away from sports-specific development in the past, “CSPs have held onto that” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) because “that’s at the core of what we are about” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Also, in other policy situations the CSP “try to act as an innovator between Sport England and the sports” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) which implies the role of a policy broker. In this situation trampolining being governed by English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics now rather than the British Trampoline Federation is likely to be advantageous since providing they prioritise trampolining, English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics are likely to be a stronger coalition.

For Leicestershire and Northamptonshire County Sport Partnerships, their work with NGBs “is kind of built around their Whole Sport Plans” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Both County Sport Partnerships also liaise closely with regional gymnastics staff to formulate county plans (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009; and Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) because “it’s got to be the sports’
vision” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). However the County Sport Partnership does “have a role to check and challenge the county plan” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). Ultimately plans for trampolining and gymnastics more widely for the counties are about “mutual objectives that we’re working together to do” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008) and are “a really good example of partnership working” (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). While neither Leicestershire nor Northamptonshire have a specific plan for trampolining, “it’s obviously built into the gymnastics stuff” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Further evidence of partnership is demonstrated by Leicestershire County Sport Partnership increasing their work with gymnastics because of the needs of School Sport Partnerships and the Local Authority (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008) and developing Community Sports Networks to work closely with local partners (Leicestershire CSP Official B, June 2008). During discussions neither counties explicitly referred to a policy document which described their preferential treatment of Olympic sports in the case of Northamptonshire or lack of differentiation between Olympic and non-Olympic sports in the case of Leicestershire. In both counties there was an implicit assumption that that was the way they worked.

According to one County Sport Partnership official, when referring to their programmes “a lot of the work did pre-exist the fact that we’d been successful with the Olympics” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). However:

what the Olympics does now is give us an opportunity to sort of move sport not just off the back pages and inside pages but on occasion get on the front pages for hopefully some good reasons (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008).

The London 2012 Olympic Games offers “a huge opportunity for us to showcase the fantastic work” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008) that is happening regionally in terms of Local Authorities, schools and NGBs. As a result “for once we’re getting it [sport] on the agenda and having a meaningful dialogue about resources” (Leicestershire CSP
Official A, May 2008). If the London 2012 Olympics is opening up possibilities for new sporting policies, then it is likely to be of benefit to trampolining being in the Olympic programme.

Within English Gymnastics, staff at a local level feel “our national plans are filtered down to us” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). In the wider sports system there is further evidence of this: “when there’s a big push from Government or Sport England to look at things like equity issues” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) English Gymnastics then “spend a lot of time and money on those” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). Hence in terms of things like giving Olympic disciplines preferential treatment, at a local level this is going to be determined by English Gymnastics national policies and Sport England policies. Nevertheless some clubs feel “the Government programmes don’t really come into our day-to-day training” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009) and “it’s great they’ve got all these policies and ideas and are being paid a fortune to do these things, but they don’t actually get down to the grassroots at all, not to be implemented” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). However it could be argued that clubs are influenced by Government policies and the work of English Gymnastics in ways they are not explicitly aware of.

In 2004 when English Gymnastics were “tasked by Sport England to write a plan for English Gymnastics” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) through the process they “established that there were certain roles that were needed” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) and changed associated policy accordingly. In the 2009 to 2012 planning cycle English Gymnastics have “started looking from the participant out” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). This involved “meeting with each discipline as English Gymnastics” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) to find out:

what their vision is and what their goals are for going forward and how we can support the bit below World Class Level for them
Hence there is clear evidence of true partnership in decision making and constructing policy – this suggests that some form of feedback to policy formation is possible too. Also English Gymnastics realises it “differs in what the needs are per discipline, some are more developed than others” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008), thereby considering disciplines in their historical context. This may mean that English Gymnastics support of trampolining is influenced by the fact it only came under the governance of gymnastics in 1999 and is an Olympic discipline. A similar process of consultation occurs at a local level in terms of deriving English Gymnastics’ policy. For example, an English Gymnastics’ official recently had a county evening where they “tried to get as many people together as possible to start writing a county plan for Leicestershire and Rutland” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). This created a forum where representatives from each discipline and advocates of things like sport for all could legitimately argue their points of view. Furthermore, when the English Gymnastics official works with other agencies such as County Sport Partnerships because they all have their own different targets “we have to somehow try to marry those up so we all reach our targets working together at the same time” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009).

Sport England, and often County Sport Partnership policy too, does not tend to make explicit reference to trampolining but rather provides a framework which will effect what support sports get and to what degree Olympic recognition affects this. One exception to this is Northamptonshire’s prioritisation of trampolining for reasons relevant to the county; however there are no explicit policy documents stating this. English Gymnastics do have policies specifically relating to trampolining but due to their purely recreational focus, these are not explicitly influenced by the fact trampolining is an Olympic discipline. Game Plan and other Sport England policies often appear to be driven by a top-down approach with County Sport Partnerships being required to deliver them.
By contrast, occasionally County Sport Partnerships act almost as a coalition against Sport England, as exemplified by the sport versus active recreation debate. County Sport Partnerships also work with NGBs around their Whole Sport Plans and this tends to be in partnership. Some of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire County Sport Partnerships’ policies are implicit rather than explicit tangible policy documents. Within English Gymnastics much of their policy appears to be derived at the top then implemented down the chain of command. However they are trying to consult clubs and participants more.

6.6) Conclusion

This chapter has provided an overview of how recreational trampolining has been affected by being part of the Olympic programme. As discussed during the chapter, because of concurrent changes in the sporting delivery system (such as the introduction of County Sport Partnerships) it has often been necessary to compare trampolining with other disciplines of gymnastics (Olympic and non-Olympic) rather than just before and after Olympic inclusion per se to fully understand the implications of Olympic inclusion on recreational trampolining.

Broadly speaking, the members of the recreational trampolining fraternity interviewed are pleased with the work which English Gymnastics do to support the sport. English Gymnastics is an additional source of governance present since trampolining fell under the auspices of British Gymnastics and this greater home country presence is viewed positively. English Gymnastics does not prioritise any disciplines over others because it is predominantly concerned with recreational gymnastics and increasing participation and under this remit Olympic inclusion is irrelevant. In the 2009-2012 planning cycle English Gymnastics worked closely with the different disciplines to ascertain what they required to move forward.
While support is split equitably, not all disciplines will receive identical support because it is acknowledged they are all at different stages of development. Hence because trampolining is an Olympic discipline it may be more developed at an elite level for reasons connected to this and then this is likely to filter down the pathway so the nature of support needed from English Gymnastics will vary from non-Olympic disciplines. The situation is similar in terms of regional support from English Gymnastics. In Leicestershire women’s artistic gymnastics clubs take up a large majority of the development officer’s time but that is just down to the fact that most of the clubs in the county practice this discipline rather than an explicit structural decision to focus on this. The East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee is now under the governance of English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics. However their remit and the support they offer to clubs has not been affected either by the change in NGB nor Olympic inclusion.

Sport England’s remit is very much about ‘sport for all’ so currently whether a sport is in the Olympics or not does not affect how they support it at a recreational level. The same is true of Leicestershire County Sport Partnership. By contrast, Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership does prioritise Olympics sports and have focussed on trampolining in particular because it is already strong in the county. Thus it is impossible to comment on County Sport Partnerships on a country-wide basis. One way in which recreational trampolining has indirectly benefited from the sports inclusion in the Olympics, is that now it is governed by English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics they form a larger agency than the British Trampoline Federation to lobby for trampolining to Sport England and County Sport Partnerships and both organisations did cite the difficulties in working with smaller NGBs.

In terms of financial support through sponsorship, recreational trampolining has historically received little sponsorship and the inclusion of the sport in the Olympics has not changed this.
It has been very difficult to ascertain if Olympic inclusion has increased participation in trampolining due to lack of relevant data. There is plenty of anecdotal evidence from interviewees to suggest that participation in trampolining has risen since 2000 when it first appeared in the Olympics. However even if a rise in participation in trampolining since then can be proven, it is more difficult to directly attribute the causality of this being down to Olympic inclusion. A number of interviewees pointed to the increased availability, accessibility and affordability of garden trampolines as a key factor in the increased popularity of the sport over the past decade. Moreover there is concern that if the London 2012 Olympics do cause a massive rise in interest in trampolining and desire to participate, there is not currently the supply to meet this demand, and this needs to be addressed to maximise the benefits of Olympic exposure for the sport.

The tension between elite trampolining and recreational trampolining has been exacerbated since trampolining was included in the Olympics. This conflict is partly due to the massive increase in funding trampolining has received to support the elite end through the World Class Programme and the fact that this funding is very ring-fenced and contractually based on Olympic success which then alters the focus throughout the whole of the sport (as discussed in section 5.4 too). Within clubs there is also significant focus and prioritisation of the elite, but some argue that this has always been the case regardless of trampolining being in the Olympics now.

Overall recreational trampolining has not benefited significantly from the sport now being in the Olympic programme and because of the increased focus on the elite within the NGB may even have experienced some disadvantages.
Chapter Seven - School trampolining

7.1) Introduction

This chapter will look at the effects of the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympics on school level trampolining in England. As Chapters Five and Six, this chapter will again first of all identify the relevant organisational structure from Chapter Four with the addition of empirical data and information about how they are conceptualised (section 7.2). This section will also briefly consider how trampolining takes place in schools in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire. There will then be an explanation of the impacts on school trampolining of the sport joining the Olympic programme from an organisational perspective (section 7.3), a resource perspective (section 7.4) and a policy perspective (section 7.5). Finally, conclusions will be presented (section 7.6).

7.2) Structural Overview

As discussed in Chapter Four and highlighted in Figure 7.1, the school sport delivery system is predominantly influenced by the Youth Sport Trust, County Sport Partnerships, School Sport Partnerships and NGBs under the auspice of the DCMS. Hence the key organisations which will be considered in relation to school trampolining are the Youth Sport Trust, School Sport Partnerships and the BSGA. Brief reference will also be made to the AfPE. Organisations such as British Gymnastics, English Gymnastics and County Sport Partnerships will also have an impact on school trampolining and will be referred to where relevant in respect to schools, but have been discussed in more detail in Chapters Five and Six respectively so content will not be repeated.
The purpose or mission of the Youth Sport Trust is “to improve the life of young people through PE and sport... predominantly within the schools environment” (YST Official B, April 2009). The Youth Sport Trust is “the national agency that was made responsible for delivering the school sport strategy” (YST Official B, April 2009). So School Sport Partnerships were developed by the Youth Sport Trust. There is some overlap with the remits of Sport England and UK Sport so the Chief Executive Officers of these agencies meet regularly and “work together quite closely to ensure there is some degree of commonality” (YST Official B, April 2009) in terms of objectives and delivery while avoiding overlap. The Youth Sport Trust also works to support NGBs and this will be discussed further in section 7.3 and section 7.4. The Youth Sport Trust has been affected by London having the 2012 Olympics because “we’ve been heavily involved in the legacy strategy which is emerging” (YST Official A, February 2009) and this is connected to the PESSYP strategy. More tangibly, the first UK
School Games (which are run by the Youth Sport Trust) was in 2006, the year after the Olympic bid was successful, and will continue until 2012. Within the UK School Games “there’s a lot of modelling on the Olympic experience” (YST Official B, April 2009) and “although we don’t have the 2012 logo on our logo we are intrinsically connected with 2012” (YST Official B, April 2009).

The remit of the AfPE is allied to that of the Youth Sport Trust since it is “to try to ensure high quality physical education and school sport for all young people” (AfPE Official, June 2009). This includes developing the delivery workforce and promoting “the health and wellbeing of young people through physical education” (AfPE Official, June 2009). The AfPE is an amalgamation of the British Association of Advisors and Lecturers in Physical Education (BAALPE) and the Physical Education Association of the United Kingdom (PEAUK). Because the AfPE and the Youth Sport Trust do have fairly similar remits, the AfPE official interviewed felt it was important to identify “each organisations strengths” (AfPE Official, June 2009) and see how they could provide mutual support and also “not treading on toes and not duplicating work unnecessarily” (AfPE Official, June 2009). However in practice there could still be blurred lines of delivery and responsibility. At present London 2012 “is not driving any of our core business at all” (AfPE Official, June 2009), but the AfPE “appreciate that there will be some real opportunities in the near future associated with that” (AfPE Official, June 2009). The AfPE was not discussed in Chapter Two or included in any of the diagrams illustrating the structure of the English sports delivery structure because it is a relatively small organisation and fulfils an advisory or support role in school sport rather than being a fundamental delivery or policy forming organisation.

Looking at a regional level now, within Leicestershire there are ten School Sport Partnerships and five within Northamptonshire. In both Northamptonshire and Leicestershire the School Sport Partnerships feel
they have strong, supportive relationships with their respective County Sport Partnerships (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009; and Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) Partnership Development Managers are generally located in secondary schools, but there are examples in Northamptonshire of them being based in a primary school or Local Authority building. Leicestershire’s School Sport Partnerships are also unusual in that the county still has the three tier school system (i.e. primary, middle and secondary schools or as they term them primary schools, high schools and colleges) and also pupils move on from primary school at different ages across the county (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). In terms of trampolining and gymnastics specific staff, some School Sport Partnerships employ a coach to go into schools on a short term basis (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009).

The BSGA is responsible for “looking after schools interests” (BSGA Official, April 2009) in terms of all disciplines of gymnastics. “Nominally they cover everything” (BSGA Official, April 2009) and there are representatives on the executive board covering the range of disciplines; but in practice “most of the activity is floor and vault for practical reasons because not many schools have the full apparatus” (BSGA Official, April 2009) and there is also some focus on trampolining. BSGA’s remit is “promoting activities within the school itself” (BSGA Official, April 2009) which included competitive activities but also support for coverage on GCSE and A-Level courses. The BSGA is an independent organisation: “it’s affiliated to British Gymnastics but it’s totally self-governing” (BSGA Official, April 2009).

Gymnastics “was one of the key activity areas within both the primary and secondary curriculum” (AfPE Official, June 2009) and “it still features within the new secondary curriculum” (AfPE Official, June 2009). As discussed in Chapter Two, trampolining can generally be used to fulfil the gymnastics requirements of the National Curriculum. At Key Stage Four gymnastics “tends to become in many schools either not delivered or
indeed it is delivered in the form of trampolining” (AfPE Official, June 2009). It is also an option in GCSE and A-Level PE courses. Furthermore according to one official “trampolining is a booming sport” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) and “all the schools want to run it cos kids will bring their kit in for it!” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008). Trampolining is offered across the two counties investigated. “In Northamptonshire it is used a lot” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) – this is currently only at secondary schools but there is the hope of introducing it to a primary school once logistical barriers have been removed. In Leicestershire “it’s difficult for trampolining because a lot of the schools don’t have trampolines” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). However the official proceeded to say “I do know that the secondary schools that do have trampolines they do encourage it” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009).

When trampolining is present in schools in Leicestershire “it’s being fitted more with extra-curricular rather than curriculum” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) since due to the nature of the sport “it suits the ones who want to be there and are prepared to wait for their go and be patient” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) as opposed to the difficulties of “trying to engage lots of people at one time” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Extra-curricular clubs are usually discipline specific whereas curriculum gymnastics “tends to be more educational gymnastics, it’s more you know kind of discovery and creativity” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008).

7.3) Organisational aspects

In section 7.2 there was an overview of the roles and remits of the Youth Sport Trust, the AfPE, School Sport Partnerships and the BSGA. This section will proceed to discuss the changes in relationships between these agencies, specifically in terms of the governance of schools trampolining
and school-club links, and conflict and difficulties experienced in school trampolining. While School Sport Partnerships have also emerged during the period trampolining has been in the Olympics, this represents a generic change in the sports delivery landscape and is not specific to trampolining.

The main organisational change in school trampolining which is connected, albeit indirectly, to the sport joining the Olympics is the fact that schools’ trampolining is now governed by the BSGA whereas pre-2000 it came under the remit of the British Trampoline Federation. When trampolining was governed by the British Trampoline Federation there was not a separate organisation for school trampolining, “it was all part of the British Trampoline Federation” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Each region then appointed a ‘schools representative’ – “someone that had particular interest in working with schools” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Then when the British Trampoline Federation merged with British Gymnastics due to Olympic inclusion, the schools representatives were required to “get hold of BSGA and take schools trampolining into the BSGA” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Two ex-British Trampoline Federation officials were appointed to the executive of BSGA “to represent the trampoline interest in schools” (BSGA Official, April 2009). These individuals then communicate with the regions via their nominated representatives. In some regions these are from the local BSGA committee and in other regions it is someone from the Trampoline Technical Committee. Moreover, “the actual structure has stayed the same effectively – it’s just a change of administration” (BSGA Official, April 2009). According to one official the schools’ competition is “just the same as we ran it under British Trampoline Federation” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008) so any aspirations for change were not met. Furthermore, “nearly everybody who is involved with schools trampolining is in fact a British Gymnastics coach” (BSGA Official, April 2009). However, ultimately now trampolining in schools is not governed by the same organisation as club trampolining which does cause some issues which will now be considered.
Historically school sport organisations originated between sixty and a hundred years ago “when the landscape for school sport looked very very different” (YST Official A, February 2009). In recent years a key driver for the Youth Sport Trust has been “to encourage schools to move into a much more unified position” (YST Official A, February 2009) and have school activity and club activity within a sport governed by the same body. However when trampolining came under the governance of British Gymnastics school trampolining was split off from club trampolining. Overall, “the whole governance of school sport and club sport is not very well put together” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) and so according to one official “you get into battles of ownership, who owns things, who runs things” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). There is also the concern that within gymnastics the school association exists simply because of a “desire for ownership” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) whereas “it should be part of a cohesive plan within British Gymnastics” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). One of the main issues is “you’ve got that conflict where you’ve got a schools competition structure and you’ve got a National Governing Body competition structure” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). Within trampolining this separation is present. The schools competitions are open to anyone eighteen and under and in full-time education and there are novice and elite categories to cater for those who just participate in school and those who are members of clubs too. This means that effectively any young trampolinist can participate in both competition structures, though in practice not all who compete in the British Gymnastics competitions attend the school competitions. While there is no linkage between the two competition structures, the same was true even when schools’ trampolining came under the remit of the British Trampoline Federation. Consequently there is a need for “a single obvious system which may have a schools section feeding into the club section but not co-existing pathways” (YST Official B, April 2009). The young person is caught in the middle and may suffer from over-training or over-competing (Northampton
Furthermore, the input of school sports associations “doesn’t always mirror what the School Sport Partnerships are working towards” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). And according to one School Sport Partnership official “if we could link NGBs and school association it would be a lot easier” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). The lack of clarity also causes confusion for teachers – because of the number of new initiatives they “are probably feeling a bit bombarded from all directions really” (AfPE Official, June 2009).

From British Gymnastics’ perspective “there is very much a move to try and if you like tie everything together” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) in terms of linking school and club trampolining and gymnastics. This is probably helped by the fact British Gymnastics hold the school-club link funding rather than the BSGA (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). English Gymnastics are also working towards aligning pathways in trampolining so “the Next Steps feeds into the British Schools regional and national competition” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009) and “you then move across with the school-club link and go up” (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). Furthermore, “English Gymnastics key driver is to get kids into clubs” (YST Official A, February 2009). While they do support school competitions, due to the nature of trampolining and gymnastics “extended activity has to happen in a club setting” (YST Official A, February 2009) in terms of coaching to an elite level and school provision is more suited to recreational level participation. The Youth Sport Trust are also trying to align trampolining pathways and competition structures (YST Official A, February 2009), as are School Sport Partnerships through the work of Competition Managers (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). An associated issue is that frameworks for school trampolining and gymnastics are often written by people “from a more elite performance point of view, very much club based” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) whereas for “grassroots the simpler the better really” (English Gymnastics Official B,
February 2009). It must be acknowledged that these difficulties of lack of school / club harmonisation are unrelated to whether trampolining is an Olympic discipline or not and pre-date the merger with British Gymnastics. However as an indirect effect of Olympic recognition there is a pressure to develop club systems with talent identification as a key feature.

When trying to describe school-club links “it could be a different answer all over the country” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Within the East Midlands region “it tends to be something ad hoc” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). For example, in Northamptonshire where there is a very strong club “they have made fantastic links to local clubs and set up satellite clubs with links to more schools” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). In Leicestershire one club participates in a number of school-club links: “we send the coaches out there and then if they develop we send them to the main body of the club” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach B, May 2009). This is something the club has initiated themselves without direct County Sport Partnership or School Sport Partnership involvement. So not only are relationships different but the processes that generated links are different and unsystematic. Another trampolining coach from Leicestershire said they had “considered maybe doing a club-school link” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) but colleagues in sport development roles had advised them to “stay away from it as it’s more trouble than it’s worth” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009) and so “for that reason we’ve just avoided it” (Leicestershire Trampoline Coach A, May 2009). From a School Sport Partnership perspective, individual schools make links with a variety of sports with differing degrees of formalisation. The decision over what sports to form school-club links with is based purely on local availability rather than any distinction between Olympic and non-Olympic sports (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). A Sport England official echoed this perspective: “my worry is that young people get introduced to it [trampolining] in school and then there is nowhere for them to go” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). For trampolining and
other disciplines of gymnastics “it’s difficult to get them [children] into clubs” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008) because with “a lot of the time they are so oversubscribed and there is a huge waiting list” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). Hence some schools do not focus on trying to develop these links.

In addition to the issues relating to the governance of school trampolining further sources of conflict cited included: organisational change, subunits, volunteers, elite sport versus sport for all and issues relating to teaching methods. Each of these will be discussed in turn and evaluated in terms of impacts of Olympic inclusion.

According to one interviewee, organisational change “is a potential for conflict, for confusion and for just frustrating everybody taking part” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). The emergence of School Sport Partnerships “is a very big change, we are challenging people” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) and “some School Sport Partnerships have faced conflict” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). “Ultimately it’s about changing people’s attitudes and modernising school sport” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) and “there’s always going to be certain people in certain sports or factions in certain sports” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) who are not happy. These changes affect all sports and not just trampolining and gymnastics. One School Sport Partnership Official felt that they had “generally been very positively received by schools, by pupils and by staff” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) but admitted they had “been quite lucky” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). For this School Sport Partnership there was the belief that “I think we’ve suffered more from organisational change” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) in relation to changing guidance from the Youth Sport Trust. Changing the governance of school trampolining does not appear to have caused conflict or even significantly affected the delivery of the sport.
In terms of issues between different disciplines of gymnastics in schools, according to one School Sport Partnership official, “unless you’ve got a particular specialist I don’t think that is a real area of conflict” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Hence ideas surrounding trampolining now being an Olympic discipline are not relevant in this context. There is actually “more conflict between sports” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) as they are “all fighting for the same children and fighting for funding and fighting to be in schools” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Another School Sport Partnership official discussed conflict between different trampolining clubs in their area and the difficulties this caused in supporting them (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009), but this appeared to be based on differences in personality rather than structural reasons per se.

The Youth Sport Trust has got “a whole team of staff based around the region of volunteering, getting young people in as leaders and volunteers” (YST Official B, April 2009). Consequently “there’s a lot of work coming through School Sport Partnerships to encourage children and young people to volunteer” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). In this respect volunteering is seen as a positive thing across all sports in the school context. Conflicts or difficulties tend to arise around legislation, paper work and when volunteers have “got to jump through different hoops in order for them to volunteer” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008).

In terms of the balance between elite sport and sport for all, one School Sport Partnership official felt that “with schools we focus on sport for all and participation and getting everybody involved” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). Indeed the PESSYP strategy is “all about engaging more young people” (AfPE Official, June 2009) and “schools have specific targets to get more young people involved in physical education and school sport within and beyond the curriculum” (AfPE Official, June 2009). However, on the other hand “all schools are being pushed to have programmes in place for Gifted and Talented” (AfPE Official, June 2009).
And “if we see talent that’s where you differentiate your lessons and in a sense you even differentiate your clubs” (AfPE Official, June 2009). So “there is inevitably tension there and when resources do have to go round everybody” (AfPE Official, June 2009). In school trampolining and gymnastics differentiation within a class is particularly difficult due to the closed-skill nature of the sport, i.e. a ‘closed skill’ is unaffected by outside influences. A gymnastics coach who goes into schools refers to this issue and the difficulties arising around having one extremely able pupil in a class of thirty beginners. They tend to focus on the majority and then let the elite pupil demonstrate what they can do at the end of the lesson (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). While trampolining could be considered “a fairly inclusive activity, I think one of the downsides of it is it is quite public” (AfPE Official, June 2009). So if a pupil really struggles “that’s quite public humiliation for that child” (AfPE Official, June 2009) in that the rest of the pupils will be watching.

Another School Sport Partnership official felt that a more pertinent issue related to the needs of elite pupils in a school setting was when “you have a club versus school debate” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008) and “their club or National Governing Body don’t want them to participate in other things or compete in schools competitions” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). In terms of trampolining, according to the BSGA official some clubs “actively support” (BSGA Official, April 2009) the schools competitions, while other clubs do not want their athletes “disturbing their training programme by taking part in those silly little events” (BSGA Official, April 2009). According to the BSGA official, the majority of clubs seem to take a stance in the middle and are supportive of children who want to enter schools’ competitions, but “don’t push the kids into it so much because their major training programme is the national structure” (BSGA Official, April 2009).

In general what has been discussed in relation to the notion of elite sport versus sport for all in school trampolining is down to national policies and
trends and not sports specific, however trampolining being in the Olympic Games could cause clubs to be more elite focussed which will have a consequential effect on these children in school and is thus an indirect impact of Olympic inclusion.

The last form of conflict relating to trampolining in schools discussed by interviewees is “schools tend to have a system whereby you teach certain things differently” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). For example, “ages ago they were telling all the students to look forwards but you are meant to look at the end [of the trampoline] now” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). Part of the reason for this is that teachers may have attended a course a while ago but because they are not in a club environment are not aware of current changes. There is also the more serious concern that with certain summersaults “schools would never have been on a course as such and they were teaching moves which were not quite right” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008). Within schools “different authorities have different requirements” (AfPE Official, June 2009), so for some teachers “there would be that expectation or requirement for them to have a specific qualification” (AfPE Official, June 2009) but “in other schools and other authorities not necessarily” (AfPE Official, June 2009). Also in Leicestershire primary schools are not allowed to have springboards or crash-mats to use in gymnastics lessons “which makes the Key Steps hard” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). This coach was also concerned that children were made to do gymnastics activities in plimsolls and there were no requirements about students removing earrings or tying long hair back and there was conflict when they questioned these issues with the schools. While conflicts between schools and NGB requirements are not related to trampolining being an Olympic sport, it is still an important issue in the sport more broadly which potentially effects how it is delivered in schools.
Further to the conflicts described, there are several factors preventing more widespread participation in trampolining in schools. Firstly there is the belief that “trampolining got shot in the foot with health and safety” (EIS Official, May 2008). There is “some nervousness around the potential injuries associated with gymnastics” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). This is not helped by the fact “typically teachers are in nature not gymnasts themselves” (AfPE Official, June 2009) since generally there is “a predominance of teachers entering the profession who are games players” (AfPE Official, June 2009). For example, at one university out of an annual cohort of sixty on the PGCE course on average only three or four have a strong interest in gymnastics or trampolining (AfPE Official, June 2009). In terms of gymnastics tuition during their course they “spend the majority of time on the basics” (AfPE Official, June 2009), which includes floor work and low level apparatus. They also cover rhythmic gymnastics, sports acro and sports aerobics briefly. There is no coverage of trampolining because a separate coaching qualification is needed to teach this. Moreover “gymnastics is more accessible than trampolining for teachers that are less confident” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) since they can concentrate on “body management and the shapes rather than the skill development and the specifics” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Another difficulty is the cost of the trampoline and also sending staff on coaching courses (BSGA Official, April 2009). Thus even if increased participation is an alleged function of Olympic recognition, it is unlikely to have an impact on school level trampolining.

From an organisational perspective, trampolining being in the Olympic Games appears to have had no direct effect on trampolining in schools. The only indirect change is that now school trampolining is governed by the BSGA rather than the British Trampoline Federation. While there are often issues of lack of coherence when there is a separate schools association and NGB, school trampolining appears to have changed very little since the change in governance as there were pre-existing problems.
such as a separate schools competition structure. Furthermore, the change was due to the necessity for the British Trampoline Federation to merge with British Gymnastics rather than being directly attributable to inclusion in the Olympics. School trampolining appears to be characterised by conflict and difficulties. This is manifest through things such as organisational change; issues of balancing the needs of students with differing abilities; club coaches and schools teaching things in different ways; and many teachers’ lack of confidence in teaching trampolining and other areas of gymnastics. This may go some way to explaining how Olympic inclusion is apparently irrelevant in a school context due to the prevalence of other issues.

7.4) Economic aspects

This section will address the support (both financial and non-monetary) offered to school trampolining by British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics; the BSGA; the Youth Sport Trust; the AfPE; and School Sport Partnerships. Structural decisions within the organisation, practical support offered to school trampolining, and the effects of this in terms of prioritisation, will be considered for each organisation. This will all be examined in light of whether trampolining being an Olympic discipline influences the resourcing of it at a school level.

In terms of British Gymnastics’ and English Gymnastics’ support of school trampolining and gymnastics, one School Sport Partnership official felt that “the majority of information we get, or the perception, is gymnastics as in Olympic gymnastics [i.e. artistic gymnastics] and trampolining” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009) and the remaining disciplines such as sports acro or cheerleading “don’t get the same coverage as the other two” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). Furthermore, in terms of support from the Regional Development Officer
trampolining is not their “first priority, if you like” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). However, it has still received some financial support “so it must be some kind of priority to allocate cash against it” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). Also, in terms of British Gymnastics target in the One Stop Plan to increase the number of teachers able to coach gymnastics there is the expectation “it would be artistic first and foremost with the possibility to extend to other areas” (AfPE Official, June 2009).

One clear way in which it is felt British Gymnastics does prioritise Olympic disciplines in practise is through their funding of school-club links: “it is evident there is more focus on the Olympic disciplines rather than the others” (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). Also due to increased funding and resources for Olympic education packs there might be more focus from British Gymnastics on trampolining, artistic gymnastics and rhythmic in this respect too (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). This is a direct effect of Olympic inclusion. Key Steps and Next Steps resources will now be discussed in more detail.

Several years ago British Gymnastics produced a competition pack for primary school teachers called Key Steps. It was designed to be generic and not discipline specific and “it’s got like some body management, some basic sort of floor skills and some basic sort of apparatus work” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). The objective was to get “more teachers confident to deliver stuff in schools and give them a bit of a goal” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). Within Leicestershire much of primary school gymnastics is focussed around this (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). Each School Sport Partnership is funded by English Gymnastics to run their own competition and then send a team to the final held in Leicester (English Gymnastics Official B, February 2009). It is also used extensively in Northamptonshire (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). One School Sport Partnership official views Key Steps positively as they feel it is a useful resource, but thinks it has an
artistic gymnastics focus (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). In
terms of apparatus, Key Steps uses benches and boxes which are the
precursors to the beam and vaulting horse used in artistic gymnastics. So
this perspective that it is focussed on artistic gymnastics is justified.

In 2007 British Gymnastics and the BSGA produced the Next Steps
programme for secondary school trampolining (BSGA Official, April 2009).
Competitions start with simple five-move or even three-move routines
(routines normally contain ten moves) and then build up towards the
BSGA competition or the National Development Plan for trampolining
Competition Managers rely on Next Steps – it “gives us the information we
need to organise and deliver and plan a trampoline competition”
(Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). Hence it does influence
what they focus on. Trampolining was the first discipline for which a
resource for secondary schools was developed. The main reason for
creating the Next Steps programme for trampolining was because “the
schools were crying out for something to focus on for trampolining”
(English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). Also the Trampoline
Technical Committee and schools committee were both “proactive in
wanting to do something developmentally” (English Gymnastics Official A,
June 2008) and “supportive in pushing it forwards” (English Gymnastics
Official A, June 2008). Hence “the fact trampolining is an Olympic
discipline had no bearing on why they wanted to develop that resource”
(YST Official B, April 2009). This is reinforced by the fact that currently
Next Steps resources are being developed for acro “because it's a good
discipline for secondary” (English Gymnastics Official A, June 2008) and
rhythmic gymnastics “to boost the numbers at the grass-roots” (English
Gymnastics Official A, June 2008). If there was prioritisation towards
Olympic disciplines when constructing Next Steps programmes one would
expect artistic gymnastics to feature prominently, which it doesn’t.
The BSGA competition for trampolining is a three staged or three event process. Firstly there is a regional schools competition which is “a championship in its own right for each region” (BSGA Official, April 2009). The top three individuals and top two teams of both genders from each age group then compete in the semi-finals or zonals which are split into Southern, Midlands and Northern. From these again the top three individuals and top two teams go forward and compete in a national final. “Within that structure regions tend to do their own thing as well” (BSGA Official, April 2009) and this now often entails the Next Steps programme which is designed to lead into the BSGA competitions. The BSGA also run artistic gymnastics competitions but “it’s only got two major events each year and they’re national rather than regional” (BSGA Official, April 2009). The general structure of the trampolining competitions remained the same since being run by the BSGA rather than the British Trampoline Federation (BSGA Official, April 2009). However, “we thought there was a need for a change and if we did it with all the other changes taking place no one would notice” (BSGA Official, April 2009). So at the time of the restructuring, a two-tier competition was introduced. The novice category is “definitely schools, entirely really” (Trampoline Technical Committee Member B, July 2008), while the elite category “tend to be people that go to school but are in a club” (East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). The elite level was introduced because there was “a little niggle that some people say the schools competition should be restricted to people who only train in schools and not in clubs” (BSGA Official, April 2009). By having elite pupils compete who train extensively at outside clubs it does mean “the school getting reflected glory for something they’ve had very little to do with” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Yet on the other hand it was felt to be unfair if these pupils were not allowed to participate. Schools now have to give permission for pupils to compete regardless of where they train to ensure “the school does know the kid is taking part because the school’s insurance cover would be involved” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Partly due to the introduction of an elite category but also due to an overall rise in interest in trampolining,
BSGA “have seen a hell of an increase in participation” (BSGA Official, April 2009) and “the numbers can be quite difficult at times” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Nevertheless, there is still the concern that not all schools are aware of the competition: “we as a bunch of amateurs with no money, when we have to pay for our postage can’t write letters to every single school in the authority” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Within Leicestershire there appears to be little if any participation in the BSGA trampoline competitions, mainly because it is not a big sport within the county (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008; and Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). By contrast, in Northamptonshire the system is more developed and schools do enter the competitions. According to the BSGA official, Olympic inclusion has not affected the schools’ trampolining competitions at all “because the people taking part in schools competitions are well away from involvement with the Olympics” (BSGA Official, April 2009). From looking at the information collected through interviews there does appear to have been very little evidence of change other than the introduction of an elite category and this was unrelated to Olympic inclusion aside from the change of governance of schools’ trampolining.

Looking now at cross-sport support, the Youth Sport Trust is “not a funding body as such” (YST Official A, February 2009), i.e. they do not give NGBs money to resource school sport. Instead the Youth Sport Trust are “there as a development agency to help them, support them” (YST Official A, February 2009) and “give them some time and some expertise” (YST Official B, April 2009). Because of this “we don’t have formalised conditions of engagement” (YST Official A, February 2009) and there are not explicit targets for NGBs to meet. The Youth Sport Trust themselves do “have targets set across various elements of work” (YST Official A, February 2009) but “formal agreements will not be the driver of that” (YST Official A, February 2009) and “it’s the work going behind the scenes that will be the driver really” (YST Official A, February 2009). Historically the Youth Sport Trust have “tracked those sports who have been funded and recognised by Sport England and still do that to a large extent” (YST
However because they are trying to engage more young people in school sports, the Youth Sport Trust considers “a wide range of new and exciting sports not just traditional [curriculum] activities” (YST Official A, February 2009) and “increasingly we work with and have a conversation with a much wider range of sports in a whole variety of programmes” (YST Official A, February 2009). In terms of the impact of Olympic inclusion:

we don’t particularly work with Olympic sports, we don’t particularly not work with Olympic sports, we just work with sport (YST Official A, February 2009).

The Youth Sport Trust works with both British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics as appropriate. The Youth Sport Trust meets with sports in cluster groups and gymnastics is in one with other sports that are in the UK School Games. The Youth Sport Trust does not specifically support school trampolining: “gymnastics would be doing all that front-line work really” (YST Official A, February 2009).

The Youth Sport Trust began the UK School Games in 2006 with four sports – gymnastics, athletics, swimming and table-tennis. The Youth Sport Trust chose these sports because they “have quite a traditional background in schools” (YST Official B, April 2009) and all had a schools association separate from the NGB and they needed “a single obvious system which may have a schools section feeding into the club section but not co-existing pathways” (YST Official B, April 2009) as discussed in section 7.3. Furthermore, they are all Olympic sports because it was viewed by UK Sport as “important in those sports to get that competition pathway from top to bottom and bottom to top” (YST Official A, February 2009). At the moment there is “a point of principle I guess, in terms of having no more than one discipline per sport in the games” (YST Official A, February 2009) because of size. The only discipline of gymnastics present is artistic – within all the sports only Olympic disciplines are selected. There is a possibility further disciplines will be added in the future to the UK School Games. British Gymnastics applied for trampolining and rhythmic gymnastics to be included (English Gymnastics
Official A, June 2008). While neither was accepted outright, trampolining was put on a ‘reserve list’ and may be included “if the athlete village is big enough, if the facilities are good enough, if the funding is all in place” (YST Official B, April 2009). Hence if this occurred it would be a direct impact of Olympic inclusion. Also trampolining is a reasonably accessible discipline of gymnastics and if children watch the UK School Games they can “see that vision and they can try and put themselves through those steps” (YST Official B, April 2009); whereas with a discipline like tumbling that would not be possible. For sports in the UK School Games “there is some additional support provided” (YST Official A, February 2009) which takes the form of things such as Young Officials work and Young Event Manager work. In terms of focussing on specific disciplines within gymnastics, apart from work directly connected with the UK School Games “that’s really down to the sport” (YST Official B, April 2009) and as an organisation the Youth Sport Trust “wouldn’t go to gymnastics and say we think you should focus on X, Y and Z” (YST Official B, April 2009). The Youth Sport Trust official interviewed felt that disciplines not included in the UK School Games did not suffer per se because the ideas of modernisation and connecting pathways should ultimately be applied across disciplines by the NGB (YST Official B, April 2009).

In terms of support offered to school trampolining by the AfPE, the AfPE offer a range of courses and resources which “are about giving teachers the knowledge, the understanding, the confidence, to deliver activities well” (AfPE Official, June 2009). The aim is to improve teachers’ practices which will “hopefully have a positive impact on young people’s experiences of physical education and school sport” (AfPE Official, June 2009). The AfPE have recently “supported the writing of a new gymnastics resource which has been very positively received” (AfPE Official, June 2009). This is distinct from Key Steps or any other British Gymnastics or English Gymnastics resource. It is “less traditional skill orientated” (AfPE Official, June 2009) and “the focus is probably more pedagogically orientated” (AfPE Official, June 2009). The AfPE have not
currently produced any dedicated support for trampolining. The creation of written resources appears to be more determined by perceived need rather than any Olympic / non-Olympic bias.

At a local level, strategy dictates that what School Sport Partnership support schools to offer “should be what the kids want to do” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009), i.e. the choice of what activities are supported should be lead by pupil demand rather than down to the decision of the School Sport Partnership officials. However, when one School Sport Partnership official from Northamptonshire was asked what factors affect what sports they support their response was “all the wrong ones to be honest with you” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). They proceeded to explain that they support sports which have a) coaches who are available to help in schools; and either b) a club structure for children to exit into; or c) if there is no club structure in the locality “the sport is so engrained in the delivery in secondary schools that we feel that there should be” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). Though the School Sport Partnership official did argue that “virtually any sport offered well, and delivered professionally and in a fun way will attract children to it” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009).

In Leicestershire, School Sport Partnership support is also determined by availability of coaches and facilities (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008; and Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). For example, one School Sport Partnership official describes how having brand new Astroturf facilities for hockey meant “the whole status of the programme lifts” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Compared to Northamptonshire, the School Sport Partnerships in Leicestershire appear less concerned with exit roots from the sports: “we’ll support anything coming through” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008) and “a lot of the new sports that come in and are maybe a bit bizarre sports are the ones the kids really take on board” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008).
For example, when they used dance mats “it was fantastic and the students just loved it cos it’s something so different” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008) and “I don’t think you’d see that in the Olympics” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008)! Trampolining “is something kids quite like to do” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). However in Leicestershire one School Sport Partnership have had “horrendous trouble” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) trying to get trampoline and gymnastics coaches because “there seems to be a massive Leicestershire shortage of appropriately qualified gymnastics coaches” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008).

The preceding discussion of factors that affect which sports School Sport Partnerships support illustrates that Olympic inclusion is not a consideration: “I don’t focus on Olympic sports” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009) and “I wouldn’t have said the Olympics has that much impact on our choices” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Also, “a lot of the popular sports in schools such as cricket and rugby, they’re not actually Olympic sports” (AfPE Official, June 2009) so “tradition has something to do with it” (AfPE Official, June 2009). Furthermore, “we don’t tend to do that much with the Olympics per se cos it’s in the middle of the summer holiday” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Closer to the London 2012 Olympics “we’re going to have all this pre-material and post-material” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) so whether a sport is in the Olympics may have more influence then.

Sports receive differing amounts of support from School Sport Partnerships (financial and otherwise). There is not set criteria for this but it appears to be affected by the degree to which the existing structure is developed in terms of provision and whether there is potential to increase participation. The basic precursor for sports to receive support from School Sport Partnerships is “if they are prepared to put some time and effort into it, we’re prepared to see what we can do to help” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). From a school perspective
“I don’t think schools necessarily know what’s been included or not included in it [the Olympics]” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). Their priority is “to get coaches in to look good for Ofsted and things” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009) so “the more activities and the more diverse the activities are, the better” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009).

Given the structural reasons behind the support offered to the different sports by School Sport Partnerships, the practical support offered to trampolining in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire will now be considered. In Leicestershire the high schools do not generally do much trampolining for reasons of lack of qualified teachers and apparatus and the cost associated with both (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008; and Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Some colleges do it and “there’s been a lot of support and funding gone into the trampolining that happens there” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). This has been possible through a Big Lottery Fund bid because “we had particular requests from girls to take part in trampolining” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) and also “we’ve got quite a high ethnic minority group in the top part of our borough and they seem to enjoy it” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) so “it’s obviously something we want to tap into” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). There tends to be more general gymnastics or educational gymnastics in schools. There is also some cheerleading, sports acro and rhythmic gymnastics in Leicestershire schools because these disciplines are seen as “just a little bit more accessible” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Cheerleading has become popular in secondary schools since the advent of High School Musical (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). One of the School Sport Partnership officials interviewed runs some after-school gymnastics clubs themselves and has recently helped a parent set one up in a primary school because ideally “it needs to be sustainable without me there” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). Also “with Big Lottery Funding they’ve had eight hours of either gymnastics or dance coaching
that they’ve been able to get into their schools” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). This usually takes the form of a block of eight weeks of general gymnastics classes for Year Three pupils in primary schools. Within Leicestershire, schools are required to do gymnastics in Year Three and “the teachers don’t like teaching it” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). The gymnastics coach normally takes the PE lessons and offers a mixture of basic floor skills and rhythmic gymnastics (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009). In terms of her coaching trampolining, “generally out of the week it’s only a couple of hours” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009) because “why would you have a trampoline without a trampolining teacher” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009)? The coach tends to offer extra-curricular activities at secondary schools and curriculum support at primary schools. Within Leicestershire, “there are others, not that many but there are” (Leicestershire County Gymnastics Coach, May 2009) coaches employed in a similar role.

In Northamptonshire, School Sport Partnerships and also the County Sport Partnership have made a considerable investment into teacher education in trampolining. One School Sport Partnership official describes how they have “funded teachers onto Teachers’ Award courses” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009) for trampolining and also tried to run one themselves. Within the County Sport Partnership there is also a focus on offering trampolining courses for teachers and also general gymnastics and swimming as these are sports where “typically there is a lot of fear” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). Because of this support within the county, trampolining in schools is “predominantly all very much teacher-lead stuff” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). Also the Community Sports Coach scheme “had a fairly significant impact on the amount of trampolining that the school could offer” (Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009). One School Sport Partnership through Big Lottery Funding helped a couple of trampoline clubs to set up satellite centres in schools (Northamptonshire
Within schools gymnastics tends to be offered in the form of either trampolining or basic artistic gymnastics (Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009). To this end within School Sport Partnerships there are secondary trampolining competitions and primary general gymnastics competitions following the Next Steps and Key Steps programmes respectively (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009; and Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). There is also some limited provision for rhythmic gymnastics: “we’ve set up after-school clubs here and at a couple of other schools in rhythmic gymnastics” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009) or rather the School Sport Partnership has “put a coach in and they’ve taken it forward” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). This School Sport Partnership Official explained how they “see sports acro or tumbling as an extension of the basic gymnastics programme” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009) and the School Sport Partnership “would be involved in the basic gymnastics programme” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009).

Within the School Sport Partnership, Competition Managers have ‘priority sports’: “they are sports nationally that have been identified which must be a priority for us in terms of our work programme” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). There are sixteen sports and “gymnastics is one of them, but not specifically trampolining” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). They were selected by the Government and the Youth Sport Trust and include all the sports in the UK School Games plus others. Because decision making took place at that level, the interviewee was unsure “whether they are Olympic sports or not has effected whether they have become a priority sport” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). So it appears that rather than echoing Olympic recognition, it is more a case that broader policy accountability is now the norm. Competition structures are also determined “partly by local need and what people want to see locally happening” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). This is particularly important in a sport like gymnastics which
is composed of different disciplines but it is not specified in the national plans which disciplines should be prioritised. With gymnastics, Competition Managers “have to be careful of not overkill, but in terms of the amount of time there is to deliver things” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). Trampolining “is very popular in Northamptonshire, it’s very popular in the curriculum” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). So in terms of organising competitions in the county “that’s had a big impact” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) and the discipline has been focussed on. Hence there is some confusion about priorities.

Competition Managers “are going to be much more accountable against the priority sports” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) and then within these sports “what they see as their priority in terms of competition” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009. Hence there will be more attention given to gymnastics as a whole, but because British Gymnastics’ and English Gymnastics’ priorities had not been released as the time of interview it is uncertain if there is any focus on Olympic disciplines. As well as this, Competition Managers “are also measured on getting more new young people involved in inter-school sport” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) which “does have an influence” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). One School Sport Partnership official explicitly identified how trampolining competitions encourage “different kids, new kids, which is fantastic” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) and “showed to us that as a sport that has huge potential and massive impacts” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009).

Support from the Youth Sport Trust, AfPE and School Sport Partnerships is generally not determined by whether a sport is in the Olympics or not. These organisations are more concerned with increasing participation and giving young people as positive experience of school sport. Trampolining and artistic gymnastics do receive more provision in the school setting from British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics than other disciplines.
Yet this appears to be down to reasons of accessibility, current
development and strength of existing structures rather than for reasons
related to the two being Olympic disciplines of gymnastics. Gymnastics in
the form of artistic gymnastics appears in the UK School Games.
Consequently the sport is a priority for Competition Managers in School
Sport Partnerships. However at this level there is no external drive for
particular disciplines but again trampolining and artistic gymnastics are
favoured for the aforesaid reasons. Thus at a school level there is minimal
change in support for trampolining connected to its Olympic inclusion.

7.5) Policy aspects

Some examples of policy within the Youth Sport Trust, the BSGA and
School Sport Partnerships which determine aspects of their work have
already been discussed in the preceding two sections (7.3 and 7.4) such
as the rationale behind support provided by the School Sport Partnerships.
Here further policies will be discussed and also the decision making and
implementation process will be considered. In addition to policy making
within the aforesaid organisations, the National Curriculum as a key policy
for school sport, will be looked at. The PESSYP strategy will not explicitly
be discussed because it only emerged during the period of data collection
and some key officials were interviewed before it was implemented. Often
discussion is around the generic formulation of the policies rather than
specifically relating to trampolining or Olympic / non-Olympic sports
because the specifies and implications of the policies have been
discussed previously.

The formation of general policy within British Gymnastics and English
Gymnastics has already been discussed in relation to elite and
recreational trampolining in sections 5.5 and 6.5 respectively. The main
thing which is relevant to school trampolining to add is the creation of the
Next Steps resource. In effect that can be thought of as a policy document of what could be covered in school trampolining. According to the BSGA official “the BSGA and British Gymnastics between then got together” (BSGA Official, April 2009) and Next Steps was written as a collaboration between the two organisations. It took “about twenty of us the last three years getting that off the ground” (BSGA Official, April 2009). The BSGA official felt “it just dragged on after problems” (BSGA Official, April 2009). This was “partly because there were too many people involved, too many cooks spoil the broth at times” (BSGA Official, April 2009) and also “they changed their minds about how it was going to go” (BSGA Official, April 2009). During the creation stage, the Next Steps policy was piloted in Northamptonshire and some School Sport Partnerships “got the Next Steps stuff years ago in draft format as they wanted us to pilot it” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). They were then “able to feed back to them in terms of how it actually works in a competition scenario” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). Despite the consultation process, the individual felt “we don’t have an influence” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009).

The main policy of the BSGA relating to trampolining in schools is that around the schools’ competitions. The members of the BSGA committee with responsibility for trampolining ‘inspire’ decisions related to policy (BSGA Official, April 2009). Any ideas which they come up with then get circulated to the rest of the ten regional representatives. From a regional perspective “we do get involved in the changes that they [BSGA] make and that sort of thing” (East-Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee Member, April 2009). They also have two or three meetings a year as a group and “every region is invited to send a representative to these meetings” (BSGA Official, April 2009). The agenda will cover aspects of what happened over the season since the last meeting and include:

what complaints were put it; what's gone wrong; have there been and problems; what rule changes we need to think about; are the present rules working? (BSGA Official, April 2009).
Then “if we get enough turn-out we’ll make decisions at the meeting” (BSGA Official, April 2009). If the attendance is poor then the BSGA trampoline committee “will think oh crikey and send circulars and round-robins to everybody” (BSGA Official, April 2009). Decision making and policy setting “does tend to be a little informal” (BSGA Official, April 2009) but “we’re democratic” (BSGA Official, April 2009). One interesting example of policy change which has been discussed earlier is when the competition went from being an open competition to having two different ability categories. This change was almost ‘sneaked in’: “we thought that there was a need for change and if we did it now with all the other changes taking place no one would notice” (BSGA Official, April 2009).

The key priority of the Youth Sport Trust “is around the school through the network of School Sport Partnerships leading into the community” (YST Official A, February 2009) and they “are the national agency that was responsible for delivering the school sport strategy” (YST Official B, April 2009). *Game Plan and A Sporting Future for All* only influence the work of the Youth Sport Trust indirectly in the sense that “if we are trying to build a relationship with a sport, the sport will find their own path through those challenges” (YST Official A, February 2009). However the Youth Sport Trust still “try and mirror if you like what the Governing Body itself would be doing” (YST Official A, February 2009) and to this end have policies on “performance, participation, leadership and volunteering, coaching and competition” (YST Official A, February 2009). According to one Youth Sport Trust official “the Senior Management Team are the policy setters for the company” (YST Official A, February 2009) and “major headline decisions will be made through the board” (YST Official B, April 2009). The Senior Management Team is composed of the five directors of the various directorates, namely schools, sport, finance, communications and human resources, and is chaired by the Chief Executive (YST Official B, April 2009). The Chief Executive is also Chair of UK Sport so “in terms of integration of organisations, those two organisations closely work together” (YST Official B, April 2009). The work of the Youth Sport Trust
“exists in a strategic plan” (YST Official A, February 2009) which “all five directorates contribute to on an annual cycle” (YST Official A, February 2009). Within the directorates “any individual will contribute and put their views into the melting pot through their line managers” (YST Official A, February 2009) so the official felt the Youth Sport Trust “are a pretty open company in terms of individuals capacity to have a say in the shaping and structuring of the company” (YST Official A, February 2009).

In terms of transmission of national policies from agencies such as the Youth Sport Trust and Sport England to the School Sport Partnerships, “some things come down from the partnership [County Sport Partnership] through us” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008) and so “we’re used as a pathway sometimes to get information and things into schools” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008). Interestingly, one School Sport Partnership official explains how they don’t look at NGB plans such as British Gymnastics One Stop Plan because “my assumption is that the people coming to me are the ones that fit it into their plans” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009).

With planning on a county-wide level it is more of a two-way process between the County Sport Partnership and the School Sport Partnership: “there is interaction and communication and we feed into their business plan and they feed stuff down” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) and “there’s influences both ways round” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). To this end, in Leicestershire there is a Partnership Development Manager group to help facilitate this (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). This County Sport Partnership is also “developing a county focus group for gymnastics” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Within the School Sport Partnership the Partnership Development Manager “will look at the national plan to plan for the whole partnership” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008) and then School Sport Coordinators “will produce a family plan [for their ‘family’ of schools] which comes from a national plan for the partnership” (Leicestershire SSP
Official A, July 2008). Any major policy change within the School Sport Partnership would initially be considered at a steering group meeting consisting of School Sport Partnership staff, head teachers from within the partnership and Local Authority representatives – “it would be flagged up that we are looking to do this differently” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009). That would then be proceeded by consultation with schools and also “it would be run past the Youth Sport Trust as to whether this was in-keeping with the scheme” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009).

More minor policy change or “day-to-day stuff” (Northamptonshire SSP Official A, April 2009) such as which sports the School Sport Partnership are working with would be decided upon by the Partnership Development Manager in discussion with the School Sport Co-ordinators and Primary Link Teachers in their regular meetings. Because “with regards to School Sport Partnership school initiatives, things we are doing, it is our work” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). One School Sport Partnership official highlighted how decisions are “influenced from consultation, from what people have fed back, from the pupils cos we’ve got all the evaluations” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008) and there is also “feedback through PE departments and primary school staff as to what they can cope with, what they can manage” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). This process was felt to be important because “if you just sit in your ivory tower and direct sports I don’t think you’d make yourself very popular” (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008). Looking further into the School Sport Partnership, the School Sport Co-ordinator often helps schools write PE policies and one School Sport Partnership official describes how a School Sport Co-ordinator is trying to get “a unified assessment procedure” (Leicestershire SSP Official A, July 2008) throughout all the primary schools which feed into the same secondary school. Overall as explained by a School Sport Partnership official:

there is a certain amount of planning from the bottom and there’s a certain amount of planning that is done at the top and dropped down
Competition managers also have some influence and input into School Sport Partnership policies (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). As a network they can have an impact on wider policies such as priority sports and “what the National Governing Bodies are trying to say that we need to be doing” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009) and also aspects of the Youth Sport Trust’s work. However the official felt that in reality Competition Managers “don’t have massive amounts of influence in terms of what happens nationally” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009). Often because Competition Managers act within a School Sport Partnership or County Sport Partnership, their work “stays very much within our own areas and it’s kind of heads down stuff” (Northamptonshire SSP Official B, June 2009).

Despite organisations being consulted, it is felt that the National Curriculum is “driven by Government” (AfPE Official, June 2009) and “we have a rather top-down education system” (AfPE Official, June 2009). During curriculum developments, such as the new secondary curriculum or the review of the primary curriculum, “AfPE would be very central in trying to secure the position of physical education within the curriculum” (AfPE Official, June 2009). In terms of AfPE’s power in policy making, “a lot of it’s work is based around advocacy and influence” (AfPE Official, June 2009). By contrast the Youth Sport Trust felt “our job isn’t to dictate what the curriculum is” (YST Official B, April 2009) but rather “to make sure whatever PE teachers are delivering we can support them to make it the best quality” (YST Official B, April 2009). Hence while they do work with a variety of organisations that do look at what is delivered in the curriculum” (YST Official B, April 2009) they do not directly try to influence what is included in it. Looking at trampolining and gymnastics specifically, one official said that British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics had not been consulted over how to implement the sport in schools through the National Curriculum or the QCA plans (Trampoline Technical Committee Member
B, July 2008). When the BSGA official was asked if they had been involved as an organisation, their reply was “we’d like to but we don’t get invited” (BSGA Official, April 2009). The BSGA are more concerned that “the exam boards are not consulting the Governing Bodies of the sport on what to do” (BSGA Official, April 2009) and so they are sometimes “asking kids to do something wrong” (BSGA Official, April 2009) or something which is dangerous in trampolining such as expecting pupils to operate rigs. And so “it is a battle with the exam boards in that respect” (BSGA Official, April 2009).

As acknowledged by an interviewee, the National Curriculum and related policies such as exam board syllabi appear to be driven by a very top-down process. The same could be said of the Next Steps document, though there was limited consultation in this case. By contrast, in the BSGA and within School Sport Partnerships there is much more cooperation and consultation in the decision making process.

7.6) Conclusion

From consideration of changes to school trampolining from organisational, economic and policy perspectives since the sport has become an Olympic discipline very little appears to have altered:

for the general school population unless there is something that tangibly effects them or something they can see, I can’t imagine it would have much impact (Leicestershire SSP Official B, July 2008).

The only major organisational change detailed is that now school trampolining is governed by the separate schools association, the BSGA, whereas it used to come under the remit of the British Trampoline Federation. This happened because the British Trampoline Federation was required to merge with British Gymnastics when trampolining was included in the Olympics as a discipline of gymnastics and gymnastics in
Britain has a separate NGB and schools’ association. However it must be acknowledged that this change in the governance in school trampolining is not a direct consequence of Olympic inclusion per se. Furthermore, the majority of support for school trampolining from the British Trampoline Federation was focussed around the annual schools’ competitions and under the governance of the BSGA there has been minimal change to this assistance.

Whether or not a sport or discipline is in the Olympics or not is irrelevant in terms of the support offered from the Youth Sport Trust, the AfPE and School Sport Partnerships. These agencies appear to be more concerned with increasing participation in any sport or physical activity. There is evidence discussed which indicates a slight potential bias in British Gymnastics’ support towards Olympic disciplines in terms of aspects like school-club links. However this could also be due to the potential of these disciplines to increase participation in gymnastics rather than a decision made on the basis of a discipline being in the Olympics or not.

As discussed in Section 7.3, much of school trampolining is plagued by conflict and difficulty and hence Olympic inclusion may not have had as much impact on trampolining as it might on another sport. There is also the opinion that:

I think it [trampolining] would carry on in schools regardless. I don’t think it is dependent on Olympic status or coverage in that respect because in a lot of schools children enjoy trampolining as an activity (AfPE Official, June 2009).
Chapter Eight - Review of findings

8.1) Introduction

This chapter is going to offer an overall answer to the subject of investigation in this thesis:

The effects of Olympic inclusion on sport:
the case of trampolining in England

Chapter Five provided an answer to the question of how elite trampolining has been affected by Olympic inclusion; Chapter Six provided an answer to the question of how recreational trampolining has been affected by Olympic inclusion; and Chapter Seven provided an answer to the question of how school trampolining has been affected by Olympic inclusion. This chapter will now draw together insights from across the delivery structure and use theoretical concepts to try and explain changes and impacts rather than just describe the observations, as in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. This will take the form of organisational, economic and policy overviews of the impacts of trampolining being included in the Olympics. Thus the question of how Olympic inclusion affects the organisational structure of trampolining in England will be answered in section 8.2; the question of how Olympic inclusion affects the funding and support of trampolining in England will be answered in section 8.3; and the question of how Olympic inclusion affects policies relating to trampolining in England will be answered in section 8.4. The findings from these sections will then be drawn together in an overall conclusion.
8.2) Organisational aspects

How trampolining has changed in England since Olympic inclusion will be considered from an organisational perspective in this section. The key aspects covered include: working with new external partners; the change in NGBs; prioritisation of disciplines within British Gymnastics, English Gymnastics and the BSGA; changes in the professionalism of governance; working with volunteers; tensions between elite trampolining and sport for all; changes to the internal competition structure; and the overall reception to Olympic inclusion. These are the issues which have emerged from Chapters Five, Six and Seven. It is important to remember that there have been concurrent changes to the sporting landscape since 2000 when trampolining became part of the Olympic programme. Examples of this include a new local delivery system for recreational and school sport in the form of County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships; since 2005 it has been known that the 2012 Olympics will be in London; and there has been an increase in lottery funding invested in sport. Thus when assessing the impact of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England this has been factored in by explicitly considering the implications of these changes on Olympic and non-Olympic sports.

Since trampolining has become an Olympic discipline the sport has more external partners at an elite level through links with UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA. These organisations primarily only work with Olympic sports and disciplines and so this is a direct impact of Olympic inclusion. In some respects these organisations all take the form of Mintzberg’s (1983) external coalition in the sports delivery structure in that they influence the organisation from outside. In Mintzberg’s (1983) model the external coalition actually comprises of owners, associated, employee associations, publics and directors, rather than separate organisations. Hoye et.al. (2006) stated that one of the unique features of sport which distinguishes it from other industries is the interdependence between organisations. Mintzberg (1983) also describes four basic systems of
influence: the system of authority, the system of ideology, the system of expertise and the system of politics. The relationship between British Gymnastics and UK Sport fits with Mintzberg’s (1983) notion of the system of authority due to the presence of bureaucratic controls and the feeling there are superiors and subordinates. As discussed in section 5.3, there are many examples of British Gymnastics being required to follow policy directives from UK Sport (generally in order to access funding). Mintzberg (1983) primarily used the model of the systems of influence to describe the internal coalition rather than the external coalition, but again it is necessary to be flexible when applying a business based model to sport.

As described in sections 5.2 to 5.5, there is an unequal power relationship between UK Sport and British Gymnastics due to reasons of resource control. This reflects Astley and Sachdeva’s (1984) findings in that intra-organisational power is the combination of three sources of power: hierarchical authority, resource control and network centrality. In this case the dominant source of power is resource control since British Gymnastics must follow UK Sport’s requests such as formality of governance, in order to receive funding. For the same reasons, this unequal power relationship between UK Sport and British Gymnastics also demonstrates Slack’s (1997) idea of ‘reward power.’ There is evidence of British Gymnastics relationship with the EIS being part of a more ‘pragmatic partnership.’ Features to suggest this include it primarily serving the needs of more powerful members; access to resources is based on perceived competence; and organisations join to access resources (Tomlinson, 2005). Within the EIS there is a low degree of centralisation in decision making as demonstrated by there being lead-regions and home-regions. British Gymnastics previously had strong links with Loughborough University and Bangor University which appeared to take the form of Tomlinson’s (2005) idea of ‘idealistic partnership.’ British Gymnastics relationship with the BOA also fits with Tomlison’s (2005) notion of ‘idealistic partnership.’ These relationships or ‘idealistic partnerships’ are characterised by sharing of resources, expertise, experience and good
practice; networking; an internalised sense of loyalty and commitment; and
genuine interest and involvement in the issue. Tomlinson’s (2005) notions
of ‘pragmatic partnership’ and ‘idealistic partnership’ provide valuable
descriptions of the differing types of relationship here. The only aspect of
the model which did not appear applicable when describing British
Gymnastics partnerships was that one of the benefits of a ‘pragmatic
partnership’ is “spreading of funders costs and risks; to achieve
coordination and economies of scale” (Tomlinson, 2005, p.1183). In this
case it does not fully explain the rationale for UK Sport funding British
Gymnastics to develop elite trampolining.

At a recreational level all recognised sports can receive support from Sport
England and County Sport Partnerships and so trampolining would still be
working with these agencies even if it was not in the Olympic programme.
Furthermore, Sport England does not prioritise Olympic sports over non-
Olympic sports and nor does Leicestershire County Sport Partnership.
Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership does demonstrate a focus
towards Olympic sports and this appears to be particularly prevalent in the
build-up to the London 2012 Olympics.

To a certain degree Sport England’s relationship with UK Sport and the
Youth Sport Trust fits with Tomlinson’s (2005) notion of an idealistic
partnership, but there is also the feeling that the three organisations co-
exist rather than directly work with each other. While County Sport
Partnerships aspire to be ‘idealistic partners’ with national agencies such
as Sport England, in reality the situation is more akin to Tomlinson’s
(2005) notion of ‘pragmatic partnership’ since “Sport England are both a
corporate parent and a paymaster” (Leicestershire CSP Official A, May
2008) and “the pounds, shillings and pence element does influence and
give those partners the ability to direct and influence the agenda”
(Leicestershire CSP Official A, May 2008). County Sport Partnerships
relationships with English Gymnastics may take the form of Tomlinson’s
As with Sport England and County Sport Partnerships, the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships will work with any recognised sport in a school setting and School Sport Partnerships will sometimes even support more alternative or modern forms of physical activity such as using dance mats. And so at a school level, like at a recreational level, the same organisations would be involved in trampolining regardless of Olympic inclusion.

In terms of organisational structure, the Youth Sport Trust displays vertical differentiation as displayed by the presence of five separate directorates with discrete roles. Morgan (1997) used his notion of ‘images of organisations’ to categorise organisations under a number of metaphors. The Youth Sport Trust could be considered as an ‘organisation as organism’ because this metaphor recognises that different parts of the organisation are best suited to different tasks. The AfPE was less central to this study than the other organisations mentioned so little was found out about its organisational structure or mode of operation. Because the BSGA is a self-governing organisation but affiliated to British Gymnastics, British Gymnastics could be thought of as being part of the ‘external coalition’ to use Mintzberg’s (1983) terminology. Internally the BSGA appears to have a high degree of vertical differentiation with the governance of each discipline being quite separate. This can also be explained by Morgan’s (1997) idea of ‘organisations as organisms’ in that organisms adapt to their environment. School Sport Partnerships show a high degree of formalisation in organisational structure because there is a clear hierarchical chain of command involving Partnership Development Managers, School Sport Coordinators and Primary Link Teachers. This fits Morgan’s (1997) notion of ‘organisations as machines,’ apart from in a School Sport Partnership there is not ‘unity of command’ (i.e. each subordinate only has one senior) because Partnership Development
Managers, School Sport Coordinators and Primary Link Teachers are also accountable to the head-teachers of their schools. When school-club links do exist they tend to operate following Tomlinson’s (2005) idealistic version of partnership in that both the schools and the clubs benefit from the linkage.

The main direct organisational change associated with Olympic inclusion is the British Trampoline Federation closing and trampolining in England being governed by British Gymnastics at an elite level, English Gymnastics at a recreational level and the BSGA in schools. This change in governance was due to a ruling by the IOC that there can only be one NGB per sport per country and in the Olympics trampolining is categorised as a discipline of gymnastics.

The loss of the British Trampoline Federation and forced merger with British Gymnastics was viewed negatively by the vast majority of interviewees from a trampolining background. In this sense the IOC and possibly British Gymnastics are demonstrating Lukes’ (2005) first face of power in that the organisations are making trampolinists do something they otherwise wouldn’t have done. Hence this is a power issue as well as an example of organisational change. Former British Trampoline Federation officials resented the loss of autonomy and authority. In Hrebiniak and Joyce’s (1985) typology of organisational adaptation to change this would be classified as ‘natural selection’ which is characterised by minimal choice, selection out of the organisation, and low autonomy due to external constraints. ‘Natural selection’ features low levels of conflict so this construct is not totally applicable in describing this situation. The two examples of Governing Body merger are described in the literature - the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association and Hockey Canada (Stevens, 2006) and USA Equestrian and the US Equestrian Team (Jaffer, 2002). Both of these also featured high degrees of animosity. While the new Governing Bodies were viewed to be more effective in the long term, there were issues during the mergers such as
uncertainty over operating procedures, more complicated decision making processes, concerns over prioritisation of disciplines and questions over power.

As can be seen from the description of the internal structure of British Gymnastics in sections 5.2 and 5.3, British Gymnastics demonstrates vertical, horizontal and special (functional) differentiation. This fits with Minztberg’s (1980) notion of ‘divisional form’ in his typology of basic organisational configurations. It is categorised by the delegation of power to market based units, i.e. different disciplines or committees. There are also elements of ‘adhocracy,’ i.e. vertical and horizontal differentiation (Mintzberg, 1980). However this organisational configuration suggests less formalisation than is apparent in British Gymnastics. Creating an Olympic disciplines subcommittee demonstrates increased levels of formalisation to combat issues of co-ordination and control, as found by Childs (1973).

Since English Gymnastics is a subsidiary of British Gymnastics, the split between British Gymnastics governing and managing only elite trampolining and English Gymnastics governing and managing recreational trampolining is not so clear cut in practice and British Gymnastics also take some responsibility for recreational trampolining. This can be described by Mintzberg’s (1983) notion of an external coalition in that power is passed from British Gymnastics to English Gymnastics through the board and Chief Executive Officer. In this case, the observations fit more closely with Mintzberg’s (1983) intended use of the model than when it was used with respect to British Gymnastics and UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA.

In terms of the relationship between English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics there is indication of strong hierarchical authority in terms of English Gymnastics being required to implement British Gymnastics’ policies in England and being predominantly funded by British
Gymnastics. Two out of three of Astley and Sachdeva’s (1984) forms of inter-organisational power are demonstrated in this relationship: hierarchical authority and resource control.

During the course of this investigation it emerged that British Gymnastics were becoming concerned with the amount of control English Gymnastics were beginning to possess and wanted to reduce this. Theoretically this will lead to increased centralisation, co-ordination and direct supervision of English Gymnastics, fitting with Mintzberg’s (1980) notion of ‘simple structure’ in organisation design. This is common with organisations facing severe crisis and British Gymnastics perceived loss of power could be considered an example of this. The change in relationship between British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics could also be explained in terms of Mintzberg’s (1983) model of power again. British Gymnastics as an external coalition have now decided to pass less power onto the internal coalition, i.e. English Gymnastics. This fits with Arendt’s (1970) notion that power only exists in actualisation and cannot be stored.

Because in one sense some power is being delegated to clubs and co-ordination is through the use of performance control systems such as Gym Mark, this aspect of English Gymnastics work shows clear signs of ‘divisional form’ in Mintzberg’s (1980) typology of basic organisational configurations. I.e. while some power is delegated to individual clubs, outputs are constrained through the use of performance control systems. However in other respects, such as the fact that ultimately to exist as a club most things have to be done through English Gymnastics or British Gymnastics as applicable, there is demonstration of a high degree of formalisation, i.e. mechanisms govern operation. This fits more with Mintzberg’s (1980) notion of machine bureaucracy or Morgan’s notion of organisations as machines, though neither offers a complete description. British Gymnastics’ relationship with the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee also implies a high degree of formalisation and
centralisation and again this can be described by Morgan’s (1997) image of an organisation as a machine.

Coaches appear to be more positive about English Gymnastics than British Gymnastics. This is possibly because English Gymnastics are not seen as a forced replacement for the British Trampoline Federation like British Gymnastics but rather an additional source of support which has made the process of experimenting and adjusting easier, as described by Floyd and Lane (2000). However the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee does not work with an English Gymnastics official based in the region which is somewhat surprising given the roles of each organisation and implies a reluctance to change – a common problem according to Slack (1997). Managers within a sports organisation prefer stability and predictability since it makes control easier, however it is necessary for the organisation to evolve to remain up-to-date and competitive.

From the perspective of the officials involved, the change in governance of trampolining in schools from the British Trampoline Federation to the BSGA appeared to be met with ambivalence. Despite schools’ trampolining originally being part of the NGB for the sport and then coming under a schools association after the merger with gymnastics, in reality there was little change to its governance since trampolining in schools was always quite separate from the central British Trampoline Federation structures. In essence school trampolining is still governed by the same individuals, but just via a different organisation. There is no evidence of any change in professionalisation or formalisation. Thus for example it is not possible to classify the organisational change in terms of Hrebiniak and Joyce’s (1985) typology of organisational adaptation because no real change occurred in practice. This suggests that top management did not fulfil Floyd and Lane’s (2000) roles of ratifying, recognising and directing change. Furthermore, for reasons of continuity, officials from organisations such as the Youth Sport Trust and County Sport
Partnerships are keen for club and school sport to come under the governance of the same establishment.

A further reason for concern from the trampoline fraternity (for example coaches and other officials) over the merger of the British Trampoline Federation with British Gymnastics was a perceived lack of prioritisation of trampolining as a discipline. There was a definite feeling from former British Trampoline Federation officials, coaches and elite trampolineists that within British Gymnastics artistic gymnastics is viewed as the top discipline. Some thought that trampolining and rhythmic gymnastics were almost in a ‘second tier’ as they were Olympic disciplines; while others felt that trampolining was still ‘laughed at’ and not yet viewed as part of gymnastics. In the modern Olympics, Coubertin (1931) laid down strict notions of equality between all sports, disciplines and events, but this does not appear to be true in practice even within one NGB. British Gymnastics officials acknowledged the cultural differences between trampolining and other disciplines of gymnastics (i.e. trampolining used to be a separate distinct sport) but also emphasised that efforts had been made to unify the sports. Little reference was actually made to what measures had been employed to bridge the lack of connection and to what degree any attempts had been successful. According to Amis et.al. (1995) conflict between subunits, such as different disciplines, is a common cause of conflict in sport. This is believed to be due to things such as the interdependent nature of sub-units and fairly informal methods of operation. The same difficulties did not appear to exist within English Gymnastics to such a degree since staff work across disciplines to a greater extent and also their main priority is increasing participation in any form of gymnastics. Thus there is a difference in the culture of British Gymnastics and English Gymnastics. There seems to be a similar ethos of equality between disciplines within the BSGA and of just increasing the presence of gymnastics in schools regardless of disciplines. However, primarily due to historical reasons it is only trampolining and general
gymnastics which the BSGA has developed to any significant level within schools.

Several interviewees involved in elite trampolining alluded to how the governance of that aspect of the sport had become more professional since Olympic inclusion. An example of this is changes to coach education. This was partly due to the discipline coming under the governance of British Gymnastics and being required to conform to their policies. It was also a result of the demands of being an Olympic sport and the external impetus from organisations like UK Sport and the BOA. In part this can be explained by Childs’ (1973) findings, in that increased formalisation combats issues of co-ordination and control due to greater accountability. Childs (1973) also found a link between formalisation and size. Other interviewees felt that the governance of trampolining did not alter as much as expected under the control of British Gymnastics – more positive outcomes were anticipated. Hence within British Gymnastics, top management may not have demonstrated sufficient ratification, recognition and direction - essential roles in managing change as highlighted by Floyd and Lane (2001).

Kikulis et.al. (1992) investigated organisational change in sports Governing Bodies specifically. They described a progression from ‘kitchen table’ through ‘boardroom’ to ‘executive office.’ Before merger with British Gymnastics, the British Trampoline Federation had features of both a ‘kitchen table’ and ‘boardroom’ organisation. For example, the British Trampoline Federation was run solely by volunteers and lacked professionalization, thus displaying features of a ‘kitchen table’ organisation. However, the British Trampoline Federation also held some formal structures and hierarchies of command and thus displayed features of a ‘boardroom’ organisation. By contrast, British Gymnastics is clearly an ‘executive office’ organisation. It is influenced by external providers of financial support (such as UK Sport) and key roles are filled by appointed professionals or volunteers with necessary experience. Kikulis et. al.’s
model serves well to explain the change in formalisation since the British Trampoline Federation merged with British Gymnastics. However in practise it appears to be more of a continuum than a discrete three stage model.

There was some concern both from within British Gymnastics and from the BOA that while the governance of trampolining had improved and become more professional since it had been in the Olympic programme, the discipline still needed to lose aspects of its more amateur philosophy. This is exemplified by the ethos of some elite participants and their lack of commitment and dedication to training compared to those at an equivalent level from other disciplines. Lidz (1997) expressed similar concerns relating to the mentality of snowboarders after the inclusion of snowboarding in the Winter Olympics, in that they adopted a fairly relaxed approach to competition. Within British Gymnastics, officials acknowledged that there is a difference between the professionalisation and formalisation of the governance of the various disciplines but it was not felt to be a clear Olympic / non-Olympic split. Other factors, such as the history of the discipline affected its professionalisation and formalisation too. For example, artistic gymnastics is the oldest discipline and the most widely practiced.

At a recreational level there has also been some increase in the professionalism of the governance of trampolining. This appears to be a direct result of being governed by English Gymnastics and needing to comply with their policies on aspects such as coach education rather than being linked to the Olympics per se. This again can be explained by Childs’ (1973) findings relating to formalisation. There have also been generic governmental changes in policy, such as the requirement for clubs to meet Club Mark standards. At a recreational level there does not seem to be much variation in governance between disciplines of gymnastics which is possibly due to the more generic cross-discipline management of the sport at this level.
Relating to the increased professionalism of the governance of trampolining since Olympic inclusion, the tension between paid staff and volunteers has been exacerbated. Due to being in the Olympics there are higher levels of accountability for financial investment within the sport and the effect it should have on performance and so paid staff are needed to take on this responsibility. There are concerns that volunteers, while hard working, cannot take a strategic overview of the direction which the sport needs to take. They are also maybe more adverse to change than paid staff and often have strong allegiances to particular disciplines or causes. According to Amis et.al. (1995) relationships between volunteers and professional staff are a major cause of conflict in sport and can also take the form of difficulties between volunteers who dictate policy for the organisation and paid staff who are required to implement it. A specific area of difficulty is the fact that members of the national Trampoline Technical Committee are all volunteers and World Class staff feel they do not possess the knowledge and skill base needed. The East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee is also composed of volunteers and is responsible for recreational and sub-elite trampolining in the region. There is concern from coaches that they are not very pro-active in going out and supporting clubs or implementing changes. Furthermore regardless of changes in the governance of trampolining, the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee do not work with English Gymnastics despite having some similar aims and they appear to have been unaffected by trampolining joining the Olympic programme. A reluctance to change is a common problem in organisations according to Slack (1997) because stability is easier to manage even if it is not beneficial for the organisation. Apart from this, the main issue with volunteers in recreational trampolining was just actually finding them! Some coaches also felt it was often quicker to do jobs themselves rather than making time to delegate them to a volunteer especially as a large proportion of volunteers would only help with the club for as long as their child was involved. In secondary schools there is a drive from the Youth Sport Trust and County Sport Partnerships
to increase the number of young people volunteering in sport. The only conflicts around volunteering in schools tend to be about legislation and paperwork. So it is only at an elite level that volunteering in trampolining has been directly affected by Olympic inclusion.

The tension between elite trampolining and recreational trampolining or sport for all has increased since trampolining has become part of the Olympic programme. This again is a major source of conflict in sport according to Amis et.al. (1995) in terms of aspects such as splitting funding. There is evidence of a bias towards elite trampolining both at a macro level within British Gymnastics and also at a micro level within clubs. This has been exacerbated by trampolining being an Olympic sport because elite trampolining now has a more professional governance and a requirement to meet targets relating to success at an elite level. The focus on elite trampolining will only be magnified by the 2012 Olympics being in London. In many clubs the Olympics provides an increased motivation to get participants to an elite level and hence affects decision making within the clubs in terms of prioritising the needs of the elite. In other clubs, although due to constraints such as poor facilities they have no realistic chance of coaching an individual all the way to represent Great Britain in the Olympics, they again focus on the needs of the more able participants within their setting possibly still for reasons of reflected glory. Moreover often efforts to raise recreational participation within clubs have the hidden agenda of providing a larger pool from which to identify talent or to subsidise elite training. Because British Gymnastics prioritise the support of elite trampolining over recreational trampolining this demonstrates Lukes’ (2002) third face of power, preference shaping, since it would be in the personal interest of the majority of the population for recreational sport to receive greater subsidy. Elite performance staff appear satisfied with this focus and thus there is no evidence of Lukes’ (2005) first face of power demonstrated here by the organisational structure the actors are operating within. By contrast in school trampolining the focus appears to be totally on sport for all and when trampolining features in a lesson or as
an extra-curricular club it is a fully inclusive activity. Indeed in school trampolining and gymnastics it is often the needs of the most able pupils that are not met.

Since trampolining has been in the Olympic programme the internal competition structure for club trampolining has been altered. The aim behind this was to provide a better system of athlete development which would ultimately result in more success internationally. While there was no explicit reference to the Olympics, it was felt by interviewees that this was actually the driver behind the transformation. Thus it is a direct consequence of Olympic inclusion. Because of the associated changes in coaching methods, it is felt that the new competition structure will benefit all participants in the sport from beginners to elite in terms of skill development. School trampolining competitions are still not closely linked to the club structure and Olympic inclusion and the change to the NGB has not had any impact in this respect. At the time of Olympic inclusion, but for unrelated reasons, an extra category was added into the schools' competition to cater for more able pupils.

Olympic inclusion was overwhelmingly viewed as a very positive thing by the trampolining community. Elite participants felt it significantly raised the status of the sport. Although the Olympics was viewed as a much more important competition than world championships, the significance of these other competitions has not decreased but rather there is now effectively another layer on top of the player pathway. This agrees with what was argued by authors such as Damkjaer (2004), Schaffer and Smith (2000b) and Segrave (1988) in that competing in the Olympics is the ultimate goal for most athletes. But this has appreciably amplified the pressure placed on elite trampolinists representing Great Britain. There is also less of a closed season between competitions for rest and learning new moves or combinations. Another form of conflict exhibited can be described by Woodman and Hardy’s (2001) notion of organisational stress for elite athletes (this is not reflected in Amis et.al.’s (1995) findings). Firstly
conflict appeared to be present in the form of coach-coach interactions. This could be classified under Woodman and Hardy’s (2001) class of ‘leadership issues’, but this category appears to refer more to athlete-coach interactions. Secondly, issues relating to the integrity of British Gymnastics, in terms of things like selection policies, would be classified under Woodman and Hardy’s (2001) notion of environmental issues and team sources of organisational stress.

The decline of synchronised trampolining which does not currently feature in the Olympic programme also fits with the ideas raised by Damkjaer (2004), Schaffer and Smith (2000b) and Segrave (1988) over the importance of the Games – because synchronised trampolining does not feature in the Olympic programme significantly less attention is given to it both organisationally and by clubs and participants. While it feels that power is involved here or at least preference shaping, it is difficult to match it with any of the theoretical constructs of power since voluntary choice is involved too. So for example to say Lukes’ (2005) third face of power is present (i.e. power is also exerted through preference shaping or influencing) would be too extreme since the individuals involved are making a conscious choice which ultimately does not go against their best interests.

At a recreational level participants are frequently unaware that trampolining is now an Olympic sport, particularly since it has had less direct impact at this level. There has possibly been a rise in recreational participation since trampolining has been in the Olympic programme. Cashman (2004) and Wieting and Lamoureux's (2001) findings, relating to taekwondo and curling respectively, also indicated an increase in participation after the sports joined the Olympic programme. However, there have been difficulties in obtaining quantitative data relating to participation in trampolining and also issues of causality because other factors could have also led to any increase so it was not feasible to draw a conclusion on this aspect. Furthermore, it was also argued that the
capacity of the current club structure would not cope with the sudden influx of participants the London 2012 Olympics might bring. At the school level while interviewees from School Sport Partnerships felt trampolining was a popular activity with pupils when offered, there are many issues such as a lack of facilities preventing more widespread participation regardless of Olympic inclusion.

The main organisational impact of trampolining being admitted to the Olympic programme is the British Trampoline Federation being subsumed into British Gymnastics, English Gymnastics and the BSGA. Whilst this has brought improvements in governance to the sport (such as coach education), it has not been without difficulties. Amis et. al.’s (1995) findings relating to the four main structural antecedents of conflict specific to sports organisations (i.e. sub-units, elite sport versus sport for all, volunteers and organisational change) were all demonstrated. The one most influenced by Olympic inclusion is the conflict between elite trampolining and sport for all as there has been an increased focus on the former. Also, since trampolining has been in the Olympic programme it has been required to work with new external partners. The most notable of these is UK Sport – in this relationship UK Sport are the more dominant partner. Many generic organisational theories, such as Mintzberg’s (1983) model of the external and the internal coalition or Morgan’s (1997) images of organisations, offered valuable insights to explain observations; however these models needed some adaptation to be used in a context away from business for which they were designed.

8.3) Economic aspects

This section will consider how trampolining in England has changed since Olympic inclusion from an economic perspective. It is more difficult to consider economic support across the sporting landscape from a holistic
standpoint since funding decisions and priorities when allocating assistance tend to be very much done on an organisation by organisation basis; so for example UK Sport provide funding for elite trampolining and Sport England for recreational trampolining. However attempts will be made to consider the implications of this support on other aspects of the player pathway. For example, does the support of elite trampolining affect the support of recreational trampolining? So although there may not be direct links in funding throughout the system there may be indirect impacts such as prioritisation of funding. Also, theoretical explanations for findings throughout the system may utilise the same or similar concepts. The main focus of this section is funding, with some discussion of sponsorship towards the end.

Since becoming an Olympic discipline elite trampolining now receives significant financial support from UK Sport. Because organisations such as British Gymnastics have an independent legal identity they agree contracts with UK Sport as an organisation rather than as separate individuals from the organisation (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). There is a clear principal-agent relationship in place with a contract between UK Sport (the principal) and British Gymnastics (the agent who acts on the principles instruction). Theoretically contracts are designed to ‘align incentives’ (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). While in this case it is reasonable to assume all involved have similar interests since it could be expected that British Gymnastics would want their gymnastics to be as successful as possible, a contract could prevent potential complacency and also directs where the funding is spent.

The performance contract between UK Sport and British Gymnastics is underpinned by the idea from economists that holding employees responsible for their performance raises standards (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). However this may cause employees to shift their focus to the aspects of their job that enable them to receive incentives: “we’re always concentrating on the end goal, that’s Olympic champions” (Trampoline
Technical Committee Member A, July 2008) and “the last eight to ten years have been dominated by medal targets” (BOA Official, July 2009). UK Sport are completely clear “we are not investing money for them to fail” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). They justify this because they are investing Government money and in turn need to be accountable – “you can’t just take the money and say thanks and not worry about accounting for it” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009) so “there has to be some checks and balances” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). Li et.al. (2000) proposed that in sport the most applicable form of company motivation is the ‘goal orientated model of efficiency.’ In this case due to the ‘no compromise’ approach from UK Sport sports are funded “to deliver medals, not just go to the Games and take part” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009), the ‘winning maximisation model’ is more appropriate. The later could be more suitable in relation to recreational sport.

Gratton and Taylor (1991) argue that in fact exercises like UK Sport’s ‘Mission 2012’, which looks at every sport across three key dimensions and provides ideas for improvement, offers a better assessment of NGBs than just looking at performance. Furthermore, supporting aspects such as coach development can be explained by Milgrom and Roberts (1992) assertion that in the sport industry investment can be non-monetary and investment in education is extremely important because it contributes to human capital.

Elite trampolining also receives practical assistance and support in kind from the EIS and the BOA now it is part of the Olympic programme. It is also very ring-fenced, even to the extent of being athlete-specific, so no resources filter down to recreational or school level. However trampolining receiving this support from the EIS and the BOA is not dependent on meeting targets and as a consequence does not influence the focus of British Gymnastics to such a degree as the support received from UK Sport. Therefore it can be viewed as just a focussed advantage of Olympic inclusion.
Elite trampolining does significantly benefit from this support from UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA in comparison to the non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics which do not receive it. Furthermore artistic gymnastics is the only other discipline to receive input from these organisations – despite also being an Olympic discipline, rhythmic gymnastics does not because it failed to meet targets. However, unlike artistic gymnastics and rhythmic gymnastics, trampolining still does not have a dedicated national training centre. While there are potential plans for one to be built in the future, it is felt that if it does not go ahead before the London 2012 Olympics it is extremely unlikely to happen afterwards.

The funding and support that Sport England give to recreational sport is unaffected by whether the sport is in the Olympics or not and is motivated by the notion of public welfare in that participation in sport offers benefits to society such as improved health and reduced crime rates (Gratton and Taylor, 1991). Hence trampolining now being part of the Olympic programme will not affect the sport in terms of Sport England assistance. For many sports, such as trampolining, support received from Sport England is essential because they would struggle to survive in the free-market (Gratton and Taylor, 1991). As with UK Sport, the connection between Sport England and NGBs could be described as a principal-agent relationship (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). So English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics are the agents who act on behalf of the principal, i.e. Sport England, to help them meet their targets on things like levels of participation in sport. At the time of interview, funding and support from Sport England was not dependent on the sport meeting targets and hence should not influence what NGBs such as English Gymnastics choose to focus upon. While Sport England does have targets to meet as an organisation primarily based on the number of people participating in physical activity, these are not directly passed onto the sports.
The support that Leicestershire County Sport Partnership gives to sports is not determined by whether they are in the Olympics. Northamptonshire County Sport Partnership is however more influenced by the Olympics. The research investigating the views of members of the two County Sport Partnerships indicated that in the run-up to the London 2012 Olympics there will be an increased emphasis on Olympic sports which will benefit recreational trampolining. Currently County Sport Partnerships do give varying amounts of support to different sports but this is predominantly influenced by which sports are strong in the county and which sports offer most potential for development in the sense of numerical increases in participation. For example, in Northamptonshire trampolining already has a well-developed club structure within the county and so is a key part of the County Sport Partnership’s plans. By contrast in Leicestershire County Sport Partnership trampolining and gymnastics more generally receives much lower levels of support because it is less of a prominent sport there. This suggests that supply structure matters and could impact on the effectiveness and application of Sport England’s strategies. Recreational trampolining also receives support from County Sport Partnerships because it is often found to be a popular sport with girls and ‘semi-sporty’ children (those that participate in some sport but still ought to do more to meet health recommendations) so it helps County Sport Partnerships meet their objectives with regards to these groups.

In terms of County Sport Partnership support for trampolining, investment in things like coaches and coaching courses (as described by Northamptonshire CSP Official A, February 2009 and Northamptonshire CSP Official B, February 2009) creates the important asset of human capital (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). When trampoline clubs receive support from the County Sport Partnership there do not appear to be explicit contracts attached to this support. According to Milgrom and Roberts (1992) the function of a contract is to align incentives and priorities in the absence of direct monitoring. In this case this might not be necessary because a precursor of the County Sport Partnership offering
support is a shared objective. One club was almost reluctant to apply for County Sport Partnership funding due to the transient nature of the support offered. Difficulties relating to the uncertainty of funding streams and the consequential negative implications for programmes if financial support is withdrawn were discussed by Gratton and Taylor (1991) with reference to sponsorship rather than funding per se. The same principles apply to funding; however it could be that at the time of their discussion (1991) because there was less funding available there was hence less dependence on it. Since neither NGBs nor clubs receive support on condition of meeting targets and appear to have limited post-award monitoring, receiving County Sport Partnership funding is unlikely to affect their priorities or focus. However, County Sport Partnerships do need to report back to Sport England the results of their funding. Li et.al. (2001) argue that because the number of participants is more straightforward to report on than how positively participants experience the sport, then it is used as a target and hence influences decision making. Sport England does now measure participant satisfaction too which may also have an effect on choices made.

English Gymnastics offers all disciplines of gymnastics equitable support whether they are in the Olympics or not. It is given on a need led basis so is not necessarily identical. This approach continues through to the support given by the Regional Development Officers who are funded by English Gymnastics. They have a number of targets based around Gym Mark accreditation, participation and coaches. These are generic targets and not discipline specific. The presence of these targets does effect what the officials focus on. This again can be explained by the findings of Milgrom and Roberts (1992): when employees receive incentives for certain aspects of their jobs or have to reach certain targets in those areas, naturally they give more attention to those things. When trampoline clubs are funded by English Gymnastics (for facility improvement for example) they also have to meet participation targets. However from interviewees it was felt that in this case holding people responsible for
their performance in terms of increasing participation does not really affect their priorities because values are already aligned.

Several interviewees felt that trampolining being part of English Gymnastics offered the sport more capacity to engage with organisations such as Sport England and County Sport Partnerships and hence receive more support from them. A similar thing could be said about elite level trampolining in respect to the external organisations which they work with, i.e. British Gymnastics has a greater capacity to work with organisations such as UK Sport. These are both indirect impacts of Olympic inclusion.

Considering trampolining in schools now, the Government also chooses to support the Youth Sport Trust based on the principle of public welfare – i.e. due to welfare benefits such as health and behaviour, the Government has reason to want to increase young people’s participation in sport. This then equips the Youth Sport Trust with a certain degree of power under Arendt’s conceptualisation of power (Habermas, 1986). I.e. power is a collective decision to work towards a common goal. The Youth Sport Trust does not then fund NGBs or sporting activities directly, but rather acts as a development agency creating the important asset of human capital (Milgrom and Roberts, 1992). Because of this, the Youth Sport Trust does not have formal contracts or conditions of engagement with agencies which it works with. Furthermore the Youth Sport Trust works with NGBs on the whole sport rather than specific disciplines. Again other than being part of a larger NGB structure, trampolining is not advantaged by being part of the Olympics in this context. Nevertheless, sports in the UK School Games do receive more input from the Youth Sport Trust and these sports are all Olympic. While it is only artistic gymnastics which is part of the UK School games programme and not trampolining, it is argued by the Youth Sport Trust that there is a ‘trickle-down’ benefit for the rest of the NGB. This is thus an indirect impact of Olympic inclusion because it is only since trampolining now comes under the governance of gymnastics
that it receives this support. The AfPE works in a similar way to the Youth Sport Trust, but often produces resources rather than offering direct help.

English Gymnastics and British Gymnastics are keen to develop any form of gymnastics activity in a school setting. English Gymnastics support of trampolining in schools is also driven by reasons of investment in human capital and welfare benefits. While some respondents tended to emphasise that artistic gymnastics is English Gymnastics’ first priority in schools, it actually appears to take the form of general foundation gymnastics rather than artistic per se. Furthermore, when creating Next Steps resources for schools, trampolining was the first discipline to be selected because of a need for a secondary school programme for the sport. Then sports acro was the next discipline to be looked at because it was felt to be an accessible discipline for secondary schools and rhythmic to try to increase participation at grass-roots. Hence there was not a bias towards Olympic disciplines when creating the Next Steps resources. The creation of these resources was motivated by the idea of investment in human capital but also could be considered to be driven by a goal orientated model of efficiency (Li et. al., 2000) because the resources are designed to maximise the number of children participating in the sport. As discussed earlier, this is believed by Li et. al. (2000) to be the most common form of firm motivation. The provision of the BSGA schools trampolining competitions and the UK School Games are probably also driven from a public welfare perspective; although part of the motivation behind the UK School games was to improve player pathways in Olympic sports with the ultimate aim of winning more Olympic medals.

A goal orientated model of efficiency drives School Sport Partnerships support of trampolining and other sports in schools. They are particularly concerned with raising participation and ensuring all children receive five or more hours of school sport per week. Li et.al. (2001) argued that because the number of participants is easier to collect data on than say positive experiences of school sport this is usually used as a target.
School Sport Partnerships are supposed to select sports to support according to pupil demand. In practice choices are determined primarily by local availability of facilities, coaches and exit routes into clubs for pupils. So in terms of School Sport Partnership support for trampolining, Olympic inclusion is not relevant. When School Sport Partnerships receive funding from external agencies this is given with a clear contract. This does effect what the School Sport Partnership focuses on because the funding is often for certain projects, although they are not always set targets per se. School Sport Partnerships do not tend to set targets or have formal contracts with the sports they work with. Again like the Youth Sport Trust, School Sport Partnerships see the importance of investments in human capital. For example, in one School Sport Partnership they have invested in teacher education in trampolining.

Competition managers within School Sport Partnerships have sixteen priority sports which include gymnastics but not specifically trampolining. It was uncertain exactly how these sports were selected and whether there was an Olympic bias. Competition Managers focus more on these priority sports since they are more accountable for them – this again can be explained by ideas discussed by Milgrom and Roberts (1992) in terms of incentive contracts. Within gymnastics trampolining is generally the most popular discipline for secondary school competitions.

Another form of financial support for trampolining is sponsorship. Sponsorship of elite trampolining has increased marginally since the sport has been included in the Olympic programme. More widely within British Gymnastics there is a preference for sponsoring Olympic disciplines. This fits with the findings of Cole (2005) and Mariani (1995) in that there is a perceived benefit to companies in linking their product to the Olympic Games. Also the support of individual trampolinists can be explained by Gratton and Taylor’s (1991) findings that sports sponsorship is focussed on individuals at the very top, since there is a higher chance of return on their investment. Despite this slight increase in sponsorship since Olympic
inclusion, it is still relatively low level. Literature such as Gratton and Taylor (1991) discusses issues related to the appropriateness of a sport to the sponsors’ image. In the case of trampolining and gymnastics, interviewees referred to the converse, i.e. alcoholic drinks manufacturers would not be seen as suitable sponsors.

Olympic inclusion has had even less impact on sponsorship of recreational trampolining. This can be explained by Ferrand et. al.’s (2007) argument that sponsorship of sport tends to be focused at the elite level. Trampolining in schools receives no or virtually no sponsorship and this has not been affected by Olympic inclusion.

It is only at an elite level that the funding and support of trampolining has been significantly increased by it being part of the Olympic programme. At a recreational level it has had very little impact and at a school level none at all. Throughout the system funding appears to be very target driven. At an elite level funding of trampolining is dependent on the sport meeting performance targets in the Olympics and other world championships. Lower down the sport system the funding of trampolining is not determined by the sport itself meeting targets, but rather the support agencies such as Sport England have targets to reach which influences which sports and activities they support and how. Because of the importance of targets throughout the sport delivery system, Milgrom and Roberts (2002) discussion of principal-agent relationships and incentive contracts were particularly useful to explain some of the decision making and reasoning behind observations. This can be exemplified by British Gymnastics focus on success in elite trampolining. Also, since sport is different from most other industries Li et.al.’s model of company motivation was valuable. However, with respect to this it did appear that different parts of the British Gymnastics / English Gymnastics consortium held contrasting motivations – something not considered in the model. Similarly, Milgrom and Roberts (2002) explanation of the notion of human capital and Gratton and Taylor’s (1991) discussion of the Government funding sport due to public welfare
benefits also proved useful to supplement more business-centred economic theories.

8.4) Policy aspects

This section will give a theoretical overview of policy formation synthesising the findings from across the sport delivery system. In Chapters Five, Six and Seven there was a discussion of how policy emerged from each of the organisations contributing to elite trampolining, recreational trampolining and school trampolining respectively. Also many examples of policy within the key organisations which affect trampolining in England have been discussed in sections 8.2 and 8.3 and also in chapters 5, 6 and 7 respectively. This section is going to analyse each of the key organisations in turn to see how the theoretic policy formation models considered (i.e. the stages model, institutional analysis, multiple streams and the ACF) provide an explanation of the empirical findings. The organisations connected to the delivery of elite trampolining will be considered first (i.e. British Gymnastics, UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA), then those organisations connected to the delivery of recreational trampolining will be considered (i.e. Sport England, County Sport Partnerships and English Gymnastics), and finally organisations connected to the delivery of school trampolining will be considered (i.e. the BSGA, the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships). Overall conclusions will then be drawn in terms of the applicability of the models.

Due to the organisational change of elite trampolining now being governed by British Gymnastics (rather than the British Trampoline Federation) and having input from UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA it is affected by the policies of these organisations since being in the Olympic Games. There have also been some trampoline specific policy changes after it joined the
Olympic programme. These include re-structuring the competition pathway towards Olympic success.

Policy formation within British Gymnastics will be considered first. One of the key features of the stages model is that it is a ‘top-down’ process (John, 2000). There is much evidence of this in British Gymnastics policy making as described in section 5.5. Furthermore, when consultation does occur it does not necessarily influence policy hence giving further support to the hierarchical nature of the stages model. In terms of setting the agenda for the policy decision making process within British Gymnastics this suggests evidence of Lukes’ second face of power – ‘non-decision making’ which confines the scope of decision making (Lukes, 2005). From comments by interviewees such as British Gymnastics Official A (May 2008), there is also an impression that the policy is divided into a series of discrete stages and policy formation and implementation are seen as congruent which again fits with a stages model. In reality it was very difficult to discern whether policy intentions turned into practice because many policies referred to somewhat idealistic aims which are unlikely to have been realised during the scope of the study. However another British Gymnastics Official mentioned that while British Gymnastics has to take the lead on things like selection policies it “has to be done in consultation so you have some buy-in” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008) thereby implying more difficulty with implementing policy than indicated by the stages model. Another important characteristic of the stages model is that there are no localised policy decisions (John, 2000) and this is reflected by the national nature of most of British Gymnastics’ policies.

An institutional approach to policy formation recognises more of a partnership in decision making and not a ‘top-down’ approach (Houlihan, 2005). There was also some evidence of this in the formation of British Gymnastics policies if one adopts Houlihan’s (2005) second definition of an institution as a group of people within the same organisation sharing
the same values and beliefs. While examples of cooperation and partnership in decision making cited in section 5.5 contradicts the evidence cited in support of the stages model, it must be acknowledged that in terms of valuing the views of individual coaches “it’s literally only in like the last couple of years that they’ve really emphasised it” (Elite Trampolinist B, June 2008). Moreover an institutional approach recognises that institutions create a forum where pressure groups can legitimately argue their point of view (John, 2000). This can be seen by the fact coaches can give feedback at competitions or some larger clubs are actively consulted for their opinion. Another strength of an institutional approach is that it directs attention to the structures within which actors operate and emphasises the value of placing institutions in their historical context (Houlihan, 2005 and John, 2000). This is of particular relevance to trampolining given that historically it had a separate NGB and still is considered maybe slightly disconnected within British Gymnastics (see section 5.3).

Kingdon’s (1995) multiple streams approach also acknowledges the importance of institutions but assumes continuous policy change and that an idea only moves onto the political agenda if there is a ‘policy window’. Trampolining joining British Gymnastics and also not performing well on an international level in the Olympics has offered such a ‘policy window’ for changes to the internal competition structure to occur. Increases in funding also gave a ‘policy window’ for change in terms of performance programmes for trampolining (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). The scenario of a Trampoline Technical Committee Member proposing changes to the World Class Programme (as described in section 5.5) fits with the ideas of acceptance / rejection and that policies may not be adopted by all as featured in the multiple streams model.

The key feature of the ACF is the presence of difference coalitions (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999) which contain actors from different organisations. In the case of British Gymnastics the coalitions often
appeared to be more divisionally based. The group of people wanting to reform the competition structure was more close to Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith’s (1999) idea of a coalition as it contained members from different structural interest groups such as British Gymnastics officials and coaches. Furthermore there are conflicts of interest between coalitions and “some quite diametric views” (British Gymnastics Official B, May 2008). In terms of a policy broker (as required by the ACF) this frequently takes the form of high up British Gymnastics officials as “you need someone with that overview to look what’s best for Great Britain” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008) and “it’s taking people’s issues and concerns on board and almost taking that wider strategic perspective” (British Gymnastics Official A, May 2008). A specific example of this is the Trampoline Technical Committee who are required to liaise between the needs of different coalitions (Trampoline Technical Committee Member A, July 2008).

Within UK Sport there is evidence of a top-down approach to policy formation thus giving support to the stages model (John, 2000). However it was implied that the agenda for decision making is not closed and so thereby not reflecting Lukes’ (2005) second face of power. Further support of the stages model is demonstrated in the way policy suggestions “are obviously developed at a lower level by the Lead Officers in the different teams” (UK Sport Official A, August 2009). This indicates the policy process is divided into a series of stages (Houlihan, 2005 and John, 2000) and also policy formation and implementation are seen as congruent (Houlihan, 2005). Conversely the importance given to state institutions, such as “we do have direction set to us by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport as our sponsor department” (UK Sport A, August 2009), validates an institutional approach to policy formation (John, 2000). John (2000) described how one of the faults of an institutional approach is that in reality organisations are influenced by decisions made by politicians. This is true of UK Sport since the officials interviewed acknowledged they do respond to changing political direction. The
institutional approach also emphasises the presence of partnership in decision making (John, 2000) and this was demonstrated by UK Sport as described in section 5.5. This also fits with Arendt’s conception of power in terms of reaching a decision agreeable to both parties (Habermas, 1986). The idea of external influences being important is developed by the multiple streams framework (Kingdon, 1995). This has been reflected in the fact that policy changes are often preceded by resource changes and the 2012 Olympics being in London has offered opportunities for change – both examples providing ‘policy windows.’ There is no mention of any forms of coalition or groups with conflicting views within UK Sport so there is little support for the ACF in this setting.

The formation of policy within the EIS also shows some aspects of a stages model since policy is governed by a hierarchical structure including UK Sport governance. However there is demonstration of features of an institutional approach too, such as partnership in decision making within the EIS. The fact that there is always a post-Games review and consequential modification of policy supports the ‘policy window’ idea of the multiple streams framework (Kingdon, 1995). Again there was little evidence found to support of the ACF.

Within the BOA the emphasis on working in partnership with NGBs and the acknowledgement of the importance of the role of other organisations supports the institutional approach and again fits with Arendt’s concept of power (Habermas, 1986). Holding the Games in London in 2012 could be seen as a ‘policy window’ in Kingdon’s (1995) multiple streams framework. Another example of a policy window allowing significant policy amendment within the BOA are changes within the senior structures, most fundamentally a new Chairman of the Executive Board being appointed (BOA Official, July 2009). Since the introduction of National Lottery funding there has been significant changes to the underlying elite sport delivery system - this again fits with the multiple streams framework which assumes continual policy change (Kingdon, 1995). There is also evidence
of the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999) because “if a sport or group of sports want to see something happening then they have to campaign” (BOA Official, July 2009). The BOA would then be considered the policy broker within the model in this case. From the information given there was little evidence of the stages model.

In terms of the theories of policy formation considered - i.e. the stages model (John, 2000), the institutional approach (Houlihan, 2005), multiple streams (Kingdon, 2005) and the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999) - characteristics of each could be used to explain the construction of policy relating to elite trampolining. Policy formation within British Gymnastics featured aspects of all four models. Evidence of the stages model was demonstrated through a top-down approach to policy formation. Because there were also some features of partnerships and pressures groups, support for the institutional approach was given too. Trampolining joining British Gymnastics offered a ‘policy window’ for change, thereby demonstrating a key feature of the multiple streams framework. And finally features of the ACF were demonstrated through the presence of policy brokers and coalitions, such as those wanting to reform the competition structure. Both UK Sport and the EIS offered support for all models except for the ACF. There was no evidence of opposing coalitions within the organisations. The BOA offered support for all except the stages model. In this organisation there appeared to be very little top-down formation and implementation of policy. This is discussed in more detail in section 5.5.

At a recreational level Sport England and often County Sport Partnership policy does not make explicit reference to trampolining but rather provides a framework from which support is given to different sports and to what extent Olympic inclusion affects this, as with UK Sport, EIS and BOA policy at the elite level. Particularly at a County Sport Partnership level, some of the policies appear to take the form of implicit beliefs rather than tangible policy documents, such as Northamptonshire’s slight prioritisation
of Olympic sports when allocating support. English Gymnastics by contrast does have trampoline specific policies, but because of their recreational focus these policies are not influenced by trampolining being an Olympic discipline.

From discussions in Chapter Six, there is the suggestion that much of Sport England policy is written centrally then deployed with the expectation it will be implemented in all areas with little regional differentiation. This also indicates a belief that policy formation and policy implementation are seen as congruent. Both these ideas can be explained by the stages model (John, 2000). However in practice “there’s been a central structure and local areas have been able to adjust that to their needs” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). Houlihan (2005) criticised the stages model for this reason, because in reality implementation does not always follow neatly from one stage to the next and “you can't have a one plan fits all sort of mentality, it has to have some flexibility” (Sport England Official B, June 2008). Also the fact that Government significantly influences Sport England policy and actions is a feature of the institutional approach (John, 2000).

As described in section 6.5, County Sport Partnerships view their role as delivering national policy at a more local level. This implies a top-down approach to policy formation, which again can be described by the stages model (John, 2000). And the fact that policy intentions turn into reality further supports the stages model (John, 2000). Because Sport England’s behaviour changes the actions of County Sport Partnerships against what they might choose to do in terms of a focus on adult rather than youth participation, this also demonstrates Lukes’ (2005) first face of power.

The institutional approach can also be used to explain policy formation in County Sport Partnerships in terms of how it works in partnership with NGBs when deciding county plans for sports such as trampolining. This fits with the institutional approach since it’s key characteristics include true
partnership in decision making when constructing sports policy (Houlihan, 2005); the presence of a forum where groups can legitimately argue their point of view; and acknowledgement of the importance of structures (Houlihan, 2005).

The way that London hosting the 2012 Olympics offered opportunities for County Sport Partnerships to promote sport within the region and change policies fits with the notion of a ‘policy window’ in Kingdon’s (1995) multiple streams framework. A change in situation, such as a change of Government or natural disaster, allows a package of problems, policies and politics to reach the decision making agenda. The benefit of the London 2012 Olympics in getting sport on the decision making agenda can also be explained by Lukes’ (2005) second face of power whereby he acknowledges the fact that the decision making agenda itself is often closed.

Within County Sport Partnership policy making, in terms of offering a full explanation there was also some need for the last model of policy formation considered, the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999). In some ways County Sport Partnerships act as a coalition against Sport England. For example, County Sport Partnerships continued pursuing sport-specific development in the past despite direction from Sport England away from it. Also in other situations, such as interaction between Sport England and the sports in a county, the County Sport Partnership could be thought of as a policy broker.

In both Leicestershire and Northamptonshire County Sport Partnerships there were no explicit policies on their treatment of Olympic and non-Olympic sports. This could be considered indicative of Lukes’ (2005) second face of power – non-decision making or difficulties getting items onto the decision making agenda.
Since English Gymnastics staff at a local level feel that national plans are passed down to them, this is indicative of a stages model of policy formation where there is a top-down approach and policy follows through chains of command with no localised policy decision (John, 2000). In the stages model there is also a belief that policy formation and implementation are congruent, but this does not appear to be demonstrated in this case given that many clubs feel they are unaffected by national policies.

In terms of policy making within English Gymnastics, there is also support for the institutional approach (Houlihan, 2005; and John, 2000) because English Gymnastics are beginning to conduct significantly more consultation to find out what clubs and participants really require. Hence there is clear evidence of true partnership in decision making and constructing policy. English Gymnastics also take account of disciplines’ individual needs according to what stage of development they are at and so are considering the historical context.

Lastly there is also some evidence of Kingdon’s (1995) notion of multiple policy streams in English Gymnastics’ policy making. Sport England requested that English Gymnastics constructed a more comprehensive development plan and through this process a variety of policies were changed. In Kingdon’s terminology this would count as a ‘policy window’ because the external push to change or reconsider current practice allowed things to move forward.

In terms of policy affecting recreational trampolining, it is best explained by the stages model (John, 2000) predominantly due to a top-down approach to policy formation and implementation. The institutional approach (Houlihan, 2005) is also useful due to some partnership in decision making between organisations being present. Policy formation in Sport England, County Sport Partnerships and English Gymnastics all demonstrate features of the stages model (John, 2000) and the institutional approach.
There is additionally some evidence of multiple streams (Kingdon, 2005) and the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999) in County Sport Partnership policy formation due to policy changing when ‘policy-windows’ arise and the County Sport Partnership acting as a policy broker between Sport England and the sports within the county. There is also evidence of multiple streams (Kingdon, 2005) in English Gymnastics policy formation because there are several examples of policy changing due to external directives such as guidelines from Sport England. This is discussed in more detail in section 6.5.

The main policies which affect trampolining and other sports in the school curriculum are the National Curriculum and related documents such as exam board syllabi. The Next Steps programme for trampolining helps structure the activity in both curricular and extra-curricular settings. Extra-curricular trampolining is also influenced by the work of the BSGA. The policies of the individual School Sport Partnership then influence the sport on a local level.

It is difficult to fit policy formation within the BSGA with any particular theoretical framework given that it is characterised by co-operation, democracy and possibly some apathy. The institutional approach features true partnership in decision making so this aspect is applicable. The example of a larger global change in organisational structure allowing policy on competition levels to change could be considered an example of a policy window in the multiple streams approach (Kingdon, 1995). Because the multiple streams approach focuses on how decisions actually get on the decision making agenda, this theory fits with Lukes (2005) second face of power.

Since the Next Steps resource for trampolining was written in collaboration between British Gymnastics and the BSGA, clear support of the institutional approach is demonstrated in terms of the relationship between the organisations. However the institutional approach also stresses that
policy is not constructed from a ‘top-down’ process (John, 2000) and despite School Sport Partnership officials in Northamptonshire being consulted about Next Steps they still felt they had no real input.

Within the Youth Sport Trust policy formation appears to align with a stages model predominantly. Policy emerges from a ‘top-down’ approach lead by the Senior Management Team and implemented through directorates and there is little evidence of localised policy decision making (John, 2000). This also implies a hierarchy of power, and the one-dimensional view of power is sufficient to explain this (Dahl, 1968). However there are also aspects of the institutional approach present; namely that state institutions play an important part of the policy process given that the Chief Executive of the Youth Sport Trust is also the Chair of UK Sport so the two organisations do work in partnership at times.

By contrast, within School Sport Partnerships, the institutional approach seems to best explain how policy emerges. There is significant evidence of partnership and collaboration in decision making such as the fact that major policy change comes through a steering group and more minor policy change is decided upon by the Partnership Development Manager after discussion with School Sport Co-ordinators and Primary Link Teachers and as a result of feedback. This also fits with Arendt’s notion of power (Habermas, 1986). Also the fact that major policy change needs to be approved by the Youth Sport Trust to ensure it is in-keeping with the idea of School Sport Partnerships acknowledges the importance of state institutions within the policy process (Houlihan, 2005). This also can be explained by Lukes’ (2005) second face of power in that institutions constrain choices. Both within the School Sport Partnership and in the wider school sport context, Competition Managers act as a coalition to influence policies relating to school competitions. This fits with the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999). However for this model to be fully demonstrated, policy brokers and more obvious rival coalitions would need to be identified (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999).
The National Curriculum and exam board syllabi are driven by a very ‘top-down’ Government led process with no consultation or localised policy decisions. Hence it is best explained by the stages model (John, 2000). Furthermore, in this model policy formation and policy implementation are seen as congruent (John, 2000) and there is the implication that educational policies such as the National Curriculum will be implemented by all schools.

As with recreational trampolining, policy change relating to trampolining in school can predominantly be explained through the stages model (John, 2000) and the institutional approach (Houlihan, 2005) due to a top-down approach to policy formation and implementation and some evidence of partnership between organisations when constructing policies. While there is also some support for the multiple streams framework (Kingdon, 2005) and the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999), this is more limited and tends to relate to specific examples. This can be exemplified by the change in governance of school trampolining providing a ‘policy window’ for an extra tier to be introduced into the schools’ competitions. This is discussed in more detail in section 7.5.

At an elite level there has been significant policy change relating to trampolining since it has become part of the Olympic programme. At the recreational and school level whilst there has been policy change since 2000 it is generally totally unrelated to whether a sport is in the Olympics or not. In terms of policy theory, overall in elite sport, recreational sport and school sport the support for the ACF (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 1999) was less than that found by authors such as Houlihan (2005). It appeared to be more determined by institutions or organisations rather than cross-agency relationships and is thus more in keeping with a stages model (John, 2000), institutional analysis (Houlihan, 2005) or multiple streams approach (Kingdon, 2005). This could be due to reorganisation and redefining of organisational boundaries.
8.5) Conclusion

The inclusion of trampolining in the Olympics has received strong support from those involved in the sport, particularly at an elite level, and it was felt it raised the status of the sport. The forced merger of the British Trampoline Federation with British Gymnastics has contributed to the increased professionalisation of elite trampolining, but it was not without opposition from the trampoline community. The governance of elite trampolining has also become more professional due to increased expectations put on the sport from organisations such as UK Sport. Nevertheless, there are continuing concerns that there is still a somewhat amateur philosophy within the sport. Globally technical standards (i.e. the difficulty of moves performed and form) in elite trampolining have dramatically risen since it has been part of the Olympic programme. Levels in British or English trampolining have not seen a corresponding improvement, so relatively speaking athletes are performing worse on an international scene. A new internal competition structure has been introduced within England, with changes from grass-roots to elite competitions, motivated in part by trying to improve performance on an international stage. Elite trampolining benefits from extensive funding from UK Sport and support from the EIS and the BOA because of being an Olympic discipline. However all three are very ring-fenced and the UK Sport funding is dependent on meeting ambitious performance targets and so forms an incentive contract which has dictated the focus within the NGB. The increased professionalism and higher levels of accountability within elite trampolining has lead to more tension between paid staff and volunteers.

Most of the effect of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England has only been seen at the elite levels of the sport. Moreover, the balance between elite trampolining and sport for all has swung further towards the former from both financial and structural perspectives. Part of the reason for little of the benefits arising from trampolining being in the Olympics filtering
down to the recreational level is a lack of coherent structures both within the sport and in the wider sporting landscape. Recreational trampolining is governed by English Gymnastics and also has input from Sport England and County Sport Partnerships. The support given by these organisations is not affected to a significant degree by whether the sport or discipline is in the Olympics and is more focussed on increasing participation in sport. The same is true of school trampolining – it is not governed by British Gymnastics, and support from the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships is generally not influenced by whether the sport is in the Olympics. Concern has also been raised over trampolining coaching in schools and how it often falls short of NGB requirements despite teachers needing to complete a coaching course run by British Gymnastics. At both a recreational and school level support given by agencies, such as County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships respectively, appears to be fairly ad hoc with things such as County Sport Partnership decisions regarding prioritisation and school-club links being dramatically influenced by existing local provision. There are currently too many other issues and priorities in recreational and school trampolining preventing the sport joining the Olympic programme to have had a more significant impact.
Chapter Nine - Conclusion

9.1) Introduction

The concluding observations from this study will be encompassed in this final chapter. The aim of this research was to investigate the effects of Olympic inclusion on sport through the case study of trampolining in England. This was considered in terms of changes to elite trampolining, recreational trampolining and school trampolining across the dimensions of organisational structure, funding and support, and underlying policy. This has been achieved through constructing a primarily qualitative piece of work underpinned by a critical realist ontology and epistemology. 45 individuals involved in the sport of trampolining or working in the more general sport delivery system were interviewed using semi-structured interviews. They were selected from the following organisations or groups: elite participants, coaches, British Gymnastics, English Gymnastics, the BSGA, UK Sport, the BOA, the EIS, Sport England, the Youth Sport Trust, County Sport Partnerships, School Sport Partnerships and the AfPE. Transcriptions were subsequently analysed and supplemented with written sources where appropriate.

The first part of this chapter (section 9.2) will consider the contribution to knowledge and theoretical insights developed through this study. A number of limitations have materialised. These will be discussed in the next section of the chapter (section 9.3). The final section of the chapter (section 9.4) will look at how themes which emerged within this thesis could be developed into further research.
9.2) Research study contribution

This research study has contributed to existing literature on the effect of Olympic inclusion on sport in a number of ways. To date, this is the only study which has adopted a truly multi-disciplinary approach. By using aspects of organisational theory, economics, policy theory and power theory it has allowed the exploration of direct and indirect impacts of Olympic inclusion. Moreover, changes right across the delivery system have been considered by investigating the consequences for elite trampolining, recreational trampolining, and school trampolining of the sport being added to the Olympic programme. Unlike other previous research on the implications of Olympic inclusion on a sport, using qualitative data in the form of interviews provided a clearer holistic understanding of the experiences of individuals involved in the sport when it was going through changes. Extensive quotations taken from these interviews were presented throughout the thesis to give a better insight into these perspectives. To enable changes in trampolining across the delivery system (i.e. at an elite, recreational and school level) to be fully considered, interviewees were selected from a range of organisations. As discussed in Chapter Two, previous studies investigating the effects of Olympic inclusion on sports have tended not to involve primary research and have also focussed on limited aspects of the sport.

Furthermore, the critical realist epistemology and retroductive method adopted is fundamentally concerned with identifying structures which underpin behaviour observed through data collected (Bryman, 2004). Related to this, critical realism views the world as being composed of three layers – the empirical (experiences), the actual (events) and the real (mechanisms) – with theory being used to infer underlying structures. Interviews were predominantly concerned with finding out what happened to trampolining since 2000 when it joined the Olympic programme and why these changes occurred - i.e. the interviews were concerned with finding out about the empirical (experiences) and the actual (events). Questions
in the interview schedule were written to reflect this. Theory was then used to develop a causal account of why things happened – i.e. a consideration of the underlying mechanisms. So for example, structural changes could be linked to organisational and policy dimensions and behavioural changes could be linked to economic and power dimensions. These dimensions were separated within Chapters Five to Eight.

This methodology has allowed discovery that most of the direct implications of the inclusion of trampolining in the Olympics have only affected the elite level of the sport. Overall, adding trampolining to the Olympic programme was viewed as a very positive thing by interviewees involved in the sport (particularly individuals connected to elite trampolining) because it was seen to improve the status of the sport and offer opportunities. The forced merger of the British Trampoline Federation with British Gymnastics received significant criticism from former British Trampoline Federation members due to a perceived loss of power and autonomy. However this amalgamation did raise standards of governance and management in elite trampolining, as did increased expectations from organisations such as UK Sport. For example, there is now a higher degree of formalisation and accountability. As a consequence of the increased professionalisation of the governance of elite trampolining, there is now more tension between paid staff and volunteers. From some quarters there is still concern that an amateur philosophy remains within elite trampolining. To address this and also issues associated with a relative decline in Team GB’s performance from the time when the sport was first included in the Olympic programme, a new internal competition structure has been introduced for trampolining in England. Since the sport has been in the Olympic programme elite trampolining has benefitted from significant funding from UK Sport and also support from the EIS and the BOA. Assistance from all three organisations is extremely ring-fenced and channelled towards the elite. For example, EIS support is totally focused on a very limited number of named individuals who compete at an international level. Funding from
UK Sport is dependent on British Gymnastics meeting ambitious performance targets in trampolining and so forms an incentive contract which has dictated the focus with the NGB. Hence the balance between elite trampolining and sport for all has swung towards the higher echelon of the sport from both economic and structural perspectives.

Few benefits from trampolining being in the Olympic programme filter down to the recreational and school levels of the sport and those that have tend to be indirect impacts. This is partly due to a lack of coherent governance both within the sport and also in terms of the wider sporting landscape. This can be exemplified by the fact that trampolining has three different NGBs or associations (i.e. British Gymnastics, English Gymnastics and the BSGA) and sport more widely has separate organisations responsible for elite sport, recreational sport and school sport (i.e. UK Sport, Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust). Support given to recreational trampolining by English Gymnastics, Sport England and County Sport Partnerships, and support given to school trampolining by the BSGA, the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships appears to be relatively unaffected by trampolining being in the Olympics. Also there are more pressing issues and priorities in recreational and school trampolining which prevented the Olympic inclusion of trampolining having a greater impact. For example, at a recreational level there is often a shortage of trampoline clubs to cater for demand and similarly in schools there is often a lack of trampolines and trained teachers.

Figure 9.1 summarises how each of the research questions postulated in section 1.1 has been answered from the preceding discussions.
Table 9.1 – Key findings related to how Olympic inclusion has affected trampolining in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of trampolining</th>
<th>Organisational structure</th>
<th>Funding and support</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Elite trampolining    | ● Elite trampolining is now governed by British Gymnastics.  
                      ● Olympic inclusion has raised the standards of governance and management. E.g., there is a greater degree of formalisation and accountability.  
                      ● This had lead to increased tensions between paid staff and volunteers.  
                      ● Trampolining is felt to have a higher status but there are still concerns about its amateur philosophy.  
                      ● There have been changes to the competition structure with the ultimate aim of increasing GB’s performance on the international scene.  
                      ● Elite trampolining now receives funding from UK Sport and support in kind from the EIS and the BOA.  
                      ● This is channelled towards the elite and extremely ring-fenced.  
                      ● Within the NGB there is an increased focus on elite success due to an incentive contract being in place.  
                      ● Sponsorship has only increased marginally.  
| Recreational trampolining | ● Recreational trampolining is now governed by English Gymnastics.  
                         ● The balance between elite sport and sport for all has swung more in the favour of higher level performers.  
                         ● There is some circumstantial evidence to suggest participation in trampolining has increased but because of difficulties in collecting  
|                         | ● Due to the highly focussed nature of the increased support given to elite trampolining, little or none of this has filtered down to recreational level.  
                         ● Support offered to recreational trampolining by English Gymnastics, Sport England is generally unaffected by Olympic inclusion.  
                         ● There is variation between County Sports Partnerships whether they  
                         | ● Since trampolining has become an Olympic sport it has come under policy directives from UK Sport, the EIS and the BOA.  
                         ● The degree to which British Gymnastics do focus more on disciplines which are in the Olympics is contested.  

participation data and alternative explanations for any rise, it is difficult to determine causality. support Olympic sports more or not. • Sponsorship has not really increased. in the Olympics or not.

| School trampolining |  ● School trampolining is now governed by the BSGA and so is now governed by a schools’ association rather than the NGB for the sport. ● There are many pre-existing difficulties facing school trampolining, such as many teachers’ lack of confidence in teaching trampolining and other areas of gymnastics, which have prevented Olympic inclusion having more impact. |  ● Due to the highly focussed nature of the increased support given to elite trampolining, little or none of this has filtered down to school level either. ● Support offered to school trampolining by the BSGA, the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships is generally unaffected by Olympic inclusion. |  ● The BSGA and English Gymnastics’ aim is to increase participation and quality of provision in school gymnastics regardless of discipline. ● Resource documents such as Next Steps trampolining have been written on the basis of need rather than whether a discipline is in the Olympics or not. ● Policy relating to school sport from organisations such as the Youth Sport Trust and School Sport Partnerships is focussed on increasing the quality and opportunities for children to participate in school sport and is not influenced by whether a sport is in the Olympics or not. |

This research offers an understanding of how the sport of trampolining in England specifically has been affected by Olympic inclusion. According to Hakim (2000), case studies can provide a unique contribution to knowledge. Furthermore, using Yin’s (2000b) classification of case studies trampolining could be through of as being a ‘typical case’. Hence effects of Olympic inclusion, such as changes in UK Sport support and the implications of this with NGBs, could be indicative of more general phenomena.
Although the focus of this research was on the effects of Olympic inclusion on a sport, it has also offered more general contributions to knowledge of the current sporting landscape in England. Firstly, implicit within the study is a systematic consideration of how different parts of the sporting system fit together and the nature of these affiliations. This could be exemplified by the relationship between British Gymnastics and UK Sport being dominated by an imbalance of power; the fractures between elite recreational and school sport; or the strong presence of a target driven culture and the implications of this on decision making in sport. Secondly, Lakendahle (1999) highlighted that trampolining coming under the governance of gymnastics is the first time in Olympic history two International Federations have merged. The implications of this in an English context have been observed and described.

In terms of a contribution to theory, this study has synthesised elements of organisational theory, economics, policy theory and power theory, which have been used to explain and explore the implications of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England. One discipline of theory on its own would have not been sufficient to fully understand the complexities of the situation. The discussion in this thesis provided evidence that the main way in which current theory is deficient is in terms of providing a theoretical model to explain policy formation. None of the current frameworks were felt to be sufficient and often aspects of the stages model, the institutional approach, the multiple streams framework and the ACF were demonstrated within the same organisation. Hence there is a need for a re-assessment of a suitable model to describe policy formation in today’s sporting context.
9.3) Limitations

While it was argued in section 9.2 that this research has made a significant contribution to knowledge of the implications of Olympic inclusion on a sport, as with any study there are also limitations. The main issues which will be discussed in this section are related to the sample, data, validity and reliability, causality and external generalisation. One set of limitations relate to the fact that this is a qualitative piece of work. Therefore, within the case study of trampolining on the basis of the interviews undertaken only analytical generalisation rather than statistical generalisation is possible.

In this study the sample size per se was not crucial since the majority of individuals interviewed fitted Flick's (1998) notion of ‘expert interviewees’ and so could also be thought of as representing their organisation. From a critical realist perspective, there may be differences between how observers see an event according to their existing standpoint and beliefs but there is still ultimately one reality. Devine (2002) argued that while there may be different understandings of reality, it is rare for a sample of interviewees to be totally unrepresentative of the group which they represent. Furthermore, according to Downward (2005) processes behind observable actions should not be attributed to unique individuals but instead are potentially indicative of persisting transcending relationships. One clear limitation inherent in the research sample was that due to access people still involved in trampolining were targeted; those with strongest views against Olympic inclusion or the merger of the British Trampoline Federation with British Gymnastics might have out-migrated from the sport. A further difficulty lies in the nature of the embedded case study of recreational trampolining in the East Midlands. Because staff from only two County Sport Partnerships and two School Sport Partnerships were interviewed it was difficult to obtain a fully coherent picture of the whole country. Ideally significantly more County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships should have been
considered, but because this aspect only constituted a part of this study due pragmatic constraints associated with time and resources available to conduct the empirical stage of the research this was not possible.

The traditional positivist standards, in terms of validity and reliability associated with the natural sciences, are not applicable to qualitative research. However, alternative measures have been employed to ensure that the study was rigorous and credible. According to Ward Schofield (2000), when researching a case study internal validity – i.e. producing a coherent description of the situation – is more pertinent than external validity. To a certain degree this has been achieved by this piece of research since the effects of Olympic inclusion on trampolining have been ascertained. In terms of the reliability of using interviews involving retrospective self-reported data, there are issues of respondent bias, difficulties with articulation and poor memory recall (Cresswell, 2003). Furthermore, from a critical realist perspective there is a distinction between the ‘intransitive’ and ‘transitive;’ i.e. objects and knowledge about the object (Peacock, 2000). There is also an implicit acknowledgement that there is a difference between the situation of enquiry and the language used to describe it. Thus to ensure internal reliability and validity in this study, claims were not made without the support of a chain of evidence involving multiple sources. At a macro level, the quality of qualitative research can also be assessed to evaluate the significance of the research question, appropriateness of the methodologies and contribution to the field (Weed, 2007). For this study these aspects have been justified throughout the thesis. The significance of the research question was discussed in Chapters One and Two, the appropriateness of the methodology was discussed in Chapter Four and the contribution to the field discussed in section 9.2.

In many such studies within the social science it is difficult to ascribe causality rather than just an observed association between factors and events. According to Sayer (2000) this is a particularly pertinent issue
when research is undertaken with a critical realist ontology and epistemology. In this piece of work trying to ascertain which changes in trampolining in England were due to the sport joining the Olympic programme was made more difficult by concurrent related changes, such as the change in NGBs, and also concurrent unrelated changes, such as changes in the local delivery of recreational and school sport through the creation of County Sport Partnerships and School Sport Partnerships. The interview schedules were carefully designed to try to minimise these problems. For example, when interviewing County Sport Partnership staff and School Sport Partnership staff care was taken to identify how the support of trampolining varied from non-Olympic sports or non-Olympic disciplines of gymnastics and also to what degree Olympic recognition influenced their decision making.

A final limitation of this piece of work is that of external generalisation beyond the effects of Olympic inclusion on trampolining. While it has been argued that the case study of trampolining has been investigated as robustly as possible to ascertain the effects of Olympic inclusion on a sport, it is questionable how much of this knowledge and understanding can be applied to other sports. With case studies there is the possibility of naturalistic generalisation or transferability. However, Gomm et.al. (2000) are critical of this approach since it is often unclear what features are universal and which are specific to the particular case. To address the concerns of Gomm et.al. (2000), the effects of Olympic inclusion on other sports in England need to be investigated before any generalities can be identified. Further research will be discussed in more detail in section 9.4.

9.4) Implications for future research

This thesis has investigated the effect of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England to date. It could be thought of as an ‘instrumental’ case study
under Stake’s (2005) classification and thus prompt further case studies to be investigated and thereby suggest aspects of more global cause / effect relationships (Yin, 2003b). The most obvious expansion of the research would be to consider more sports and the implications in other countries. The ideal situation would be to choose a case study sport at the same time the IOC decide to include it in the Olympic programme so it would be possible to investigate it longitudinally in real-time rather than relying on retrospective accounts as has been the case with trampolining. Also the converse could be investigated – the implications for a sport if it had been withdrawn from the Olympic programme. Once a coherent picture of the general or expected effects of Olympic inclusion on sports has been ascertained, then it might be possible to make some normative judgements to help sports which are included in the Olympics in the future avoid pitfalls suffered by other sports. A further dimension would be to consider the implications for sports of being in the Commonwealth Games programme either instead of or in addition to being part of the Olympic Games programme.

Also as discussed in section 9.2, this study has highlighted a number of issues which fall beyond the immediate aims of this study but could provide opportunity for further investigation in the field. Examples of this include: the effects of mergers of NGBs on sports and aspects connected to the current sporting landscape in England such as power imbalances.
Appendix One

An overview of the different disciplines of gymnastics

**Women’s Artistic Gymnastics:** Female gymnasts perform routines individually on four pieces of apparatus, namely the vault, uneven bars, beam and floor. This is what people may typically think of as ‘gymnastics.’

**Men’s Artistic Gymnastics:** Male gymnasts perform routines individually on six pieces of apparatus, namely the floor, pommel horse, rings, vault, parallel bars and high bar.

**Trampolining:** Both men and women compete in trampolining (in separate competitions). Routines on the trampoline are composed of ten skills and must start and finish on the feet. It is also possible to do synchronised trampolining where two or more gymnasts perform the same routine in time with each other, each on their own trampoline.

**Rhythmic Gymnastics:** Female gymnasts perform routines on a floor area using hand apparatus; namely ribbons, hoops, clubs and balls.

**Double Mini-Trampoline (DMT):** A DMT is like two mini trampolines that have been joined in the middle. The first is at an angle and called the mount, from which skills are performed onto the second mini tramp. The second mini tramp is called the spotter, where skills can be performed to land on it again or as a dismount onto the landing mat (British Gymnastics, n.d.). It is competed by men and women.

**Tumbling:** The gymnast gains speed and power by running along a 25-metre track and then performs a series of somersaults and twists. Again there are competitions for male and female gymnasts. Artistic gymnasts also produce tumbling series in their floor routines.
Sports Acrobatics: Gymnastics perform complex acrobatic skills in pairs or groups on a standard gymnastics floor area creating a routine with dance elements too. Standard competitions have categories for men’s pairs, women’s pairs, mixed pairs, women’s trios and men’s fours.

Aerobic Gymnastics: Gymnasts wear aerobic trainers and perform routines which contain jumps, leaps, static supports, variety of push up moves and technical skills, upon a sprung wooden floor. Both male and female gymnasts compete as individuals, in pairs, in trios and in teams of six (British Gymnastics, n.d.).

Team Gym: This is a team competition for clubs. Routines exhibit gymnastic skills in three different disciplines: floor, trampette and tumbling. There are competitions for women’s teams, men’s teams and mixed teams and a team comprises of between six and twelve gymnasts.

Cheerleading: This is the newest discipline under the governance of British Gymnastics. There are competitions in cheerleading, cheer dance, pom dance and street cheer and both men and women compete. Routines involve jumps, dance, tumbling, stunts, cheers and chants (British Gymnastics, n.d.).

Gymnastics and Movement for People with a Disability (GMPD): It involves the coach adapting some skills to ensure people with a disability are able to take part in gymnastic activities. All of the disciplines within British Gymnastics have a role in the promotion and inclusion of people with disabilities (British Gymnastics, n.d.).

General Gymnastics: This offers a varied range of activities suitable for all, comprising of essential gymnastics exercises as well as games, with and without apparatus. It incorporates aspects of the other disciplines. It plays a role within the IOC sport for all activity (British Gymnastics, n.d.).
Appendix Two

A list of past, present and future sports on the programme of the Summer Olympic Games

Current Programme

/ = sport or discipline competed at the specified Games

d = demonstration sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics – Diving</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics – Swimming</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics – Synchro swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics – Water polo</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics (track and field)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing/Kayaking – Flatwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing/Kayaking – Slalom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling – BMX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling – Mountain biking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling – Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling – Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>Field hockey</td>
<td>Football (soccer)</td>
<td>Gymnastics – Artistic</td>
<td>Gymnastics – Rhythmic</td>
<td>Gymnastics – Trampoline</td>
<td>Handball</td>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>Modern pentathlon</td>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>Table tennis</td>
<td>Taekwondo</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Triathlon</td>
<td>Volleyball – Indoor</td>
<td>Volleyball – Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Past Sports**

The following sports and disciplines have previously been part of the Summer Olympic Games program (either as official sports or as demonstration sports), but are no longer on the current program:

\[=\text{sport or discipline competed at the specified Games}\]

\[d=\text{demonstration sport}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport or Discipline</th>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1902</th>
<th>1903</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque pelota</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croquet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating – Figure skating</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>included in the Winter Olympic Games program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice hockey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeu de paume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rackets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roque</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstration Sports

The following sports or disciplines have been demonstrated in Summer Olympic Games for the years shown, but have never been included on the official Olympic program:

- American football (1904 & 1932)
- Ballooning (1900)
- Bowls (1900)
- Field handball (1952)
- Glima (1912)
- Kaatsen (1928)
- La canne (1924)
- Longue paume (1900)
- Roller hockey (1992)
- Savate (1924)
- Water skiing (1972)

- Australian rules football (1956)
- Bowling (1988)
- Budo (1964)
- Finnish baseball (1952)
- Gliding (1936)
- Korfball (1920 and 1928)
- Lifesaving (1900)
- Motorsport (1900)
- Sambo (1980)
- Swedish (Ling) gymnastics (1948)
- Weight training with dumbbells (1904)

The Beijing Olympic Committee received permission to organize a wushu competition, but it will not be considered a demonstration or exhibition sport at the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games.

Information taken from the IOC (n.d.).
Appendix Three

Evaluation Criteria for Sports and Disciplines from the Olympic Programme Commission

1. History of the sport and the IF.
2. Participation of Olympic IFs in Olympic Games and multi-sports Games.
3. Date of the first World Championships.
4. Results of World Championships.
5. Number of affiliated national federations.
6. Participation by national federations in the Olympic Games / World Games qualifying events.
7. Participation by national federations in World Championships and/or qualifying events.
8. Participation by national federations in Junior World Championships and/or qualifying events.
10. Number of affiliated national federations organising national championships.
11. Best athlete participation in the Olympic Games and Olympic Games qualifying events.
12. Spectator attendance at Olympic Games.
13. Spectator attendance at World Championships.
14. Media interest at the Olympic Games.
15. Written press coverage.
16. Television coverage of the Olympic Games and World Championships.
17. New media.
18. IFs’ sponsor and marketing programmes.
19. Sale of television rights by IFs.
20. Athletes’ committee.
22. Presentation of the sport.
23. Impact on the environment.
24. IFs’ anti-doping policies.
25. IFs’ financial status.
26. Strategic planning process.
27. Scope of development programmes.
28. Cost of new competition and training infrastructures.
29. Costs related to equipment at competition and training venues.
30. Costs related to individual sport/discipline technology requirements at competition venues.
31. Security requirements for a sport or discipline.
32. Costs and complexity of television production.
33. General considerations.

(Taken from IOC, 2002.)
Appendix Four

What is a trampoline routine?

In a competition the trampolinist must generally take part in two rounds – the compulsory or set (where moves are prescribed) and the voluntary (where the moves are selected to best demonstrate the competitors ability).

Each routine consists of ten moves or contacts with the bed - for example back drop counts for two moves since the trampolinist lands on their back then their feet. The routine is performed in swing time, i.e. without intermediary straight jumps between moves. This is preceded by up to a minute of jumping to reach sufficient height.

Routines are now scored out of 10 on the basis of form (e.g. correct shape, body tension, consistency of height) with a tariff added to the voluntary routine to take account of the difficulty. There are five judges present and the lowest and highest scores for each routine are dropped and the remaining three added. The compulsory and voluntary scores are then usually combined.

Depending on the competition, a final round may occur where a predetermined number of top scoring competitors perform their voluntary routine again to decide the final ranking.
Appendix Five

British Gymnastics’ self-identified key roles

Performance
- Providing and delivering World Class programmes and UK elite programmes.
- Developing a competition structure and ensuring common standards for competitions.
- Delivery of UK competitions including UK Championships.

Support Services
- Developing and managing coaching/coach education, judging/judge education and volunteer education programmes in conjunction with home countries.
- Providing information and technical expertise.
- Disseminating best practice and benchmarking across the UK.
- Providing cost effective services that would not be economical at a regional or home country level in consultation with home countries.
- Creation of UK programmes for club development e.g. Gym Mark.

Structure
- Providing a UK voice and delivering a common message for the sport, and campaigning on behalf of the home countries.

Policy
- Developing a UK wide vision, strategic plans and policies in partnership with key stakeholders.
- Ensuring that quality is consistent through licensing and development, monitoring and enforcement of rules at UK level.
- Mediating between home countries in discipline issues, grievance issues and appeals where appropriate.
● Developing and monitoring policies and principles for child protection, equity, health and safety, ethics and others in conjunction with home countries
● Provide UK wide information systems and central database management.

Each of the Gymnastics Governing Bodies in the UK agrees to the overall mission for the sport and the following key underlying core values governing gymnastics activity:
● Putting members first.
● Investing in and maximising the potential of members, staff and volunteers.
● Applying the principles of equity.
● Recognise and discharging all duties of care including Health, Safety and Welfare.
● Embracing the principles of Continuous Improvement.
● Embracing the principles of Best Value (Challenge, Consult, Compare, Compete).
● Applying the principles of a drug free sport.
● Applying the principles of LTAD.

(Taken from British Gymnastics, 2005, p.6.)
## Appendix Six

### Analysis of whether the QCA schemes of work for gymnastics can include trampolining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gymnastics unit</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Core tasks</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (KS1)</td>
<td>• A database of ideas for still shapes and balances. • Resource cards with pictures of actions and body shapes, • An appropriate selection of: – low apparatus, e.g. mats and benches, – portable apparatus, e.g. a selection from planks, inclined platforms, padded platforms, A-frames or trestles, ladders, bars, balance beams, tables, – fixed apparatus, e.g. climbing frames, ropes.</td>
<td>No specific mention of a trampoline, and it doesn’t appear to fit in with the types of exemplar apparatus given.</td>
<td>Task 1: Choose two ways of travelling, e.g. walking backwards safely and a roll, and link these to make a short movement phrase which you can remember and perform on the floor. Task 2: Choose three ‘like’ actions, e.g. three different jumps, three rolls, or three ways of taking your weight on your hands, and link these actions to make a short movement phrase on the floor and apparatus. You need to be able to remember and repeat your movement phrase.</td>
<td>A trampoline would only be appropriate for Task 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (KS1)</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td>Task 1: Create and perform a simple sequence, on the floor and using mats, of up to four elements. Task 2: Transfer your sequence to a combination of floor, mats and apparatus. Work with a partner to combine your sequence and your partner’s sequence.</td>
<td>While the tasks could not be completed exactly as written, it would still be possible to create sequences of four moves on the trampoline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (KS2)</td>
<td>• Resource</td>
<td>No specific</td>
<td>Task 1: Using</td>
<td>Task 1 requires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year 4 (KS2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Create a sequence using floor and mats that has up to six elements.</td>
<td>No specific mention of a trampoline, and it doesn’t appear to fit in with the types of exemplar apparatus given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Using floor and apparatus, work with a partner to create and perform a sequence.</td>
<td>No specific mention of a trampoline, but it could fit in with the exemplar ‘fixed high apparatus’ given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Resource cards showing body shapes, balances, and action and movement combinations.
- An appropriate selection of:
  - Low apparatus, e.g. mats and benches,
  - Portable apparatus, e.g. a selection from planks, inclined platforms, padded platforms, A-frames or trestles, ladders, bars, balance beams, tables,
  - Fixed apparatus, e.g. floor and apparatus, create and perform a sequence of contrasting actions.

Neither task is really possible on a trampoline since there is the expectation that the floor will be used and a variety of elements (e.g. balances, jumps and travels) should be included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 5 (KS2)</th>
<th>Year 6 (KS2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **• Resource cards and CD-ROM-based ideas on partner work and sequences.**  
**• An appropriate selection of:**  
– low apparatus, e.g. mats,  
– intermediate apparatus, e.g. benches, planks, vaulting box tops, inclined platforms, padded platforms,  
– portable high apparatus, e.g. vaulting boxes, bar boxes, high tables,  
– fixed high apparatus, e.g. ropes, rope ladders, climbing frames,  
– monitoring equipment, e.g. a pulse rate monitor.  
No specific mention of a trampoline, but it could fit in with the exemplar ‘fixed high apparatus’ given. | **• Resource cards and material from NGBs showing specific agilities and sequences.**  
**• An appropriate selection of:**  
– low apparatus, e.g. mats,  
– intermediate apparatus, e.g. benches, planks, vaulting box tops, inclined platforms, padded platforms,  
As above.  
| **Task 1: Working with a partner or in a small group, and using floor and mats, create and perform a gymnastic sequence of at least eight elements.**  
Task 2: Adapt the floor and mat sequence that you created in Task 1, so that it can be performed on apparatus that includes two sections with different levels. | **Task 1: Using what you know about composing a sequence, create and perform a sequence on floor and apparatus for an audience.**  
Task 2: Adapt the sequence you created in Task 1 so that it can be performed in a small group of three or four, using the floor and apparatus so that each person starts and |

Again there is the expectation that a variety of elements will be included (e.g. balances, jumps and travels) and the partner/group aspect would be difficult on a trampoline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link – Year 6/7 (KS2/3)</th>
<th>Development – Year 7/8 (KS3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- portable high apparatus, e.g. vaulting boxes, bar boxes, high tables, - fixed high apparatus, e.g. ropes, rope ladders, climbing frames.</td>
<td>- Intermediate apparatus, e.g. benches, planks, vaulting box tops, inclined platforms, padded platforms. - Portable high apparatus, e.g. vaulting boxes, bar boxes, high tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finishes in a different place.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: With a partner, create and perform a pair sequence on the floor lasting about one minute. Task 2: Using the ideas and actions that you used in your pairs sequence, join with another pair and combine the two sequences to produce a group sequence either on the floor or using apparatus.</td>
<td>Task 1: In pairs or threes, pupils design and then perform an apparatus sequence of six to eight actions incorporating flight, rolls and balances. Task 2: In pairs or threes, pupils create and then perform a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both tasks necessitate being primarily floor based rather than using a trampoline.</td>
<td>Both would be impossible on a trampoline due to the skill demands (particularly balances).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate – Year 9/10 (KS3/4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Advanced – Year 10/11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Fixed high apparatus, e.g. ropes, rope ladder, climbing frame. | • Olympic apparatus.  
• Digital still and video cameras.  
• Database of techniques and agilities.  
• Resource cards with techniques and short sequences. |
| sequence on the floor, incorporating four to six still partner contact shapes. | 
| While a trampoline is still not specifically mentioned, it would definitely come under ‘Olympic apparatus.’ |
| Task 1: Pupils design, prepare and perform a group sequence on the floor. The sequence must last between 1 and 1.5 minutes, and involve four or five performers.  
Task 2: Pupils design, prepare and perform a group sequence using apparatus. The sequence should last 1 to 1.5 minutes. It should make use of either fixed/Olympic apparatus, or rhythmic gymnastic apparatus. |
| Observation |
| Task 2 could be done using a trampoline as the piece of apparatus, with a display created around it using the floor as well. |
| Pupils work in a small group to plan, organise and perform gymnastic competitions or displays.  
Trampolining would be ideal for this as it perhaps one of the easiest disciplines for pupils to mark, given that each of the ten moves is scored as a decimal out of one mark. |
schedules and simple action plans.

(Details of schemes of work taken from QCA, 2000a and 2000b.)
Appendix Seven

Routines introduced with the new competition structure from October 2008

FIG A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The routine consists of 10 different elements, each with a minimum of 270° somersault rotation.</td>
<td>The voluntary routine has no tariff limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Two elements, marked with an asterisk (*) on the competition card, will have difficulty ratings. The difficulty will be added to the execution score to give the total score for the first routine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. None of these two elements may be repeated in the voluntary round.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The routine consists of 10 different elements, only one skill allowed with less than 270° somersault rotation. Each element meeting the requirement must be marked with an asterisk (*) on the competition card. These requirements cannot be fulfilled by combining them into one element but must be performed as separate elements. 1. One element to front or back, followed by a move with a minimum 450° rotation. AND 2. One somersault of at least 720° rotation. 3. One somersault of at least 360° rotation with a minimum of 540° twist.</td>
<td>The voluntary routine has no tariff limit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten different elements with At least nine somersaults of at least 270° somersault rotation to include: At least one somersault of at least 270° somersault rotation landing on front or back, followed by a move of at least 450° somersault rotation. And one of the following: A back somersault with 360° somersault rotation and a full twist. or A front somersault with 360° somersault rotation and 1½ twists. or A double somersault.</td>
<td>The voluntary routine is subject to an 8.4 tariff limit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten different elements</td>
<td>The voluntary routine is subject to a 6.5 tariff limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least seven somersaults of at least 270° rotation to include one of the following three elements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. One move of at least 270° of somersault rotation, landing on front or back, followed by a move of at least 450° somersault rotation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A back somersault with 360° somersault rotation and a full twist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A front somersault with 360° somersault rotation and 1½ twists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine (E1)</th>
<th>Set Routine (E2)</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td>The voluntary routine may include a maximum of seven somersaults (270° to 450°).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Back somersault (S)</td>
<td>1. Barani (P)</td>
<td>Tariff will be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Straddle jump</td>
<td>2. Straddle jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Full twist jump</td>
<td>3. Back somersault (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tuck jump</td>
<td>4. Barani (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Back somersault (T)</td>
<td>5. ½ twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Back somersault to seat (T)</td>
<td>6. Tuck jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ½ twist to feet</td>
<td>7. 1½ twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ½ twist jump</td>
<td>8. Pike jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pike jump</td>
<td>9. ¾ front somersault (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Barani (S or P)</td>
<td>10. To feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine (F1)</th>
<th>Set Routine (F2)</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td>The voluntary routine may include a maximum of five somersaults (270° to 450°).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Back somersault (T)</td>
<td>1. Barani (T)</td>
<td>Tariff will be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seat drop</td>
<td>2. ½ twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ½ twist to feet</td>
<td>3. Straddle jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tuck jump</td>
<td>4. Back somersault (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Barani (T)</td>
<td>5. Full twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Straddle jump</td>
<td>6. Tuck jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Front drop</td>
<td>7. Back drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To feet</td>
<td>8. ½ twist to feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Front somersault (T)</td>
<td>10. Back somersault (P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Club G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine (G1)</th>
<th>Set Routine (G2)</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Back somersault (T)</td>
<td>1. ½ twist to front drop</td>
<td>The voluntary routine may include a maximum of three somersaults (270° to 450°), and two body landings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Straddle jump</td>
<td>2. To feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ½ twist to seat drop</td>
<td>3. Straddle jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ½ twist to feet</td>
<td>4. Full twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ½ twist jump</td>
<td>5. Pike jump</td>
<td>No tariff will be awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Full twist jump</td>
<td>7. ½ twist to feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tuck jump</td>
<td>8. Tuck jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 3/4 Front Somersault (S or P)</td>
<td>9. ½ twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To feet</td>
<td>10. Front somersault (T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Club H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td>The voluntary routine may include a maximum of two body landings and a maximum of one somersault (270° to 450° degrees).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ½ twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Front drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pike jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ½ twist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Straddle jump</td>
<td>No tariff will be awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Back drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tuck jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Full twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Club I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Routine</th>
<th>Voluntary routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jump (arm set)</td>
<td>There is no voluntary routine at this level. Competitors must repeat the set routine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Seat drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ½ twist jump</td>
<td>No tariff will be awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Straddle jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Full twist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pike Jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ½ twist jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tuck jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Front drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Eight

An example of an interview schedule used

This was used for actors from East Midlands County Sport Partnerships.

Key questions:

● I have read about CSPs, but could you describe what support you provide for sport in the Leicestershire in terms of your personal job remit?
  - How was this decided? Who decided it? Was there any consultation?
  - The information on CSPs discusses the three main focuses of young people, club development and workforce development. Is the focus just on youth sport or do you consider the participation of the wider population too?
  - How much of this is lead by London having the 2012 Olympics?

● Does whether a sport is in the Olympics effect how you support it?
  - What other criteria do you use to decide which sports receive support? Public opinion is used in part?
  - Do some sports receive more support than others? How was this decided?
  - Is there more pressure to deliver in Olympic sports?

● What support have you given the sport of trampolining?
  - E.g. financial, support for coaching programmes etc, building new facilities or paying for equipment.
  - How does this fit with the BG One Stop Plan?
  - More specifically, how does it relate to Long Term Athlete Development and Trampoline Performance Pathways? Are these imposed by UK Sport?
  - Are you involved in talent ID schemes?
  - How do external directives effect what you focus on?

● What conditions must trampolining fulfil to continue to receive this support?
  - Is this the same for all sports?
  - Is this the County Sports Partnership’s decision or agreed in consultation with British Gymnastics or local clubs?
  - How do you seek compliance?

● How does your support of trampolining vary from other disciplines of gymnastics?
  - The other disciplines are artistic, rhythmic, tumbling, sports acrobatics and DMT.
● While BG supports all disciplines of gymnastics, it says in the One Stop Plan it gives special priority to Olympic disciplines. What evidence do you see of this with respect to trampolining?

● BGs mission statement recognises the importance of all involved in gymnastics reaching their full potential. To what extent do you think this is true?
  - Do all disciplines get the same attention?
  - An all abilities?

● Game Plan and Sporting Future for All discuss the twin-track approach of increasing participation and increasing international success. How does that affect your work?

● Do you think whether a sport in the Olympics has any effect on whether the there is more emphasis on elite athletes or sport for all within the governing body structure?
  - In general, do Olympic sports have better talent development programmes?

● What do you know about trampolining in schools in the region?
  - Lessons, extra-curricular activities etc.
  - What effects this provision?
  - How does it vary from other disciplines of gymnastics?
  - How well do you think school trampolining is integrated into BGs plans given that The British Schools Gymnastics Association is quite separate from the BG competition structure for trampolining? Might the UK School Games change this?
  - In the One Stop Plan there is the aim to increase the number of teachers able to coach. Which disciplines? How does the coaching course differ from the normal one?
  - Some School Sport Partnerships have found that gymnastics/trampolining is one of the main areas that schools require support with. Why do you think this is?

● Do you know why gymnastics and trampolining were not ‘active sports’ but now BG has indicated a commitment to work with CSPs to deliver its performance plan?
  - Why BG chosen to get involved now?
  - Do you think that as the first all encompassing development plan by BG, the stakeholders now recognise the importance of partnership?
  - What benefits does being part of the CSP bring to the organisation?

● Do you perceive CSPs to work in true partnership with agencies such as Sport England and National Governing Bodies, or is there a hierarchy of control and reliance on funding/support systems?
  - Are there asymmetries in power? How is it manifest?
- Does each institution have its own specific clear-cut role?
- How have organisations such as BG adapted to the existence of CSPs? Role of managers?

● Literature suggests that in sports organisations causes of conflict are elite sport versus sport for all, sub-units, volunteers and organisational change. What do you think about this?
  - Do you see any conflicts in BG regarding trampolining?
  - Have you had any conflict with British Gymnastics, the East Midlands Trampoline Technical Committee or local clubs regarding trampolining?

● How are you accountable to the government and ‘customers’?
  - What evidence of programme viability or performance measurement do you use? Who is this for?
  - As an organisation do you receive any sort of incentive contract or continued funding based on meeting targets? Does this alter your focus?
  - Do you do things you would rather not due to external pressure? From whom?

● What capacity do you have to make a difference or change the pattern of events?
  - What events lead up to policy change? Do you make many localised policy making decisions?
  - Who chooses what is on the decision making agenda? How is it chosen?
  - How do people influence decisions? (Hierarchical authority, resource control, network centrality.)
  - Are there different group with radically different views of what is important? How are these reconciled?

● Finally, overall what do you think might be the effects of Olympic inclusion on trampolining in England?
  - Do you think Olympic inclusion matters?
  - Do you think it actually has any effect on recreational participants?
  - Have other things had more effect on trampolining? If so what?
Appendix Nine

Pre October 2008 routines which were used in the old competition structure

Ladies, Mens

As per FIG World "A"
10 different skills each with a minimum 270° somersault rotation.
Two of the elements must have a combined minimum difficulty of 2.3.
The difficulty for these two elements will be added to the execution score.
Both of these elements must be asterisked on the performer's tariff sheet.
Neither of these elements should be repeated in the voluntary routine, or the performer will lose the difficulty score for them.

Grade 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 11</th>
<th>Under 13</th>
<th>Under 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back SS (P)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barani (P)</td>
<td>barani (S)</td>
<td>barani (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>back SS (P)</td>
<td>full twisting back SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back SS to seat (T)</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>barani (P)</td>
<td>back SS (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>barani (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
<td>crash dive (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barani (T)</td>
<td>crash dive (S)</td>
<td>barani ball out (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front SS (P)</td>
<td>barani ball out (T)</td>
<td>front SS (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under 17, 17+, Under 19, 19+
As per FIG World "B"
10 different skills to include:
9 with minimum 270° somersault rotation
1. One element to front or back
2. One element from front or back in conjunction with (1)
3. One double somersault (front or back) with/without twist
4. One element with minimum 540° twist
Note, elements cannot be combined to fulfil requirements 1-4.
### Grade 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 11</th>
<th>Under 13</th>
<th>Under 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back SS (P)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>barani (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
<td>back SS (P)</td>
<td>back SS (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barani (T)</td>
<td>barani (P)</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>barani (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back SS to seat (T)</td>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>crash dive</td>
<td>crash dive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front SS (P)</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>barani ball out (T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Under 17, Under 19, 19+**

10 different skills to include:

1. 9 skills with minimum 270° rotation
2. 1 skill landing on either the back or front
3. from the above landing - somersault with minimum 450° rotation
4. either 1 somersault with min 360° rotation and min 360° twist
   or 1 somersault with min 720° somersault rotation

*Note, both of (4) may be incorporated into the routine*

### Grade 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 9, Under 11</th>
<th>Under 13</th>
<th>Under 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back SS (P)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back SS to seat (T)</td>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
<td>back SS (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>barani (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full twist jump</td>
<td>barani (T)</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barani (T)</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>back SS (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>back SS to seat (T)</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>crash dive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front SS (P)</td>
<td>front SS (P)</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**U17, 17+**

10 different skills to include:

1. 7 skills with a min of 270° of somersault rotation,
2. One skill from 1) landing on either the front or back and from this skill one somersault with a min of 450° of rotation, or one somersault with a minimum of 360° of somersault rotation and 360° of twist.
### Grade 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 9, Under 11</th>
<th>Under 13, Under 15</th>
<th>U17, 17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back SS (T)</td>
<td>Back SS (P)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back SS to seat (T)</td>
<td>back SS to seat (T)</td>
<td>back SS (to feet) (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>seat drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back drop</td>
<td>back drop</td>
<td>barani (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front SS (T)</td>
<td>front SS (T)</td>
<td>front SS (P)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grade 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 9, Under 11</th>
<th>Under 13, Under 15</th>
<th>U17, 17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full twist jump</td>
<td>Back SS (T)</td>
<td>Back SS (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seat drop</td>
<td>seat drop</td>
<td>seat drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to seat drop</td>
<td>½ twist to seat drop</td>
<td>½ twist to seat drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back drop</td>
<td>back drop</td>
<td>back drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front SS (T)</td>
<td>front SS (T)</td>
<td>front SS (T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grade 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 9, Under 11</th>
<th>Under 13, Under 15</th>
<th>Under 17, 17+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front drop to feet</td>
<td>Front drop to feet</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
<td>straddle jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>½ twist jump</td>
<td>½ twist to seat drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seat drop</td>
<td>seat drop</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to seat drop</td>
<td>½ twist to seat drop</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
<td>back drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>pike jump</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back drop</td>
<td>back drop</td>
<td>tuck jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full twist jump</td>
<td>½ twist to feet</td>
<td>full twist jump</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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