

The attraction, retention, and transition of elite sport development pathways in surfing in Australia

Author

Sotiriadou, Popi, Thrush, Andrew, Hill, Brad

Published

2023

Journal Title

Managing Sport and Leisure

Version

Accepted Manuscript (AM)

DOI

[10.1080/23750472.2023.2190755](https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2023.2190755)

Rights statement

© 2023. This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the following article, accepted for publication in Managing Sport and Leisure. Popi Sotiriadou, Andrew Thrush & Brad Hill (2023) The attraction, retention, and transition of elite sport development pathways in surfing in Australia, Managing Sport and Leisure, DOI: 10.1080/23750472.2023.2190755. It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/425177>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

The attraction, retention, and transition of elite sport development pathways in surfing in Australia

Abstract

Purpose: Successful athlete development is subject to stakeholder involvement with the delivery of development pathways. This paper explores the role of stakeholders on elite surfer development during its transition to an Olympic sport.

Research methods: Semi-structured interviews with 26 staff from surfing organisations were used to explore stakeholder involvement in elite surfer pathways.

Findings: Local clubs are responsible for supporting talented surfers to progress to higher levels of competition. Their limited access to support from other stakeholders is problematic because clubs lack capacity to provide surfers with the opportunities to succeed, and on their pursuit of competing at the Olympics, surfers ‘drop out’.

Practical implications: The important role that local clubs play on athletes’ Attraction-Retention-Transition-Nurturing (ARTN) processes and success, points to the need to revisit the level of support clubs receive, especially if they are to continue laying the foundations and underpin surfers’ success at the Olympics.

Research contribution: A novel outlook on the ARTN framework has been gained by illustrating the need for structural changes on stakeholder involvement with surfer development as that need is brought on to a typically lifestyle sport transitioning into an Olympic sport

Keywords: Attraction, Retention, Transition and Nurturing Process; Elite Sport and Athlete Development; Sport Development Pathways; Olympic Games; Stakeholder Analysis

Introduction

Lifestyle sports refers to a range of informal and thrill-seeking urban and rural sporting activities such as surfing and snowboarding, that are different to traditional, rule-bound, competitive, and institutionalised sports (Wheaton, 2004). The popularity of some of these sports (e.g., sports climbing, skateboarding) has increased rapidly resulting in their inclusion as Olympic sports (Sotiriadou et al., 2022). However, very little knowledge exists on the developmental pathways for athletes in lifestyle sports. Lifestyle sports are not necessarily delivered or managed like traditional sports and do not always have the same homogenous developmental policies, structures, and practices (De Bosscher et al., 2009). Empirical evidence is required to help understand elite development pathways in lifestyle sports (Newland & Kellett, 2012; Sotiriadou et al., 2022), and to identify and address areas of weakness. Advancing knowledge in this area is important given lifestyle sports are in their embryonic stages of Olympic sport consumption and opportunities now exist for countries and governments to gain benefits through the success of lifestyle sport athletes. Investigation of the development system can provide insights into how sports organisations can improve their effectiveness in delivering athlete development (Sotiriadou & Wicker, 2013).

This study examines the role of stakeholders in the elite pathway (who they are, what they do, and the effect of their involvement) from an organisational perspective. We highlight the role that various stakeholders play in supporting the sport development process, as surfing is one of the lifestyle sports that have been included in the Olympic Games and it is consequently required to respond to athletes' developmental needs to qualify and excel at the Olympic Games (Wheaton & Thorpe, 2018). We employed the *attraction, retention, transition and nurturing* (ARTN) framework (Sotiriadou et al., 2008). The ARTN framework is appropriate for investigating inputs and outputs from various stakeholders who implement strategies throughout the elite surfer development system. The research question

in this study is “How does the Australian sport system and organisations support the development of elite athletes in surfing?”

Study context

Participation in non-mainstream sports has significantly increased during this century (Wheaton, 2013). These sports are more likely to be individualistic, and participants perceive their participation as a lifestyle choice. These ‘lifestyle sporting’ activities have become a high growth sector (Kellett & Russell, 2009; Wheaton, 2013). For example, BMX became Olympic sports in London in 2012 (Newland & Kellett, 2012). The lifestyle sports of surfing, skateboarding and climbing, became Olympic sports at the Tokyo 2020 Games. Breakdancing will be included in the 2024 Paris Olympic Games. This inclusion of lifestyle sports in the Olympic Games attracts governments’ attention (Bernard & Busse, 2004).

Surfing is considered a lifestyle sport (McCuaig et al., 2015) with values based on a subculture of free spiritedness and ‘unstructuredness’ (Stranger, 2010). Surfing is a multi-billion-dollar industry with huge clothing and merchandise brands, including Billabong, Quiksilver and Rip Curl which support world surfing contests. Surfing has been labelled an ‘action sport’ (see Wheaton, 2013; Wheaton & Thorpe, 2018). It attracts sponsorship deals from the major surf brands because of its exposure on television, and in particular, social media outlets such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter (Thorpe, 2016). The use of social media by fans has dramatically increased viewer audiences. Australia is one of the greatest surfing nations and the largest surf country in the Southern Hemisphere. It is one of the most loved sports that enriches communities and the Australian culture (Surfing Australia, 2020). Since the early 1970s, Australia’s surf culture started to leave its mark and played an important role in professionalising, commercialising, and transforming surfing into a competitive sport.

Athlete development stakeholder roles and relationships

Sotiriadou et al. (2014, p. 5) identified two key types of sport development stakeholders: (a) “individuals or organisations that support sport *financially or operationally* through policy development, programs and other development strategies”, and (b) “organisations or individuals that help *implement* these policies and strategies”. This suggests that sport development stakeholders have distinct roles and stakeholders can include governments and statutory authorities, sport organisations, athletes, coaches, parents, volunteers, sponsors and sport development officers. In Australia, Sport Australia (SA) formally known as the Australian Sports Commission (the government body responsible for sport strategy and funding in Australia) establishes policy direction and manages delivery processes via national sport organisations (NSOs) (Green & Houlihan, 2006). Stakeholders and their levels of involvement critically affect the way a sport develops.

The relationships between stakeholders and the different strategies they employ can be crucial to the success (or failure) of any sport (Brouwers et al., 2015a; Sotiriadou, 2009). Moreover, the effectiveness of an NSO’s athlete development strategy affects athletes’ introduction to a sport, their decisions to continue in it, and their progression to advanced levels of competition (Sotiriadou et al., 2008).

Major stakeholders are non-profit sporting organisations, including community sport clubs, state sporting organisations (SSOs) and NSOs. They aim to provide opportunities for individuals of diverse ages to participate (Donnelly & Kidd, 2003). In Australia, elite sport development usually starts through a community-based club system that is interrelated with high performance institutes as athletes progress. It is supported predominantly through government funding (Hoye et al., 2011; Newland & Kellett, 2012; Sotiriadou et al., 2008). Community clubs are interested in creating an environment where members can develop interpersonal relationships and access training and tournaments. SSOs are the governing bodies that represent affiliated leagues, associations, clubs and participants. SSOs are

affiliated with the NSOs of their respective sports and generally work closely with state/territory government sport and recreation departments. NSOs, once affiliated, are recognised by Sport Australia as the pre-eminent bodies for the development of their sports and may be eligible to receive funding. According to Sotiriadou (2013, p. 517) the “need to continually deliver success has over the years encouraged NSOs to improve their sport development practices and elite pathways and formulate sport development plans and strategies”.

Sport development frameworks

Sports organisations employ sport development frameworks to design elite athlete development pathways. For instance, many sport organisations utilise various versions of the sport development pyramid (Eady, 1993) including the Participation Model of Sport Development (Cote et al., 2003) in which participation levels decrease as performance and competition rates increase. The philosophy driving the pyramid approach is that elementary movement skills underpin participation at the grassroots level. These basic skills improve in increasingly challenging and competitive environments as the individual progresses towards elite-level competition. The pyramid implies a linear pathway to elite athlete development, but evidence suggests that pyramids do not account for all sport development processes (de Bosscher et al., 2013) and they assume all participants will follow the same sequential pathway.

Such frameworks do not provide an understanding of, or insight into, sport development processes from a stakeholder perspective and so they do not enable an exploration of the ways in which organisations support athletes (Sherry et al., 2017). Identifying which individuals or organisations are involved in sport development, the ways in which they are involved, and the outcomes they achieve, is vital to the development of athletes (Sotiriadou, 2013) and these frameworks are not designed to do that. Consequently,

there is an link missing between athlete development frameworks and NSOs, SSOs, clubs and other stakeholders (Greyson et al., 2010).

Given that elite sport development pathways are complex (De Bosscher et al., 2009), generic development frameworks fall short in reflecting sport-specific pathways (Greyson et al., 2010; Sotiriadou et al., 2008). This study uses surfing to address some of these inadequacies, and to examine how sport organisations and key stakeholders develop, deliver and support programs and strategies at different elite athlete stages. The ARTN framework was used because it is a well-established framework that offers insight into sport development from an organisational perspective (Brouwers et al., 2015b).

Understanding the elite development processes of lifestyle sports like surfing is important given some of them have been accepted into the Olympics. Such sports face the challenge of transitioning to Olympic sports and must prove they have formal structures in place (Bliznevskiy et al., 2016). They need to attract governmental funding but may lack established processes for developing elite athletes (Newland & Kellett, 2012).

The attraction, retention, transition and nurturing (ARTN) framework

The ARTN framework is based on three interrelated sport development processes: *attraction*, *retention/transition* and *nurturing* (Sotiriadou et al., 2008). It maps the sport development processes involved in athletes' entry into a sport, their continued participation and their move towards more advanced levels of training and competition. The ARTN also enables investigation of the human and financial input of various stakeholders and offers an organisational perspective on which stakeholders are involved, how they are involved, at which level, and with what outcomes.

The attraction process involves stakeholder input to promote people's awareness of available sports programs and their benefits, and to inspire them to join sport clubs. The aim is to attract a large number of grassroots participants, some of whom will become elite

participants (Sotiriadou, 2013; Sotiriadou et al., 2022). Based on Sotiriadou and Shilbury (2013), the attraction process also endeavors to nurture large numbers of young participants that have the potential to become elite performers. Some people play sport without any desire to ascend to a higher level of participation. Others though, given the opportunity, age, and talent, may transition to higher levels of competition and even become elite athletes who reach the top of their athletic career. These opportunities to ascent to higher levels of sport participation or to maintain peoples' interest and engagement with sport and physical activity are collectively referred to as pathways. Sport development pathways can result on the retention/transition process (Sotiriadou et al., 2016). This process is about keeping participants in the sport system and identifying talented athletes and developing them through to the highest echelons of their sport. Continued sport participation hinges on facilitators and constraints, which may change throughout an individual's life (Sotiriadou et al., 2020). The transition process offers opportunities to enable gifted athletes to attain the skills required and achieve elite sporting success. Like the pathways for retention or transition, there are pathways (e.g., elite athlete welfare programs) that lead to nurturing participation or elite athlete success. Through the nurturing process sport development stakeholders support participants to engage in the sport and develop an ethos of continued participation, improvement and success. In this process relevant stakeholders coordinate their efforts with the goal of supporting athletes to achieve success at the highest levels (Brouwers et al., 2015b).

The ARTN framework has been applied to examine development processes in cross-cultural contexts (Thomson et al., 2010), in development processes (e.g., focus on one of the ARTN processes) (Sotiriadou et al., 2014), in specific strategies (e.g., facilities) (Sotiriadou et al., 2016), and in sports for specific populations (e.g., people with disabilities) (Darcy & Dowse, 2013). The present study makes a theoretical contribution on the development

processes of a non-traditional sport, surfing. Further, the use of the ARTN framework demonstrates how sport development is more multifaceted and encompassing than previously assumed.

Methods

A qualitative approach provided the appropriate research design (Baxter & Jack, 2008) for exploring the pathways for the development of elite surfers and the roles of stakeholders. The research question led to a rich qualitative analysis that allowed for multiple aspects of the topic to be explored.

Data Collection

Permission was sought from Surfing Australia to invite the staff, volunteers and affiliates of surfing organisations to take part in the study. During 2020 we obtained the details of potential participants from organisations' websites and sent 132 emails detailing the aims and benefits of the study and inviting participation. Twenty-six individuals agreed to participate in interviews. They included Surfing Australia staff, high performance program and sport development managers (de-identified as SA 1 and SA 2), chief operating officers from SSOs (SS 1-4), and surfboard riding club executives (Club 1-20).

Semi-structured interviews allowed participants to speak freely and enabled the researcher to ask for deeper explanations and investigate ambiguities (Smith et al., 2020). The questions were based on the components (i.e., stakeholders and strategies) of the ARTN framework (Sotiriadou et al., 2008). The interviews identified stakeholders and examined their involvement in elite sport pathways. Some example questions: "How is an individual attracted to surfing?", "Who is involved in elite surfer development?", "What roles do each of these stakeholders play in elite surfer development, and at what stage?", "What programs or strategies have been developed for elite surfer development?". The interviews lasted between 33 and 68 minutes and were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim by the researcher.

An inductive approach guided the data collection. Starting with the initial data from the first interview, propositions were created based on the research question. These propositions were used to modify or create new interview questions for the next respondent. This allowed the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the managerial processes involved in the sport development system (Creswell, 1998). When ideas surfaced from respondents, an inductive analytical process was used to assess them. This process also guided further sampling (Sotiriadou & Shilbury, 2010). This inductive data collection process meant that after each step in the data analysis, new interview questions emerged, providing deeper and richer inquiry.

Data Analysis

After each interview was transcribed, thematic analysis of data created open codes based on patterns and themes that emerged. Thematic analysis is widely used in qualitative research. Themes emerge from the data that is gathered and are not imposed or predetermined (Sotiriadou et al., 2020). During the interviews, field notes were taken about the meanings and patterns that emerged. Field notes were descriptive and captured as much information as possible, allowing recall of interview activities and content. Field notes were included with transcribed interview data and coded manually into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (Guest et al., 2012). The open coding of data incorporated all the surfer development stakeholders and their roles, and it included all the strategies that facilitate elite surfer pathways.

After the open coding process was complete, data that were deemed similar were combined through axial coding (Sotiriadou & Shilbury, 2010). The final phase of analysis – selective coding – examined the relationships between the codes to identify higher order themes and sub-themes.

Results

The results revealed numerous stakeholders who are directly involved with elite surfer development at different stages. They include family members, friends and schools/teachers, learn-to-surf-schools, local clubs, coaches, sponsors, SSOs and the NSO (Surfing Australia). Such stakeholders are typically found within any sport development system. Of interest, however, were the themes of *parents* and *social media* that emerged as key to surfing development. Parents were found to provide significant levels of support to their sons/daughters. Respondents explained that not all elite surfers were ‘lucky’ enough to have the support of coaches, sponsors, or higher order development stakeholders. Therefore, they needed large amounts of parental involvement to reach elite levels. Social media emerged as a contributor to attracting, retaining and transitioning surfers through the sport development pathway. Social media and its instantaneous, intimate and interactive nature have made various platforms (e.g., Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) perfect vehicles to fuel sporting aspirations. Detailed results for stakeholders in various processes in the ARTN follow.

Attraction

Family, friends, school/teachers, learn-to-surf-schools, and board riding clubs were found to be key stakeholders in the attraction process for young surfers. Family and friends were significant in attracting people to surfing. Parental and sibling influence is explained in the following example from Club 3: “A lot of it depends on family history. If you have a parent or sibling and it’s their lifestyle choice, then they’re naturally going to encourage the kid to get started. You do see a lot of dads and occasionally mums out in the water with their kids.” Respondents said parents played an integral part in the initial experience and continued development of surfers, particularly regarding financial and transport support. Some respondents said that access to the beach was a major consideration and children relied on their parents to provide transport.

Some respondents indicated not all young surfers had parents or siblings who were surfers and had been attracted to surfing through friends or programs at their schools.

However, not all schools offer surfing programs. Club 6 commented: “Some of the schools that are located near the beach have surfing as a subject but not all of them ... It all depends on the teachers at the school – if they’re motivated to run the program, then it’ll happen”

(Club 6). Club 12 agreed and explained:

It’s probably more about the teachers they have got because if they are not surfers, they won’t be confident enough to take kids to a program like that, whereas if you’ve got teachers who are surfers, they drive surfing. So, I think it comes down to how much teachers are willing to push the sport. But unfortunately, if the principal is not interested then the school won’t include a surfing program.

Club 14 said: “[Surfing] is not as big a sport here as it is in Queensland or New South Wales and we don’t have surf in the capital city so it’s not seen as sport that is taken up readily”. He went on to say, “Surfing here, unless you’re willing to actually really invest in learning, it’s just going to be an experience, not a sport”.

Learn-to-surf schools were also mentioned as key stakeholders in the attraction phase. Some privately owned learn-to-surf schools are affiliated with Surfing Australia as they deliver Surfing Australia’s “SurfGrom” program. SA 2 said the “SurfGrom” program caters for 5- to 12-year-olds and is focused on developing fundamental skills such as balance, agility, and coordination. “The SurfGrom program is recognised by Surfing Australia as the first step in the pathway for competitive surfing in Australia” (SA 2). The programs generally have the same structure and provide the same surf education. Depending on the availability of the private companies, programs are also offered to school groups. The programs are promoted via the NSOs, the SSOs and the private companies’ websites.

Respondents noted local clubs are the grassroots of Australian surfing and all children who have become elite surfers started in these clubs. Respondents agreed that clubs were vital in the attraction phase. Club 9 said “a lot of kids who were mates started surfing at a club level and then they built on that. So, the building blocks start at a club”. Club 14 said that “when it comes to developing world tour surfers, it is because of the pathways through the clubs ...we’re talking grassroots, the real heroes of Australian surfing”. Club contests teach the skills needed to pursue a competitive career and demonstrate the benefits of the support and social relationships offered by club membership.

Interestingly, club presidents do not see it as their role to attract members. One respondent commented: “Do we advertise to get members? No, we don’t have to. People just turn up. They usually know someone in the club. There is no need to advertise.” When questioned further on whether advertising would attract more members and provide opportunities to tell surfers of the benefits for joining a club, respondents were perplexed, commenting: “surfers know what the benefits are for joining a club; you get to hang out with other surfers and have contests every now and then.”

When asked about the support clubs receive to attract young members by offering junior programs or general ongoing operational expenses, financial or otherwise, respondents said it depended on the size and location of the club, and the networking capacities of its members. For example, Club 2 said his club was financially viable because it was in a ‘recognised’ surfing area, its membership base was relatively large, and members were current or past elite or professional surfers and had relationships with major surf brand companies that provided significant amounts of merchandise and sometimes monetary support. However, smaller clubs (usually those not near a major city) relied solely on membership fees. Two clubs had applied for and received local government grants that were used for purchasing competition equipment and junior coaching programs. Club 6 explained

that his club had received a government grant because a member of the organising committee was experienced in seeking grants. Club 6 also knew that other clubs did not do this because they were unaware or inexperienced in applying for grants. One respondent said the father of one of his most promising junior club members had moved the family closer to the beach and changed his job to facilitate his daughter's pursuit of a professional surfing career.

Finally, many of the respondents mentioned the role that social media plays in the attraction process. They said young individuals had been exposed to surfing via video posts by talented surfers on platforms such as Instagram and Facebook. The exciting nature of surfing had prompted young people to become involved through learn-to-surf programs and local clubs.

Retention

The results showed that the major stakeholder group involved in the retention of surfers in the development system is the *board riding clubs*. Some clubs, but not all, offer junior coaching programs and most provide opportunities to experience competition. Club 9 believed that if his/her club had not run coaching programs it would have been difficult to retain some members because if they were interested in a professional career they needed coaches and were willing to join another club to get one.

In many clubs, some experienced members had undertaken accredited coaching courses provided by SSOs and recognised under the Australian Government's National Coaching Accreditation Scheme. Club 2 explained his/her club commenced offering after-school training for juniors who were charged a small fee. Club 2 said that the training sessions were complicated to organise because "they depended largely on the availability of the coaches". Club 11 said his/her club's coaching program as "not only a service to assist motivated members to achieve higher standards but also a promotion tool that provides quality experiences to existing and potential members." Club 11 said: "Some of the smaller

clubs don't have coaches for whatever reason, so some of their members join our club instead so that they can progress their surfing using our coaches". Club 1 commented that s/he knew of a few junior members who had come from another club because "we offer development coaching programs for free, so parents are stoked and bring their kids to our club and they stay here".

Some respondents explained that offering coaching programs depended on whether there were qualified coaches who were current members and whether they were available to offer coaching programs. In other words, the club could offer a coaching program one year but not the following year. Club 9 explained that "this can be very frustrating, not only for us [the club] ... but also the members and their parents who are keen for their kid to get the coaching".

Besides offering social connections, the other major aim of clubs is to provide competitions where members are able to test their skills in an informal setting. For example, Club 11 stated "When you join a club, you get to belong to a group of like-minded people who compete together to have fun rather than high level competition and that's where most of them form their friendship circles". Club 8 said club competitions were very important to some members because it was where they could push themselves to be better, especially at the junior level. All clubs run competitions, however the number and frequency varied, usually depending on the size of the membership base.

A surprising sub-theme from data on the retention process was the role of social media. Most respondents discussed social media. Club 2 commented that social media is a way of gaining valuable exposure to potential sponsors and allowing surfers to gain financial support, with some making a living out of it. "The pathway for surfers now is to build a social media presence and then try and get sponsored and try and save up enough money to enter a WQS [World Qualifying Series] event" (Club 2). Club 13 said sponsors take notice of

surfers' performances when they are posted on platforms like Instagram. One respondent said s/he knew surfers from her/his club who had not entered any competition beyond the club-level ones and were earning a living by posting short surfing films of themselves while promoting their sponsor's logo on their surfing equipment and clothing. Club 6 said they had surfers who no longer aimed to be on the professional circuit but were financially well off as they were posting their surf travels from around the world and showcasing themselves riding big waves. Our data suggests that social media has a strong influence in retaining surfers in the sport development process but the pathways within that process have become more diverse, with some surfers no longer prioritising competition but using their skills to showcase other elements of surfing. Social media has a role in all stages of the ARTN framework and in developing hybrid pathways, a feature which appears unique to lifestyle sports.

Transition

Surfing competitions served a key role in transitioning surfers to higher levels of the sport. However, most competitions were organised and conducted within and sometimes between board riding clubs. A limited number of junior competitions were organised by the NSO and conducted by SSOs, and they served to identify talented athletes. If junior surfers performed well in these NSO-organised competitions, there was the potential of being sponsored by a third-party organisation that could possibly provide the financial support needed to transition to the junior professional circuit. Competitions are also conducted by private event operators.

For all NSO and private events, anyone could enter the competition, but there was always a limited number of places available, and entries were accepted on a 'first-in first-served' basis. This meant the better surfers competed against one another as event positions filled quickly. The respondents maintained that to be identified as talented and transition to

higher levels, it was critical that surfers continually entered SSO-run events or third-party competitions, but the problem was you had to be quick to gain a position. It is in these events “that you can be recognised or get exposure to potential sponsors and Surfing Victoria (SSO)” (SS 2). These are amateur competitions, and their main objective is to identify outstanding junior surfers. However, the question is, given the limited number of entry positions available, do these events have the best talent on display? Club 14 commented:

The junior competitions are vital where young surfers can be recognised and possibly pick up a sponsor. It is really tough financially to progress to the next step which is the Pro Junior competitions if you don't have a sponsor. If you don't have a sponsor to help out with expenses, then it is left up to the surfer or the parents to pay which can be very expensive.

Surfers who perform well at these competitions may also be nominated by SSOs to attend “Talent ID Camps” run by the NSO at its high-performance centre, Surfers under 16 are invited to fully funded NSO camps where they are coached and assessed by top coaches. The aim of the Talent ID program is to foster the development of the country's most promising junior surfers to help the future success of Australia on the world stage. SA 1 explained that the camps are a great opportunity to teach young surfers daily training programs and allow staff to identify potential candidates for high-performance pathway programs. An SSO respondent commented on the NSO's identification program:

Part of the process we use for selecting kids in the junior teams, is there are about four times a year that our kids, the better ones, can qualify for a trip to the High-Performance Centre as part of a talent identification program that Surfing Australia runs in various forms. So, we're (SSO) asked to nominate, and the kids get a free trip for three or four days of high-performance coaching.

A club executive commented that “these camps are few and far between and are only on for about a week and no-one knows how kids get selected”.

A key finding was that it was difficult to ascertain how the SSOs selected the athletes, and from which events. Some club executives did not know how surfers were selected for these camps and at what events, while others had some knowledge about the selection process. For example, Club 12 said “The juniors who do well in the state championships can be selected but they can also be spotted in other competitions but I’m not sure which ones”. When asked to explain, Club 12 said “We [the clubs] don’t really have much to do with anything when the kids compete outside the club. Sometimes we know they’re competing but that’s about it”. However, one of the respondents who was from a large club in a major city explained “Our club has one or two coaches who are very aware of the contests [outside the club] and not only train the juniors for competition but sometimes they go to the competitions with them and help them on the day”. SS 1 explained that there were two pathways; surfers can be selected to the team via professional junior competitions (organised by for-profit companies with sponsored prizemoney) or amateur competitions (e.g., SSO and NSO organised competitions), or a combination of both. Club 14 recalled a member of her/his club who was identified by a sponsor. This happened

... after she won an Australian title. Billabong picked her up halfway through the year on a paid sponsorship to do the QS [qualifying series] overseas, like in Europe and America. As soon as you win one of them, all the big companies are eyeing you off, paying for your travel.

The data analysis showed that the stakeholders and their roles in this transition phase varied depending on their experience and knowledge. They included parents, some coaches, and some club executives. From an organisational point of view, SSOs’ roles included staging and promoting competitions. Surfing Australia also promoted competitions and third-party

organisations provided sponsorship and some competition management. The data revealed an unclear transition pathway and a lack of clear criteria that clubs and surfers could refer to.

The ad hoc nature of entry into events raised questions about whether the best athletes were competing. It appeared the larger, established board riding clubs were able to transition surfers much better than smaller clubs.

Nurturing

The data revealed that the major stakeholders in the process of athlete development are the high-performance coaches, the SSOs and the NSO. When surfers progress to elite levels of talent development, clubs are not involved because they lack the capacity to offer the support required. Club 11 noted “We [the club] are not really involved with them when they go into the pro series. We’re aware of them competing in them and they sometimes also compete in our club contests if they have time”. Surfers who have transitioned to the high-performance centres and training camps are prepared for participation in professional competitions. At the training camps coaches provide surfers with high-level strategies for competition and educate younger surfers about competing in a professional arena. “The program is intended to continually increase each surfer’s technical, physical and mental skills by giving them the opportunity to experience intensive training camps where they are both challenged and supported by coaches” (SA 1). The national junior amateur surfing team, whose members qualify through the national titles and represent Australia in the International Surfing Association (ISA) Championship, also attend training camps at the High-Performance Centre prior to the championship. One of the SSOs offered, through the High-Performance Centre, various high-performance initiatives focused on aspects of training such as strength and conditioning. However, this support is not ongoing and surfers on the verge of gaining entry into the professional ranks, and some on the professional circuit, must find

private coaches so they improve or maintain their rankings. As a NSO respondent commented:

When coached at an elite level, having a second set of eyes on your performance, suggesting strategy, developing training programs and motivating the athlete changes things for a surfer. But Surfing Australia cannot continue funding and supporting surfers forever, particularly if they are the lower order ones who unfortunately aren't winning much or finishing close to the top in comps.

The WQS tour stages events all around the world, and Surfing Australia cannot support competitors with private coaching and training due to the distances involved. One of the respondents said the NSO seemed to offer these surfers some support through the High-Performance Centre, but its relationship with professional surfers was minimal. For example, Club 14 said:

They [surfers] either have to have a good sponsor, do really well in the contests and win prize money which isn't much, get a job or ask their parents for money ... I have known lots of guys who haven't been able to stay on the WQS for long.

Some respondents explained that some surfers who progressed to the World Championship Tour (WCT) (the top 34 male and 16 female surfers worldwide), like the surfers on the WQS, receive some support from Surfing Australia. "Elite surfers at this stage are contracted to the WSL [World Surf Tour] and receive money for each event, plus they have sponsors who support them financially" (SS 2). Some of the surfers who compete on the WCT have private coaches who either tour with them or coach them via internet platforms that provide video analysis. When probed further about why only *some* surfers have coaches, Club 4 explained that coaching in professional surfing is a relatively new phenomenon, and not all surfers can afford them.

Discussion and implications

An important and novel finding compared to prior studies that have applied the ARTN framework is that different surfers receive different levels of support from various stakeholders. This is due to several reasons including the level of parental support, the size and organisational capacity of their clubs, geographic location, access to coaches, individual sponsorship contracts, and access to and knowledge of SSO and NSO programs. Surfers who receive more support from these stakeholders are generally more successful in the transition and nurturing phases of their development. This finding is consistent with other studies signifying the importance of family and friends on athlete development (e.g., MacIntosh et al., 2019) as well as how essential it is for all stakeholders involved during the various development stages to cooperate in order obtain the best outcomes from the strategies they implement.

A concerning finding was that most clubs and athletes do not have a clear understanding of how surfers progress along that pathway. This is problematic because the aim of an elite sport development model is to provide athletes with a clear and holistic view of the athletic career development pathway (see Balyi et al. 2013; Coutinho et al., 2016; De Bosscher et al., 2013; Wing Hong To et al., 2013; Wylleman et al., 2013). Most clubs are not clear about how surfers gain support from the NSO and SSOs. Moreover, the clubs and athletes do not believe that the elite surfer pathway that the NSO promotes is as simple and clear to follow as the NSO claims. Our results suggest the NSO and SSOs need to provide clear direction and assistance for athletes on the elite development pathway. The absence of this support could potentially hinder talent identification and international success. In a comparison of the governance of elite sport structures of six countries, including Australia, Barker-Ruchti et al. (2018) reported on the distinctive local athlete development government discursivities and/or sport-specific adjustments such as less result-driven and more holistic interpretations of athlete development.

Further to this, board riding clubs are the main stakeholders in surfer development, particularly during the attraction process. Even though this finding is consistent with other studies showing the importance of club for athlete attraction in the Australian system (Sotiriadou et al., 2020), what is different in the case of surfing is that clubs are also involved with the retention/transition process, but we found no evidence of any involvement by clubs in the nurturing stage. Closely associated with this is the need for enhanced coordination of and communication with clubs by sport governing bodies (Mathorne et al., 2020). The important role that local clubs play points to the need to revisit the level of support clubs receive, and their capacity to contribute to elite sport development. Our findings indicate surfers need to succeed at World Surf Leagues (WSL) events or win Qualifying Series (QS) events for entry into the WSL to be eligible for support from stakeholders at the higher levels of the sport. Parents continue to play a role in surfer development at elite levels. They do so to help their children to succeed at lower-order QS events so they can be recognised for higher order stakeholder support in the surfer sport development system. The need for parental support to reach higher levels of the system, and the need for surfers to achieve success to connect with higher order stakeholders, shows there is a large gap between community grassroots clubs and the higher order stakeholders (Knight, 2017).

Even though board riding clubs are involved in most athlete development processes, they see their role as solely to facilitate attraction to the sport. This is consistent with prior research into traditional sports (e.g., Shilbury et al., 2020; Sotiriadou, 2010). It is expected that the role of grassroots clubs is to introduce participants to the sport and teach basic skills until they progress to higher levels and leave the club behind. However, as the data indicates, clubs are heavily involved in developing surfers to elite levels without even realising it, and surfers rely on clubs for their development. When surfers don't re-qualify for the WCT, they go back to their clubs for competition as there are no other elite competitions where they can

maintain their skill levels. Surfers find it difficult to garner support from higher-order surfing development stakeholders, and therefore they remain at clubs even when they have “made it”. Club executives were silent on this key point of surfer development and were surprised when asked about it.

Our investigation supports Newland and Kellett’s (2012) argument that surfing, like other lifestyle sports, is not delivered or managed like mainstream sports and does not exhibit the same homogeneous developmental practices. The results revealed that there are several stakeholders involved with each stage of surfer development. The extent of each stakeholder’s involvement varies depending on several factors. For example, during the attraction and retention stages, coaches are only involved if the club has qualified coaches available, or if children’s parents can afford to pay for private services. This means that many potential elite surfers may miss out on vital coaching at critical stages of their development. Furthermore, the NSO only seems to be involved in the attraction and retention processes to promote activities and systems carried out by other stakeholders. At the transition and nurturing stages, the role of Surfing Australia is very different as it offers programs at its High-Performance Centre to promising or elite surfers. These findings are consistent with studies on the Australian sport system that show that even though on paper the NSOs’ role is to support the whole of sport, the primary focus is to actively support the elite level (Sotiriadou, 2009; Sotiriadou & Kennelly, 2021). Along with the SSOs, Surfing Australia offers support to surfers in the transition and nurturing phases in the form of training camps. In addition to their roles in the transition and nurturing phases, SSOs play significant roles in the attraction, retention and talent identification and selection processes through the provision of events and programs.

Parents are involved in most processes within the ARTN. When surfers reach professional ranks and become financially self-sufficient, parental involvement decreases.

However, many surfers cannot maintain financial independence without sponsors or prize money and if they are to continue they either have to get a job (which is improbable due their travel commitments) or rely heavily on their parents, which is consistent with previous results from other elite sport studies (e.g., Cote, 2000; Harwood & Knight, 2009; Morley et al., 2018).

The results of this study suggest that Australian surfing stakeholders' roles and involvement vary and are specific to each development phase. This finding supports previous research (Brouwers et al., 2015a; Sotiriadou et al., 2008), that found the same situation in mainstream sports. However, the findings on the influence of the culture of lifestyle sport on the sport development process at all levels is novel. Our results suggest that attempts to establish a clear and structured sport development process is an ongoing struggle for stakeholders. Surfing relies on board riding clubs for its organisational and management practices, but those clubs are a manifestation of the free spirit and unstructured ethos of surfing. Such a reliance on the clubs to attract surfers and provide ongoing development support for most surfers seeking elite status is perhaps hindering the establishment of a large talent pool and improved levels of surfer performance, as clubs appear not to have the capacity to provide such support.

Australian surfing is unique due to the country's waves, surf culture, surfboard design, and competitions. The findings suggest that the involvement and roles of stakeholders in Australian surfing are diverse and varied, but all are essential in promoting and maintaining the sport's popularity and sustainability. The findings may be limited to the Australian context, but it is necessary to consider the powerful presence of Australia and surfing stakeholders at a global scale. Specifically, the Australian surfing stakeholders are highly representative of surfing in a global context, given Australia's prominence as a major surfing nation and its significant contributions to the sport's development and evolution (Nardini,

2019). As one of the world's most iconic surfing destinations, Australia has a strong and well-established surfing culture that has influenced surfing communities around the world (Pérez-Gutiérrez, & Cobo-Corrales, 2022). Australian surfers, surfboard manufacturers, coaches, and instructors are highly respected and influential figures in the global surfing community, with many Australian surfers ranking among the world's top competitors (Hough-Snee, 2020). In addition, Australia is home to several major surfing organisations, including Surfing Australia, which has a significant role in the development and promotion of the sport at a national and international level. Australian surfing organisations are highly active in the global surfing community, working closely with other national organisations, the ISA, and the WSL to promote the sport and support surf events and competitions around the world. Overall, Australian surfing stakeholders are highly representative of surfing in a global context, and their contributions to the sport are widely recognized and respected. As such, their involvement in global surfing initiatives is highly valued and important for the ongoing development and growth of the sport.

An unexpected finding in this study, and a finding not reported in any other ARTN studies, is surfing's reliance on social media. As a lifestyle sport and an 'action sport' (Wheaton, 2013), surfing is visually attractive. Surfers perform spectacular maneuvers in beautiful natural settings. This offers surfers the opportunity to use social media platforms and footage of the destinations they surf to obtain access to sponsors. Some elite surfers have withdrawn from professional competition circuits to make surf travel documentaries, write blogs, establish their own YouTube channels, and promote surf-specific training regimes. All of these initiatives have been financially lucrative.

Theoretical contribution and managerial implications

This study extended the application of the ARTN framework to a lifestyle sport. Applying the ARTN framework to surfing facilitated a profound representation of each stage

of the development of an elite surfer. It also identified stakeholders and the roles they play in each of those stages. Thus, by examining sport-specific sport development-related concerns and the roles played by various stakeholders, the use of the ARTN framework in a sport still transition to being an Olympic sport has highlighted (1) evidence on the discrepancies between the level of support different surfers receive from various stakeholders and the impact this may have on athlete transition and nurturing, (2) the poor stakeholder understanding of surfers progress and development, and (3) the particularly heavy involvement and expectation from local clubs to advance surfers past the attraction process of their development, as well as (4) the significant role of social media on athlete ARTN processes. Overall, the results of this study offer new organisational perspectives on the roles of the NSO, SSOs, clubs, coaches, parents, sponsors, the media, and other stakeholders on athlete development. Hence, the findings broaden our understanding of surfing development processes and extend the application of the ARTN framework.

The findings of this study have managerial and practical implications. They suggest that the pathways for elite surfers are not clear to all stakeholders. As grassroots clubs are the foundation for of all competitive surfing, the executives or representatives of each one should be fully informed of how an individual progresses to the elite level regardless of the size or geographical location of the club.

The NSO does offer a diagrammatic pathway on their website. However, as the respondents indicated, the diagram does not provide enough explanation of the intricacies involved. For example, it seems to concentrate on grassroots development but fails to clearly explain the transition from amateur to professional ranks or junior to senior competition. Given the complexities involved in these transitional phases (Ford et al., 2011; MacNamara & Collins, 2014), a more comprehensive explanation of the elite pathway and an effective, practical guide would go a long way to informing relevant stakeholders such as the

respondents in this study. This supports Brouwers et al. (2015a, p.471) who suggest that NSOs should “direct their elite development strategies towards providing quality talent development programs and clear transitions to higher levels.” As the SSOs are more ‘in touch’ with clubs and their individual surfers, perhaps SSOs should take more responsibility in talent development pathways, thereby eliminating any ambiguous transitional phases.

The respondents indicated that different surfers received different levels of support from various stakeholders. This was due to several reasons such as parental support, geographic location, access to coaches, individual sponsorship contracts, and access to and knowledge of SSO and NSO programs. Therefore, we recommend that the NSO develop a plan of best practice that allows a more collaborative approach and greater coordination between all stakeholders. For example, the different levels of access to coaches means that potential elite athletes may not have the same opportunity to progress to the highest level. Formal elite coaching in surfing is a relatively new practice and does not have decades of formal structural history, and hence it lacks the recognised benchmarks of many other sports. Therefore, there is an opportunity to streamline coaching programs. In addition, Surfing Australia could facilitate commercial sponsorships for athletes and assist in the critical financial aspects of surfers’ development. Given the role played by major surf brands (e.g., Billabong, Quiksilver, Rip Curl) and major surfing competitions, it seems natural and commercially viable for the NSO to develop an ongoing and mutually beneficial alliance with one or a number of a commercial entities. This alliance could provide benefits for the organisation and opportunities for individual athletes.

As elite athletes face increasing demands to develop a social media presence in order to develop their own brand and make connections with a broad range of stakeholders including sponsors (Geurin, 2017), it would be financially prudent for Surfing Australia to

assist surfers in this respect. This could be achieved by providing surfers with grants to hire social media development professionals.

Surfing Australia could develop hybrid sport development pathways that reflect the divergent paths elite surfers have taken, some of which do not involve competition. Such an initiative could increase the number of surfers in sport development pathways and thereby enhance prospects for increased revenue. This notion of development-specific hybrid pathways, and the provision of social media content, are unique to lifestyle sports. Lifestyle sports have the capability to attract large numbers of followers as they are typically conducted in appealing locations. Furthermore, lifestyle sports are mostly adrenaline action sports which enable followers to live vicariously through elite performers' experiences and lives.

Study Limitations and Future Research

Collecting data from the selected sample was useful in this study for harnessing details about the organisational stakeholders (and their roles at different stages) involved in the elite development pathway for surfing. This was essential as the focus of this study was to examine the ARTN from an organisational perspective. However, it is important to recognise that surfers also play a role in the development pathway. Elite surfers' views on how they experience their own developmental journey would provide valuable insights for sport policy makers, sport organisations and sponsors to better understand the needs of surfers.

Furthermore, the opinions of surfers who, due to various circumstances, were unable to become professionals would also be valuable for elite sport development stakeholders. That information would reveal where the pathway system breaks down, thereby giving stakeholders involved an opportunity to remedy the situation. An interesting finding that is worth pursuing with future research is the emergence of social media in surfing. Building on

this study, further research could help to explain the growing influence of social media, particularly throughout all the processes of the ARTN framework.

The results revealed that there are several stakeholders involved with each stage of surfer development. However, there appears to be a lack of any communication or coordination amongst many of them with regards to elite athlete development. Surfing and the development of surfers requires more collaboration between key stakeholders if surfing's legitimacy as an Olympic sport is to be established. The inclusion of surfing at the 2020 Olympic Games brought unprecedented opportunities and challenges for the stakeholders involved in the elite development pathways. Therefore, it would be useful to further research the nuances that surround the processes involved in the elite development of a sport that is new to the Olympics. The results may serve as a blueprint that provides solutions to problems faced by other emerging sports. It is necessary to acknowledge that besides the focus of this study being on surfing, the study context is Australia. However influential the Australian surfing culture maybe on a global scale, the results as well as the stemming implications cannot necessarily be generalized and translate directly to other countries. The results have shown board riding clubs play a pivotal role and are the key stakeholders in the sport development process. Therein would be great value in investigating the capacity of Australian board riding clubs to deliver development goals at the attraction, retention and possibly transition and nurturing stages. The results of such a study could provide meaningful conclusions about the support from higher level stakeholders required by clubs to deliver programs and strategies that assist in the elite surfer development pathway.

References

- Baker, J., Horton, S., Robertson-Wilson, J., & Wall, M. (2003). Nurturing sport expertise: Factors influencing the development of elite athlete. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Barker-Ruchti, N., Schubring, A., Aarresola, O., Kerr, R., Grahn, K., & McMahon, J. (2018). Producing success: A critical analysis of athlete development governance in six countries. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 10(2), 215-234.
- Balyi, I., Way, R., & Higgs, C. (2013). *Long-term athlete development*: Human Kinetics.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.
- Bernard, A. B., & Busse, M. R. (2004). Who wins the Olympic Games: Economic resources and medal totals. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 413-417.
- Bliznevskiy, A. U., Porteous, B., Kvåle, H. J., Bliznevskaya, V. S., Nemeč, M., Ermakov, S. S., & Kudryavtsev, M. D. (2016). Comparative analysis of new sport types – Potential candidates for inclusion in the winter olympic games. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 16(4), 1334-1339. doi:10.7752/jpes.2016.04211
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Breivik, G. (2010). Philosophy of sport in the nordic countries. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 37(2), 194-214. doi:10.1080/00948705.2010.9714776
- Brouwers, J., Sotiriadou, P., & De Bosscher, V. (2015a). An examination of the stakeholders and elite athlete development pathways in tennis. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15(4), 454-477. doi:10.1080/16184742.2015.1067239

- Brouwers, J., Sotiriadou, P., & De Bosscher, V. (2015b). Sport-specific policies and factors that influence international success: The case of tennis. *Sport Management Review*, 18(3), 343-358. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2014.10.003
- Budd, A., & Levermore, R. (2004). *Sport and international relations: an emerging relationship*. London: Routledge.
- Cote, J. (2000). The influence of the family in the development of talent in sport (vol 13, pg 395, 1999). *Sport Psychologist*, 14(1), 109-109.
- Darcy, S., & Dowse, L. (2013). In search of a level playing field—the constraints and benefits of sport participation for people with intellectual disability. *Disability & Society*, 28(3), 393-407.
- De Bosscher, V., De Knop, P., & Van Bottenburg, M. (2009). An analysis of homogeneity and heterogeneity of elite sports systems in six nations. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 10(2), 111-131.
- De Bosscher, V., De Knop, P., Van Bottenburg, M., & Shibli, S. (2006). A conceptual framework for analysing sports policy factors leading to international sporting success. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(2), 185-215.
- De Bosscher, V., De Knop, P., van Bottenburg, M., Shibli, S., & Bingham, J. (2009). Explaining international sporting success: An international comparison of elite sport systems and policies in six countries. *Sport Management Review*, 12(3), 113-136. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2009.01.001
- De Bosscher, V., Sotiriadou, P., & van Bottenburg, M. (2013). Scrutinizing the sport pyramid metaphor: An examination of the relationship between elite success and mass participation in Flanders. *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 5(3), 319-339. doi:10.1080/19406940.2013.806340

- de Nooij, M., & van den Berg, M. (2018). The bidding paradox: Why politicians favor hosting mega sports events despite the bleak economic prospects. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 42(1), 68-92. doi:10.1177/0193723517748552
- Dijkstra, H. P., Pollock, N., Chakraverty, R., & Alonso, J. M. (2014). Managing the health of the elite athlete: A new integrated performance health management and coaching model. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 48(7), 523-531. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2013-093222
- Donnelly, P., & Kidd, B. (2003). Realizing the expectations: Youth, character, and community in Canadian sport. *The Sport We Want (Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport, 2003)*, 34.
- Eady, J. (1993). *Practical sports development*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Ford, P., De Ste Croix, M., Lloyd, R., Meyers, R., Moosavi, M., Oliver, J., . . . Williams, C. (2011). The long-term athlete development model: Physiological evidence and application. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 29(4), 389-402.
- Galatti, L. R., Côté, J., Reverdito, R. S., Allan, V., Seoane, A. M., & Paes, R. R. (2016). Fostering elite athlete development and recreational sport participation: a successful club environment. *Motricidade*, 12(3), 20-31. doi:10.6063/motricidade.6099
- Geurin, A. N. (2017). Elite female athletes' perceptions of new media use relating to their careers: a qualitative analysis. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(4), 345-359. doi:10.1123/jsm.2016-0157
- Green, M., & Houlihan, B. (2005). *Elite sport development: Policy learning and political priorities*: Psychology Press.
- Green, M., & Houlihan, B. (2006). Governmentality, modernization, and the "disciplining" of national sporting organizations: Athletics in Australia and the United Kingdom. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 23(1), 47.

- Greyson, I., Kelly, S., Peyrebrune, M., & Furniss, B. (2010). Interpreting and implementing the long term athlete development model: English swimming coaches' views on the (Swimming) LTAD in Practice: A Commentary. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 5(3), 403-406. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.5.3.403
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Gulbin, J., Weissensteiner, J., Oldenzel, K., & Gagné, F. (2013). Patterns of performance development in elite athletes. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 13(6), 605-614. doi:10.1080/17461391.2012.756542
- Gulbin, J. P., Croser, M. J., Morley, E. J., & Weissensteiner, J. r. (2013). An integrated framework for the optimisation of sport and athlete development: A practitioner approach. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31(12), 1319-1331.
- Harwood, C., & Knight, C. (2009). Stress in youth sport: A developmental investigation of tennis parents. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 10(4), 447-456. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.01.005
- Hornig, M., Aust, F., & Güllich, A. (2016). Practice and play in the development of German top-level professional football players. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 16(1), 96-105.
- Nicholson, M., Hoyer, R., & Houlihan, B. (Eds.). (2011). *Participation in sport: International policy perspectives*. Routledge.
- Kellett, P., & Russell, R. (2009). A comparison between mainstream and action sport industries in Australia: A case study of the skateboarding cluster. *Sport Management Review*, 12(2), 66-78. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2008.12.003
- Lebel, K., & Danylchuk, K. (2014). An audience interpretation of professional athlete self-presentation on Twitter. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 6(2), 16-36.

- Knight, C. J. (2017). Family influences on talent development in sport. In J. Baker, S. Coble, S. Schorer, & N. Wattie (Eds), *Routledge handbook of talent identification and development in sport* (pp. 181-191). Taylor & Francis.
- MacIntosh, E. W., Parent, M. M., & Culver, D. (2019). Understanding young athletes' learning at the Youth Olympic Games: A sport development perspective. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 1-20.
- MacNamara, A., & Collins, D. (2014). More of the same? Comment on "An integrated framework for the optimisation of sport and athlete development: A practitioner approach". *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(8), 793-795.
doi:10.1080/02640414.2013.855805
- Mathorne, O. W., Henriksen, K., & Stambulova, N. (2020). An "organizational triangle" to coordinate talent development: A case study in Danish swimming. *Case Studies in Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 4(1), 11-20.
- Morley, D., McKenna, J., Gilbert, S., French, J., Till, K., Quarmby, T., & Turner, G. (2018). Can't pay, can't play? Talent lead's perspectives on the financial constraints experienced by athletes on the England Talent Pathway. *High Ability Studies*, 29(1), 51-64. doi:10.1080/13598139.2017.1341389
- Newland, B., & Kellett, P. (2012). Exploring new models of elite sport delivery: the case of triathlon in the USA and Australia. *Managing Leisure*, 17(2-3), 170-181.
doi:10.1080/13606719.2012.674393
- Pearson, D., Naughton, G. A., & Torode, M. (2006). Predictability of physiological testing and the role of maturation in talent identification for adolescent team sports. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 9(4), 277-287.

- Riot, C., O'Brien, W., & Minahan, C. (2019). High performance sport programs and emplaced performance capital in elite athletes from developing nations. *Sport Management Review*, doi:10.1016/j.smr.2019.11.001
- Rocha, C. M. (2017). Rio 2016 Olympic Games and diplomatic legacies. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 9(2), 277-294.
- Sherry, E., Schulenkorf, N., Seal, E., Nicholson, M., & Hoye, R. (2017). Sport-for-development: Inclusive, reflexive, and meaningful research in low- and middle-income settings. *Sport Management Review*, 20(1), 69-80.
doi:10.1016/j.smr.2016.10.010
- Shilbury, D., Karg, A., Rowe, K., & Phillips, P. (2020). *Sport management in Australia: An organisational overview*. Routledge: NY.
- Shilbury, D., Sotiriadou, P., & Green, B. (2008). Sport Development. Systems, Policies and Pathways: An Introduction to the Special Issue. *Sport Management Review*, 11(3), 217-223. doi:10.1016/S1441-3523(08)70110-4
- Smith, A. C. T., Skinner, J., & Edwards, A. (2020). *Qualitative Research in Sport Management*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367854249>
- Sotiriadou, P. (2009). The Australian sport system and its stakeholders: development of cooperative relationships. *Sport in Society*, 12(7), 842-860.
- Sotiriadou, P. (2013). Sport development planning: The Sunny Golf Club. *Sport Management Review*, 16(4), 514-523. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2012.09.002
- Sotiriadou, P., & Shilbury, D. (2009). Australian elite athlete development: An organizational perspective. *Sport Management Review*, 12(3), 137-148.
doi:10.1016/j.smr.2009.01.002

- Sotiriadou, P. (2010). The sport development processes and practices in Australia: The attraction, retention, transition and nurturing of participants and athletes. Cologne: Germany Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Sotiriadou, P., & Shilbury, D. (2010). Using grounded theory in sport management research. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 8(3-4), 181-202.
- Sotiriadou, P., Shilbury, D., & Quick, S. (2008). The attraction, retention/transition, and nurturing process of sport development: Some Australian evidence. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(3), 247-272.
- Sotiriadou, P., Thrush, A., & Hill, B. (2020). An examination of the changes on facilitators and constraints during lifelong participation in surfing. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 1-21.
- Sotiriadou, P., & Wicker, P. (2013). Community sports clubs' responses to institutional and resource dependence pressures for government grants. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 16(4), 297-314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2013.853338>
- Sotiriadou, P., Brouwers, J., & De Bosscher, V. (2016). High performance development pathways in Sherry, E., Schulenkorf, N., & Phillips, P. (Eds.). *Managing sport development: An international approach*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Sotiriadou, P., Thrush, A., & Hill, B. (2022). An examination of the changes on facilitators and constraints during lifelong participation in surfing. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 22(6), 747-767.
- Sotiriadou, P., Wicker, P., & Hill, B. (2016). The role of community sport venues and servicescape in attracting and retaining users. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 17, 1-22.

- Sotiriadou, P., Wicker, P., & Quick, S. (2014). Attracting and retaining club members in times of changing societies: The case of cycling in Australia. *Managing Leisure, 19*(5), 345-358. doi:10.1080/13606719.2014.885718
- Stranger, M. (2010). Surface and substructure: beneath surfing's commodified surface. *Sport in Society, 13*(7-8), 1117-1134.
- Surfing Australia (2020). *Strategic plan*. Surfing Australia. Retrieved from <https://surf-dev.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2020/10/Surfing-Australia-Strategic-Plan-Summary.pdf>
- Thomson, A., Darcy, S., & Pearce, S. (2010). Gamma theory and third-sector sport-development programmes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander youth: Implications for sports management. *Sport Management Review, 13*(4), 313-330.
- Thorpe, H. (2017). Action sports, social media, and new technologies: Towards a research agenda. *Communication and Sport, 5*(5), 554-578.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479516638125>
- Vaeyens, R., Lenoir, M., Williams, A. M., & Philippaerts, R. M. (2008). Talent identification and development programmes in sport. *Sports Medicine, 38*(9), 703-714.
- Wheaton, B. (2010). Introducing the consumption and representation of lifestyle sports. *Sport in Society, 13*(7-8), 1057-1081.
- Wheaton, B. (2013). *The cultural politics of lifestyle sports*. London: Routledge.
- Wheaton, B., & Thorpe, H. (2018). Action sports, the Olympic Games, and the opportunities and challenges for gender equity: The cases of surfing and skateboarding. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 42*(5), 315-342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723518781230>