

This chapter appears here in lieu of the publishers version of record. Please cite as follows:

Kohe, G.Z., Purdy, L.G. & Litou, A. (2021) Athlete welfare, stakeholder responsibility, and ethics of care in elite sport: An examination of Para-sport organisation approaches in France, in Campbell, N. & Ticknell-Smith, A. (eds.) *Developing and Supporting Athlete Wellbeing: Person First, Athlete Second* (Oxon: Routledge), 211-224

Chapter 15: Athlete welfare, stakeholder responsibility, and ethics of care in elite sport: An examination of Para-sport organisation approaches in France

Kohe, G.Z., Purdy, L.G. and Litou, A.

Abstract

Many professional sport organisations have worked to ensure members are 'appropriately' equipped for their sporting careers and lives beyond. Such entities have educational programmes, mentorship schemes, networking opportunities, and support services offering career and professional development opportunities. The range of schemes provides a potentially rich resource for athletes and a degree of comfort and security during their sporting careers. While establishing sector standards and templates, sport organisations' efforts have also been contoured by external forces and cultural shifts that have raised industry expectations regarding how businesses operate for their employees and improve their commitments to their members. To these ends, agendas to equip athletes appear altruistic and morally sensible. In this chapter, we converse with Arnaud Litou, the High Performance Manager within the National Institute of Sport, Expertise, and Performance's (INSEP) Paralympic programme. Arnaud articulates key concerns about the provision of athlete welfare within the French sport system, and raises issues that resonate across the wider professional sport sector. To understand the complexity of Arnaud's position, we utilise stakeholder and ethics of care theories. We argue that while notions of social welfare and an ethics of care may characterise welfare initiatives, incongruence with sports workers' social realities may work against their uptake and effectiveness.

Key words

Athlete welfare, France, INSEP, stakeholder theory, ethics of care

Introduction

Increased global attention to athlete welfare has driven debate and change in organisational practices in the sport sector across and within numerous nations. In response to instances of, and related media exposure about, practices in sport that jeopardise athletes' welfare, and 'cross lines' with regard to what may be deemed as morally and/or legally acceptable (e.g., abuse, bullying, harassment, discrimination), sport organisations are being forced to reflect on and change (where necessary) support structures and mechanisms. In Europe, reports such as the Syndex Report (2013) (that illuminates some working conditions in sport), and in the UK, The Duty of Care in Sport Review (Grey-Thompson, 2017) (which specifically responds to organisational criticism over athlete wellbeing and safeguarding), have drawn attention to the variable landscapes of welfare provision across regions and sports, enduring inequalities of experience, and demonstrated capacities for change and best practice (Kerr & Kerr, 2019). These discussions have, variously, illustrated that athlete welfare is complex and multifaceted. Moreover, that understanding experiences and consequently provision requires acknowledging the interplay between underlying institutional and structural factors, stakeholder relations, individual social realities and ideological assumptions. In addition, academic debates have highlighted how these issues manifest differently across populations and within individual athletes' lives (Bundon, Ashfield, Smith & Goosey-Tolfrey, 2018; De Cruz, Spray & Smith, 2019). In high performance Para-/disability sport, work has also evidenced how the specificities of disabilities impact athletes' labour, how national governing bodies manage performance and inclusivity imperatives, the roles of coaches and stakeholders in support athlete welfare beyond training and performance spaces, and gender inequalities are exacerbated (Campbell, 2016; Kohe & Peters, 2016; Purdy, Purdy &

Potrac, 2016; Richard, Joncheray & Dugas, 2017). Such research has exposed areas of concern and has brought about welcome changes in some areas of sport.

Nonetheless, research has stressed that continued examination of the sport sector is needed; particularly for re-orientating sport organisations' practices and sensibilities toward more ethical, empathetic and democratic ends, and creating new ways of being in sport that better reflect and appreciate the realities of individual worlds and working lives. Furthermore, scope remains to interrogate broader contexts, structures and approaches that inform and produce what welfare 'looks' like in particular local, national or regional settings (Henry, 2013; Purdy, Kohe & Paulauskas, 2017). This chapter adds to this growing body of scholarship by offering fresh insights on practitioners within a high performance national sport system. Our investigation also considers how current welfare initiatives are/may be incongruent with sports workers' realities and may work against the meaningfulness of provision. Building on our examinations of European athletes, this paper focuses on Arnaud Litou, the High Performance Manager within INSEP's (the National Institute of Sport, Expertise, and Performance) Paralympic programme. Arnaud's experiences draw attention to similar concerns which are manifested in the French system and played out in the welfare resourcing of the nation's Para-sport and disability sport athletes. We conclude the chapter by considering Arnaud's narrative in light of wider theoretical consideration of welfare in sport.

Introducing the practitioner

Arnaud Litou was born, raised and educated in France. His background as an elite cyclist and his experience in the cycling industry led to him to a position with the junior national road cycling programme. Based on this work, he was initially contracted by

Cycling Canada for the Junior road programme coaching position. Subsequently, Arnaud was asked to assist the Para-cycling team as the High Performance manager. In addition, he served on the Canadian Paralympic High Performance Committee from 2016-2018. Following two Paralympic cycles with the Canadian team, Arnaud was looking for a new challenge, and saw an opportunity to work with his home nation in the lead up to the Paralympics. So, he returned to France in the position of project manager for 'Paralympic Performance Monitoring' at INSEP (the National Institute of Sport, Expertise, and Performance). Arnaud was attracted to the role as he could draw upon his experience in Canada to help shape the system in France in relation to the cohesion and efficiency of supports which would, he believed, would lead to improved results.

Arnaud's experience

When I started working in France, I saw that programmes were in place, the systems were in place, but definitely not running at full speed, and definitely not in aligned with their needs. Reading the situation, I then saw my responsibility as one of supporting and assessing the needs of the stakeholders (i.e., athletes, coaches) and the levels of support required as well as make recommendations for funding from the federal government (i.e. Agence Nationale du Sport (ANS)). My role changed in September 2019 when I took up work for the ANS as Paralympic HP expert and adviser; liaising with the sport development stream to optimize alignment, coherence and efficiencies at the NSO as well as the various government levels. Currently, I see my role as a facilitator to provide the right info, and to make sure the right level of support is invested for the right needs and for the right people.

To execute my role effectively, however, I need to understand the complexities of French sport system. At the high performance level, the [Ministry of Sport] provides regulations, rules to play, targeted social programmes and funding. One specific team in the [Ministry of Sport] is responsible for high performance management. The second team within the [Ministry of Sport] is INSEP with provision to assess technical aspects of the performance programmes...which are basically former High Performance Directors, and former Olympic coaches and champions at the high performance level. Recently there has been amalgamation (or centralising) of resources in the aim of providing parity of access and opportunity for both Olympic and Paralympic athletes. Although this structure provides support for many athletes, there are concerns. One of which is that the level of funding dedicated to Para-athlete is very, very, very shallow. Such funding discrepancies and inequities have had implications on Para-

athletes' uptake of welfare programmes. With regards to welfare, there are a range of welfare programmes and funding for athletes provided by the French government via the Ministry of Sport. Firstly, some funding is provided directly to the athletes through the NSO to be used for their sporting needs, for example, equipment and competitions. Secondly, there are programmes which focus on athletes who are working who require time away to compete in their sport. Here, a contract with the employer is needed so some Ministry of Sport funding can be used by the NSO to compensate the employer for athletes' time taken from work. Thirdly, within the suite of welfare support on offer in France, there is a dual-career project. This later project involves looking at the athlete as a whole, having a career, or building a future as a student/worker/ professional, looking at specific training courses once they plan to retire and phase out and transition out of the high performance context.

While the programmes are useful, are morally the 'right thing to do', and are 'on-paper' equitable, there are concerns that there are inherent differences in the demographics of Para- and able-bodied athletes that the system does not acknowledge. Our athletes are usually older and more established in life as professionals, with families, kids, and a different social landscape compared to a lot of able-bodied athletes, or young elite Olympic athletes. Which is, looking at the average age at the games, it is obvious that we are looking at an older group of athletes on the Paralympic side of the business. However, the athletes' needs are much more important on the Para- side. And when you look outside of the athleticism, just on the demographic side of things, disabled athletes in the general population, have lower levels of employment. There are more disabled athletes who are on welfare, or struggling financially, and it is important to recognise that this applies to sport...The difference between able-bodied and Para is mind-blowing. The level of need is more important generally, so increases in funding have more of an impact, and you can see that difference. Athletes have to feel that there is equity and that they are being recognised, supported and valued, not just being used. The athletes also need to feel confident that when their performance careers are over, their contribution will be recognised and they are going to be taken care of.

The fact of the matter is that the government, through their social programmes, not only for Para-athletes, but for disabled citizens, have equivalent or complementary programmes in places across regions, and in departments. But, currently we don't have the full perspective, or map, so the field is not fully clear at the moment of what services and programmes are available; at a general level, what services and programmes apply to citizens and in what regions? Therefore, the response to welfare support in Para-sport on the ground is all over the spectrum, from low level to high level understanding and support. And it brings a lot of questions...Will [athletes] be well supported and how? Will they be under-supported? Because it's a funding relationship between the organisation and the athlete based on performance, for (what are deemed to be) non-performance related needs...But there is not enough, and no transparency as to what athletes have access to at all those different levels. To successfully navigate this, athletes need to know that they have to be proactive, first, to know what programmes exists. What could they be eligible for? Secondly, how successful could they be in funding? And, finally, at the end of the day...What does that bring them to? How much funding? How much support? How many programmes do they have access to? It has all exploded, but nothing is centralised. So, from a high

performance agency perspective there is a lot of grey; a lack of knowledge and information.

In terms of what matters most, from my perspective, is that I need [the provision] to be meaningful to them in a way that better supports them. And...that is the jurisdiction of the NSOs. I cannot step in and do their job and definitely don't wish to do that. I work alongside the NSOs to get a proper assessment of what the needs are, what level of support would be needed, and report to my boss what recommendations I make. The FPC [French Paralympic Committee] is working on their front, for example, and in my role I have more of an inter-institutional relationship with them.

The pressure on sport organisations to provide meaningful programmes has also been influenced the wider national context. Generally speaking, I feel that there is a huge sense of 'it is due to me' ... with this nation. [France] has had a strong social political culture and social programmes... over time, and through history, and for decades if not more than that. And, there is a culture that the government is there to provide. But, it creates a culture around 'it is due'. Obviously, there are basic needs that no one could be blind not to see, not to understand, and not to put themselves into someone else's shoes. There is a basic need for empathy, for anyone who is struggling. There are rights, but there is also a duty...to provide [athletes] with better conditions. But where does the contract lay? What is asked from them to get a...'return on investment'. I don't see it as a return on investment, I see it as humans taking responsibility on both sides of the fence. It's a good thing having all these programmes in place. But it's one thing to have them, but how much are they used, and how much of a positive impact do they have, and how much do they cover the welfare needs?

What we've come to realise with a new high performance agency that has recently been created, is that the government funding at the federal level is one thing. That is what athletes can benefit from through their NSOs. But then, there are other sources and different levels of support that they are eligible for. It could be through their region, their administrative region, very much like a province back in Canada or a district, cities, or their departments, which is a subset of the region. I say this from an understanding of what is going on in the international field, and how athletes are supported. There is no perfect system, but there are some good ideas and good programmes put in place in other nations. There is a clear understanding and acknowledgement of Paralympic and Olympic differences, and I think that the level of athletes on the Paralympic side having financial struggles and challenges remains significant. We have seen NSOs working with companies and looking at having a contract for an athlete, supporting great ambassadors for the movement, a great newcomer, or someone with great potential that they strongly believe in. So, they find a partner within the private sector, or with a public service as a sponsor and performance partner to provide a part-time job or a job with time dedicated to training so that they can provide the right social environment as well.

Discussion

Appreciations of, and responsibilities to welfare may vary between sports organisations and sports workers within and across nations. Since arriving at INSEP

and more recently working in ANS, Arnaud's primary focus was on reacquainting himself with the sport system in France and understanding the extent and meaningfulness of welfare provision available for athletes in the Para-sport programme. Based on his assessment of this provision, and from working with stakeholders in the system (e.g., The French Paralympic Committee, National Sport Organisations (NSOs), coaches and athletes), Arnaud views himself as 'one link in the chain' which can effect positive changes in the landscape for Para- and disability sport athletes. While this ethos may be echoed by others working in sport in other nations, Arnaud's work is shaped by local factors, and cultural, historical and social conditions. For Arnaud to achieve his aim of delivering a more cohesive, effective and successful performance programme for Para-sport athletes, the challenges are complex and multifactorial. The social realities of athletes with disabilities Arnaud has worked with over the course of his career have highlighted that specific disabilities may inhibit engagement with programmes, individuals may lack awareness of the programmes, may be concentrating on meeting their basic needs, and/or have other priorities.

Regardless of his position or organisational setting, Arnaud has illustrated that an interrogation of welfare concerns within the industry requires acknowledgement of the respective and collective roles and responsibilities each party undertakes (whether explicit and contractual, or implicit and moral). As evidenced in Arnaud's narrative, performance demands in elite sport necessitate a focus on ensuring the *in situ* high performance environment and welfare provision 'works' for all parties. For example, on the part of the athlete, that high performance, developmental, training and participation expectations are achieved, and team philosophies are upheld. On the part of the organisation, that there exists appropriate support, safety and protection provision (Brouwers, Sotiriadou & Veerle De Bosscher, 2015; Friedman, Parent &

Mason, 2004; Purdy et al., 2017). While the change in funding structure of high performance sport in France has invariably been advantageous in creating new resources and opportunities for athlete welfare support. The existence of such programmes, Arnaud noted, was not a guarantee as to their uptake, effectiveness or meaningfulness to athletes. Individual engagement in programmes, for instance, was contingent upon the willingness and desire of athletes, the motivation and encouragements provided by significant others (e.g., coaches, family members, and peers etc), and the priority given to welfare education within the national organisational, regional/local centre and club.

Programmes notwithstanding, Arnaud believes that there is a lack of understanding within organisations related to Para-athlete-specific welfare needs. Relatedly, there is also a fragmented framework of national provision and uptake of welfare support by Para-sport athletes. In addition, there remains a need to have clarity regarding the increasing number of stakeholders and delivery entities involved in welfare support (in and beyond sport). While the ambiguity of provision issues are not specific to Para-sport, the challenges are compounded by the extant conditions Para-sport athletes already face. The observations here also echo those experienced by other practitioners working in high performance Para- and disability sport (Allan, Smith, Côté, Ginis & Latimer-Cheung, 2018; Kohe & Peters, 2016). Such work has documented the prevailing funding inequities afforded to the Para-/disability sport sector, the marginalisation or liminal treatment of Para-/disability sport within high performance funding structures, and specificities of individual's welfare being at odds with organisation responses.

Acknowledging disparities, challenges, and the idea of mutual responsibilities between the athlete and sport body, for Arnaud, was an important factor ameliorating criticism of organisations' duties of care, athletes' sense of entitlement, and contractual obligations of support provision. Essentially, Arnaud's position was that the underpinning principles of the welfare provision should not differentiate between Olympic and Paralympic athletes. Nonetheless, the specificity of athlete's individual lives and the demographics of people with disabilities have an influence on the suitability of welfare provision provided, in this case, by INSEP/ANS and the NSOs. Overall, the issue is one improving welfare provision to counter inequities, and embedded social realities, within the national sport system. The outcome of which, Arnaud recognises, would fulfil an overarching moral objective to better address the social and economic realities of Para-athletes' and athletes with disabilities' lives for the better.

In understanding Arnaud's experience, we draw upon stakeholder and ethics of care theories to underscore the complex agendas and expectations entangled within sport employment and the politicisation of organisational relations. Stakeholder theory has been well recognised as a means to understand the complexities of relationships with a variety of industry and employment environments (Bridoux & Stoelhorst, 2014; Freeman, 2010; Russo & Perrini, 2010). With a focus on the varied interests parties bring to employment relations, the negotiation of (congruent and conflicting) agendas within business, and institution's intrinsic ethical responsibilities, stakeholder theory provides a useful way to explain individual sport organisation's (and the wider European professional sport sectors) engagement in welfare enterprises in the pursuit of performance success. Moreover, the theory acknowledges that all parties enter relationships for collective and individual interests. Beyond this, however, there is a

recognition that while organisations may assume primary decision making capacity, other stakeholder concerns and interests are legitimate and merit consideration (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Freeman, 2010; Friedman & Miles, 2002; Miles, 2017). Such a position then makes it possible to argue for sport organisations to appreciate athletes' welfare, and wider career concerns and consider (though not necessarily action) strategies that might be advantageous for their welfare in the immediate and long term. Yet, stakeholder theorists identify, at any one point, organisations will comprise a diverse array of participants whose purposes may or not be congruent (Miles, 2017). As such, there can be difficulty in ascertaining ownership over roles, responsibilities and outcomes (Donaldson & Preston, 1995; Freeman, 2010); a feature Arnaud identifies in French system.

With its intellectual genesis beyond sport, stakeholder theory is also useful in understanding business relations within capitalist economic systems (of which sport is a constituent part) (Freeman, 2010). The theory helps account for how organisations investing in stakeholder relations to concomitantly aid profit maximisation (for elite sport organisations interpreted as fulfilling funding-orientated performance imperatives), and utilise their existing relationships (and investments in those relationships) to add value and demonstrate their wider responsibility. We recall also Arnaud's remarks about the imperatives of INSEP/ANS to deliver on the government funding and performance imperatives, the necessity in his roles to work with key entities to deliver on these objectives, and the efforts to improve existing resources and provision across the country. To these ends, while stakeholder network creation is important, adding value to stakeholder relations (and ensuring that all stakeholders are valued within arrangements) is crucial (Jenson, 2010). It may be 'enough' for a

sports organisation to provide an amiable environment for athletes and attend to their immediate career needs and welfare. Success' and meaningfulness of provision, for Arnaud, derives from the organisation's ability to demonstrate its practical and moral commitment and social responsibility to its 'community' beyond the point of contractual stipulation (Freeman, 2010; Russo & Perrini, 2010). He identifies how attitudes to stakeholder relations are tied, in part, to the social and cultural context in which they are situated. The French context, and more global shifts, have precipitated changes in organisation-athlete interactions and perceptions of expected support. In his experiences in French Para-sport Arnaud acknowledges that these tensions are compounded by an underlying morality and sense of decency among those working in the area.

Arnaud's perspective echoes wider ethos and debate within the sport industry vis-à-vis athlete welfare, duties of care and organisational responsibility (Ronglan, 2015; Tsube & Feltz, 2015). The sport industry in France, for example, is underpinned by strong histories, cultures and narratives within the population regarding the general provision of social support, disability services and public levels of care (Kilcline, 2019). Distinct in Arnaud's position, and congruent with Kohe and Purdy (forthcoming, 2020) and Kohe and Purdy (2016), is his recognition of organisational limitations and the sensibilities that need to be shown toward developing national sport networks and approaches to better support athletes (and address funding imperatives to demonstrate greater care). Formal structures notwithstanding, Arnaud recognised a need for practitioners and sport organisations to balance the needs and desires for more holistic welfare provision across the disability sport spectrum with the funding constraints, high performance priorities, and governing relationship (particularly with

NSO) that are directed to particular elite sport imperatives, in this case, toward Paris 2024 and the subsequent Paralympic cycles.

Arnaud's comment regarding tensions between holistic approaches to welfare and contractually defined support, highlight the connection between stakeholder theory and ethics of care (Oruc & Sarikaya, 2011; Tronto, 1993). Conceptually, work on the ethics of care has identified that all human (and by extension business) relationships are imbued with moral obligation. More specifically, that while moral obligations may vary between parties, there are inherently individual and collective values, ideals and beliefs that warrant respecting, protection and nurturing (Petterson, 2011; Tronto, 1993). Fundamental to an ethics of care, theorists argue, is a universal commitment to human flourishing, condemnation of exploitation and hurt, and conviction to do no harm (Petterson, 2011). Arnaud, for example, draws connections between the context of French society and welfare expectations, organisational obligations within sport (that include but also go beyond contractual clauses), and the uniqueness of Para-athletes' lives. Here, considering a care ethic within stakeholder relations aids in appreciating the value of Arnaud's position regarding the need for organisations to work together to provide a more holistic and comprehensive account and approach to Para-sport athlete welfare.

Stakeholder care and synergy is evidenced in the work Arnaud is doing in helping map welfare provision across the state, work with other organisations, and learning from others and his experience in sport in various nations. In the pursuit of strengthening stakeholder relations in Para-sport, for example, Arnaud has illustrated the advantages of collaborative work across the sector. Furthermore, in the development

of a new performance strategy toward the Paris 2024 Olympics and Paralympics and beyond, there is collective work involving Arnaud, INSEP colleagues, the French Olympic and Paralympic Committees, NGOs, and state agencies. The goal of which, invariably, is to work more effectively, efficiently and sustainably within the sports structure.

For Arnaud, effective stakeholder relations are necessary if performance outcomes are to be met (Koggel & Ormer, 2010; McEwan & Goodman, 2010). As evidenced in the French system, there appear to be entrenched assumptions within sport organisation-sports worker discourse vis-à-vis moral obligations and duties of organisations and athletes, and social responsibility (observations similar to those noted elsewhere by Freeman (2010) and Greenwood and Van Buren (2010)). From Arnaud's perspective, there is a sense that sport organisations possess an innate duty and responsibility to establish spaces that ensure (Para-)athletes' security, support, development, and ultimately their rights, are protected and respected. In the same manner, there is a sense that all stakeholders within the system possess an obligation to help support and advance the organisation and, importantly, add value to its mission (i.e. success at the 2024 Paris Olympics and Paralympics).

Building Para-athlete welfare provision that incorporates a more holistic understanding of care is challenging. Organisations already have much to do. Moreover, there are significant variations in the capacities and resources available across sports and France. Yet, given our recognition afforded to stakeholder positions, intentions and relations, we respect that disparity in service and support provision in the sector need not necessarily be considered problematic. In some cases, it may be that universal

approaches to athlete welfare cannot be transferred; or, have limited value and uptake once they are localised. As evidenced above, it is clear that there are opportunities to improve this provision. Arnaud affirms how shifts in the sport system have brought Para-sport athletes within the high performance entity (INSEP/ANS). Such change has afforded improved recognition of athletes, and by proxy aided his role, within the French sport system, and further visibility and voice for para-related concerns. Yet, whatever shape and scope initiatives may take there is a need to consider the extensive, though largely unmapped, landscape of welfare provision for para-athletes across the French state. Furthermore, greater attention is warranted on organisations' perceptions and boundaries of care, what the implications might be for the extent and provision of welfare, and what might matter, be meaningful, of value and of need to all athletes. While the sustainability of, and engagement with, welfare and care initiatives cannot be guaranteed, such conversations may draw attention to ways of appreciating the idiosyncrasies that in this case characterise Para-sport, and how the diversity of athletes might be reflected in future high performance sport strategies in France and collaborative stakeholder work. Readers may appreciate some similarities to their respective sport sectors and work here, and see possibilities for alternate ways of enacting and strengthening welfare provision.

Based on reflection of Arnaud's experience, and consideration of stakeholder and care theories, we conclude by briefly considering how some of the challenges identified may be addressed. We support Arnaud's mapping of provision at the national level. Within this process, we reiterate the importance he expresses about identifying best practice, opening dialogue across the sector, and creating learning opportunities. As Arnaud reiterates, the system is improving, organisational and wider stakeholder

support is there, athletes have opportunities available, there is evidence of engagement, and some consideration of individual sensitivities. While this may be occurring already, such networking and knowledge transfer cannot be guaranteed, rather it relies on appropriate institutional structures, creation of collegial spaces, and the individual goodwill and momentum of constituents. The current concern for Arnaud is that there are disjunctures and unknowns between what is being provided at state level, high performance and national sport organisation level, whether there is engagement, and how meaningful that welfare provision is (related to their specific social realities).

Beyond this, and congruent with arguments put forth by other scholars and practitioners working in Para-/disability sport (Bundon et al., 2018; De Cruz et al., 2019; Kohe & Peters, 2016), we concur with Arnaud's position that change begins by first understanding the athlete and the meaningfulness of welfare provision within individual's lives. Given the extensive stakeholders involved in personal welfare generally speaking, we agree with Arnaud's assertion that there is a requirement for a multi-sectorial approach. As such, organisations need to do more work together to ensure collective welfare programmes also accommodate and reflect the bespoke, individualised, provision Para-sport athletes' need and desire. Such an approach may then be better attuned to the social realities and challenges of individuals with disabilities.

Conclusion

Arnaud's international experience in high performance sport, and his current role in INSEP, have enabled him to have an impact on the French sport system and the nature of Para-/disability sport participants' lives therein. Arnaud commented how the landscape of French athlete welfare support has improved with regard to opportunities

for athletes. In the general sense there is more programme availability, funding, and a wider interest in welfare issues. However, Arnaud has also identified the challenge of divergent stakeholder interests and approaches within the sector which have meant the welfare support is variable and the meaningfulness of the provision remains difficult to discern. Furthermore, while stakeholders have shown an interest in developing programmes for athletes, as a result of funding imperatives, the centralisation of programmes, and generalised approaches to welfare programme development, Arnaud is concerned that they do not best reflect Para-athletes' social realities. To advance, stakeholders within the system need to recognise roles and responsibilities and enter into more frequent, constructive and collaborative dialogue with each other to meet performance objectives *and* effect more empathetic relations and support. In essence, Arnaud's experience is a reminder for scholars and practitioners to acknowledge that there is a moral dimension of welfare that exists beyond what stakeholders can provision for or contractually provide.

References

- Allan, V., Smith, B., Côté, J., Ginis, K. A. M., & Latimer-Cheung, A. E. (2018). Narratives of participation among individuals with physical disabilities: A life-course analysis of athletes' experiences and development in parasport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 37*, 170-178.
- Bridoux, F. & Stoelhorst, J.W. (2014). Microfoundations for stakeholder theory: managing stakeholders with heterogeneous motives. *Strategic Management Journal, 35*, 107-125.
- Brouwers, J., Sotiriadou, P. & De Bosscher, V. (2015). An examination of the stakeholders and elite athlete development pathways in tennis. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 15*(4), 454-477.
- Bundon, A., Ashfield, A., Smith, B., & Goosey-Tolfrey, V. L. (2018). Struggling to stay and struggling to leave: the experiences of elite para-athletes at the end of their sport careers. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 37*, 296-305.
- Campbell, N. (2016). Creating a high performance Para-rowing programme in the USA: from the geography of the land to the generosity of the spirit (and everything in between). In: Kohe, G. & Peters, D. (eds) *High Performance (dis)Ability Sports Coaching*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp 24-44.

De Cruz, N.P., Spray, C.M., & Smith, B. (2019). Implicit beliefs of disability and elite sport: the para-athlete experience. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(1), 69-91.

Donaldson, T. & Preston, L. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65-91.

Freeman, R.E. (2010). *Stakeholder theory: the state of the art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, A.L. & Miles, S. (2002). Developing stakeholder theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39, 1-21.

Friedman, M., Parent, M.M. & Mason, D.S. (2004). Building a framework for issues management in sport through stakeholder theory. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 4(3), 170-190.

Greenwood, M. & Van Buren, H., (2010). Trust and stakeholder theory: trustworthiness in the organisation-stakeholder relationship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(3), 425-438.

Grey-Thompson, T. (2017). *Duty of care in sport: Independent report to government*.

Retrieved

from:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/u>

[ploads/attachment_data/file/610130/Duty_of_Care_Review_-_April_2017__2.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/610130/Duty_of_Care_Review_-_April_2017__2.pdf).

Henry, I. (2013). Athlete development, athlete rights and athlete welfare: a European Union perspective. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 30(4), 356-373.

Jenson, M.C. (2010). Value maximization, stakeholder theory and the corporate objective function. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 22(1), 32-42.

Kerr, R. and Kerr, G. (2019). Promoting athlete welfare: A proposal for an international surveillance system. *Sport Management Review*. DOI: 10.1016/j.smr.2019.05.005.

Kilcline, C. (2019). *Sport and society in global France: Nations, migrations, corporations*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Koggel, C. & Ormer, J. (2010). Care ethics: new theories and applications. *Ethics and Social Welfare*, 4(2), 109-114.

Kohe, G.Z. & Peters, D., (2016). *High performance disability sport coaching*. Abingdon: London.

Kohe, G.Z. & Purdy, L.G. (forthcoming). Organisational obligations toward athlete transitions: Confronting the bureaucratisation of athlete welfare with an ethics of care. In: M. Lang (ed) *Routledge handbook of athlete welfare*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Kohe, G. & Purdy, L.G. (2016). In protection of whose 'wellbeing'?: Considerations of 'clauses and a/effects' in athlete contracts. *Sport and Social Issues*. DOI: 10.1177/0193723516633269.

McEwan, C. & Goodman, M.K. (2010). Place geography and the ethics of care: Introductory remarks on the geographies of ethics, responsibility and care. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, 13(20), 103-112.

Miles, S. (2017). Stakeholder theory classification: A theoretical and empirical evaluation of definitions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(3), 437-459.

Oruc, I. & Sarikaya, M. (2011). Normative stakeholder theory in relation to the ethics of care. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 7(3), 381-392.

Pettersen, T. (2011). The ethics of care: Normative structures and empirical implications. *Health Care Analysis*, 19(1), 51-64.

Purdy, L. G., Kohe, G. Z. & Paulauskas, R. (2017). Coaches as sport workers: Professional agency within the employment context of elite European basketball. *Sport, Education and Society*, 24(2), 195-207.

Purdy, L.G., Purdy, J. & Potrac, P. (2017). Going the distance: A tale of energy, commitment and collaboration. Drew Ferguson, Canada's Para soccer coach. In: Kohe, G. & Peters, D. (eds) *High Performance (dis)Ability Sports Coaching*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp 7-23.

Richard, R., Joncheray, H. & Dugas, E. (2017). Disabled sportswomen and gender construction in power football. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 52(1), 61-81.

Ronglan, L.T. (2015). Elite sport in Scandinavian welfare states: legitimacy under pressure? *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 7(3), 345-363.

Russo, A. & Perrini, F. (2010). Investigating stakeholder theory and social capital: CSR in large firms and SMEs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91(2), 207-221.

Syndex. (2013). An Analysis of the Working Conditions of Professional Sports Players. Financially supported by the European Commission. Retrieved from <https://www.euathletes.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/2013-UNI-An-Analysis-of-Working-Conditions-of-Professional-Sports-Plyers-ilovepdf-compressed-1.pdf>

Tronto, J. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. New York: Routledge.

Tshube, T., & Feltz, D.L. (2015). The relationship between dual-career and post-sport career transition among elite athletes in South Africa, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 21, 109-114.