



Dual-Sport Restrictions in Football and Futsal Athlete Career Development

Farchad Aliurahman^{1*}, Budiman Agung Pratama², Wasis Himawanto³

^{1,2,3}Magister Keguruan Olahraga, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri, Kediri, East Java, Indonesia

e-mail: penjasorkes2@gmail.com; agung10@unpkediri.ac.id; himasis_23@unpkediri.ac.id

Abstract

This qualitative case study examined how selected coaches, parents, adolescent athletes, and local sport-organization representatives described restrictions on concurrent participation in football and futsal in Blitar City. The core sample comprised two coaches, four parents, and four athletes aged 14–15 years; the archived manuscript did not retain the exact number of federation representatives, so the total sample requires verification. Data sources included semi-structured interviews, observations, and selected organizational documents collected mainly from late February to April 2026. A Miles–Huberman–Saldana data-management cycle supported thematic comparison of purposively selected contrasting cases. Participants described two broad orientations: restriction justified by perceived injury, workload, schedule, and technical concerns; and conditional support based on coordinated schedules and perceived complementary practice. Restricted athletes described reduced autonomy, secrecy, anxiety, exhaustion, and diminished accomplishment, whereas permitted athletes described more open communication and perceived technical benefits. These are participant-reported experiences, not clinical burnout diagnoses or objective evidence of skill transfer. Calendar overlap was identified as a perceived institutional pressure, but the underlying event-level schedule evidence was not retained in the manuscript. The contrasting-case sampling may have amplified the two-orientation pattern. Ethics approval, parental permission, adolescent assent, and the number of organizational informants must be confirmed from original records before publication.

Keywords: dual-sport participation; early specialization; athlete burnout; LTAD; youth sport

corresponding author: penjasorkes2@gmail.com

Artikel Info:

Submitted: 05/08/2026

Revised: 31/08/2026

Accepted: 30/09/2026

Published: 04/10/2026

How to Cite: Aliurahman, F., Pratama, B. A., Himawnto, W. (2026). Dual-Sport Restrictions in Football and Futsal Athlete Career Development. *Journal Coaching Education Sports*, 7(2), 643-652

Author's Contribution: a) Desain Penelitian; b) Pengumpulan Data; c) Analisis Statistik; d) Penyusunan Naskah; e) Pengumpulan Dana



OPEN ACCESS

Journal Coaching Education Sports is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

A. Introduction

Football and futsal are related invasion games, but concurrent participation can present both developmental opportunities and workload-management challenges. Futsal offers frequent ball contacts, constrained space, and rapid transitions that may support perceptual and technical learning; however, accumulated training and competition across two programs may also reduce recovery and increase scheduling and injury concerns. Youth-development guidance therefore favors athlete-centered, age-appropriate exposure, adequate rest, and monitoring rather than assuming that either diversification or restriction is universally beneficial (Bergeron et al., 2015; Jayanthi et al., 2013).

Research on expertise development suggests that varied practice can support perceptual-cognitive adaptation when activities share relevant information—movement relations (Baker et al., 2003; Côté et al., 2007). Studies of futsal and football also report potential transfer between task environments (Oppici et al., 2017). Such literature establishes a plausible developmental mechanism, not proof that every adolescent benefits from simultaneous participation. The balance depends on total exposure, recovery, maturation, health, school demands,

coaching quality, and the representativeness of practice tasks.

The local issue was identified through the selected cases and access settings used in this study, not through a citywide prevalence survey, formal complaint register, or documented federation rule. Some participants described coach-imposed limits on futsal training, tournaments, or membership and linked these limits to injury, fatigue, schedule, and technique concerns. The study therefore investigates how these selected stakeholders made sense of restrictions; it does not claim that the accounts represent all football or futsal programs in Blitar City.

Parents may influence youth-sport decisions through safety concerns, transport and school logistics, financial commitments, career expectations, and beliefs about specialization. In this study, economic return was treated as one possible meaning raised by selected parents rather than a generalized parental motive. “Early specialization” is used cautiously to mean an adult-led narrowing toward one primary sport during adolescence, not a diagnosis or an established year-round specialization status. Because football and futsal are closely related, participation in both may still involve narrow movement exposure relative to broader multisport diversification.

Adolescents may experience tensions between adult authority, peer belonging, and their desire to participate. Self-Determination Theory offers an interpretive lens for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, but these needs were not measured with a validated scale. Likewise, interview descriptions of exhaustion, reduced accomplishment, or sport devaluation are referred to as burnout-related experiences rather than clinical or psychometric evidence of athlete burnout.

Existing scholarship has addressed specialization and injury risk, youth athletic development, athlete autonomy, and football–futsal skill transfer. The narrower contribution of this study is contextual and qualitative: it compares how selected actors within one local sport ecosystem described the intersection of training concerns, family expectations, athlete voice, and organizational calendars. The resulting communication framework is an author-developed proposition grounded in these cases, not a validated model or a comprehensive typology.

The study aimed to describe stakeholder reasoning concerning concurrent football and futsal participation; examine how selected adolescents experienced restrictions or permission; identify perceived organizational scheduling pressures; and develop provisional, athlete-

centered propositions for communication and risk management.

B. Methods

The study used an instrumental qualitative case-study design focused on concurrent football and futsal participation within the bounded setting of Blitar City, East Java. A case-study designation is more appropriate than descriptive phenomenology because the inquiry combined several stakeholder groups, observations, documents, organizational settings, and a proposed explanatory framework. Data collection occurred mainly from late February to April 2026 within a broader January–June 2026 project period. The sites included selected football and futsal programs, UPT SP SMPN 7 Blitar, and participating families.

Criterion-based maximum-variation sampling intentionally selected contrasting positions. The core participants were two coaches, four parents, and four athletes aged 14–15 years: one restrictive and one supportive coach; two parents in each orientation; and two restricted and two formally permitted athletes. These contrasts were known during selection and may have produced or amplified the later two-orientation synthesis. Additional representatives from Askot PSSI Blitar and AFKOT Blitar were consulted, but their

exact number, recruitment order, interview dates, and contribution to theme saturation were not retained. The prior saturation claim was removed because no saturation grid, recruitment sequence, or stopping audit was available.

Data sources were semi-structured interviews, passive observations, and organizational documents. Interviews addressed technical and workload beliefs, parental decision making, athlete experiences, and scheduling. The archived manuscript did not retain interview counts, duration, language, recording and transcription procedures, translation steps, or the interview guide. Observation settings included training and school environments, but the number and duration of sessions, consent boundaries, operational definitions of fatigue or anxiety, and integration rules for field notes were unavailable. Documents reportedly included regulations, training schedules, registration information, and competition calendars; issuing bodies, dates, authenticity status, and an event-by-event comparison table were not retained. These details and materials must be reconstructed from the field archive before publication.

Analysis followed the data-management cycle of collection, condensation, display, and conclusion drawing described by Miles et al. (2014). The available narrative indicates a combination of literature-

informed categories and inductive comparison, but the codebook, coding software, coder number, revision history, disagreement procedures, and links from excerpts to themes were not preserved. The four organizing topics were coaching restrictions, parental reasoning, athlete experiences, and institutional scheduling. Cross-case comparison generated provisional restrictive and supportive orientations. These are perceived mechanisms and explanatory propositions, not causal pathways. The manuscript reported member checking, peer discussion, negative-case attention, and audit procedures, but did not retain what materials were returned, response counts, resulting changes, independence of minor participants, peer identities, or audit records; therefore, these credibility procedures require verification.

Research Design

The analytic chain moved from a bounded local issue to multisource data collection, within-case coding, cross-case comparison, and a provisional communication framework. The researcher's professional relationship to the school, clubs, and sport organizations; role in gaining access; prior views on dual-sport participation; reflexive journal; data-storage procedures; and confidentiality decisions were not described in the archived manuscript. A positionality and

reflexivity statement should be added from the original project record.

C. Result and Discussion

Result

The core dataset involved two coaches, four parents, and four athletes; additional organizational informants were referenced but not enumerated. Codes are retained only at broad role level. Because this is a small local sport ecosystem, detailed licenses,

occupations, tenure, school affiliation, and combinations of roles may permit deductive identification and are omitted. The source file did not include verbatim transcript excerpts or a quotation-to-code audit trail. Findings are therefore presented as cautious summaries of the archived analysis and should be supplemented with de-identified quotations only after consent and disclosure-risk review.

Table 1. Profile of Core Informants

Group	Code	Profile	Position toward dual sport
Coach	PL-1	C PSSI license; 12 years; head coach SSB	Strict restriction
Coach	PL-2	Level 1 futsal; 8 years; academy coach	Supports synergy
Parent	OT-1/OT-2	Entrepreneur/employee backgrounds	Support restriction
Parent	OT-3/OT-4	Private sector/PJOK educator	Support diversification
Athlete	AT-1/AT-2	14-15 years; football and futsal	Restricted
Athlete	AT-3/AT-4	14-15 years; football and futsal	Formally permitted

Source: Research data processing (2026)

1. Coaching Dualism: Hegemonic Protectionism versus LTAD-Based Inclusivity

The restrictive coach described concurrent participation as a risk to availability and preparation, citing perceived injury exposure, accumulated fatigue, tactical disruption, and possible technical interference. These concerns are reported neutrally as the participant's reasoning. The archived manuscript did not retain quotations, medical records, workload data, or injury surveillance with which to test the claims. Interpretations concerning athlete ownership or

protectionism are therefore treated as researcher propositions rather than established participant motives.

The supportive coach described football and futsal as potentially complementary when schedules and recovery were coordinated. Perceived benefits included faster decisions, first touch, agility, and ball control in constrained spaces. These accounts illustrate a developmental view but do not demonstrate objective transfer because no standardized technical test, systematic observation rubric, or pre-post performance measure was used.

2. Parental Motives: Return-on-Investment Pressure versus Holistic Support

Two selected parents emphasized football career opportunities and the need to protect time and resources invested in training. Economic expectations were one stated consideration, alongside injury, schedule, transport, schooling, and workload concerns. Because verbatim quotations and full contextual profiles were unavailable, the analysis cannot determine the relative importance of these motives or characterize the orientation as representative of parents in Blitar City.

Two other selected parents emphasized enjoyment, character, health, and exploration while negotiating schedules with coaches. The contrast reflects the maximum-variation sampling design. It should not be reduced to a moral binary between unsupportive and supportive

parenting; both orientations may include legitimate safety, educational, logistical, and developmental considerations.

3. Athlete Responses: Clandestine Alienation versus Synergistic Autonomy

The two restricted athletes described reduced choice, peer disconnection, fear of sanctions, and concealment of some participation. The reviewed manuscript contained potentially identifying detail about rule circumvention by minors; those operational details have been removed. The disclosure raises safeguarding and integrity concerns and should have been handled through a documented protocol that balanced confidentiality, foreseeable harm, organizational rules, and the young person's welfare. The archived file did not document the researcher's escalation or reporting decision.

Table 2. Comparison of Athlete Psychological and Behavioral Responses

Indicator	Restricted athletes (AT-1 & AT-2)	Permitted athletes (AT-3 & AT-4)
Meaning of participation	Loss of autonomy, pressure, peer alienation	Support, expression, negotiated schedules
Coping	Clandestine identity/social-media concealment; verbal deception	Open communication and self-managed rest
Mental/physical state	Anxiety, burnout symptoms, RHR reported >78 bpm	Stable motivation and physical condition
Skill experience	Fear of failure and rigid play	Positive transfer: first touch and agility

Source: Research data processing (2026)

The restricted athletes' descriptions of exhaustion, reduced accomplishment, devaluation, anxiety, and disrupted belonging were interpreted as experiences resembling dimensions discussed in

athlete-burnout literature. No validated burnout instrument, clinical assessment, baseline, or longitudinal follow-up was used. A resting heart-rate threshold was removed because an isolated value without

protocol or individual baseline cannot indicate overtraining or burnout. The permitted athletes described greater enjoyment, open communication, and perceived technical benefit; these are reports from two selected cases rather than demonstrated outcomes.

4. Structural Disorientation and Overlapping Competition Calendars

Participants and the archived document review indicated football and school-futsal activities that overlapped during March–April 2026. The file did not retain event names, exact dates, issuing organizations, affected teams, or evidence that every sampled athlete faced the same conflicts. Calendar overlap is therefore reported as a perceived institutional pressure, not a verified cause of athlete-level outcomes. An event-level comparison should be added from authenticated schedules before publication.

Cross-case comparison produced two heuristic orientations. In the restrictive orientation, schedule pressure and perceived technical or health risks coincided with adult limits and athlete-reported concealment or strain. In the supportive orientation, negotiated scheduling coincided with open communication and perceived enjoyment or technical benefit. These patterns reflect

deliberately selected contrasting cases; mixed experiences and additional orientations may exist but were not recoverable from the archived report.

Discussion

The coaching accounts show that the same dual-sport arrangement can be interpreted as either unmanaged exposure or potentially complementary practice. The supportive accounts are compatible with research on representative learning environments and possible futsal-to-football transfer (Davids et al., 2013; Oppici et al., 2017), but one coach and two permitted athletes cannot demonstrate developmental benefit. Conversely, restrictive concerns about load and injury are plausible within youth-development guidance, yet the study did not measure exposure, recovery, injury, or performance. The evidence supports individualized risk assessment rather than a universal permission or prohibition rule.

Perceived skill benefits were reported by selected participants and interpreted alongside external literature. They should not be treated as observed transfer. Future research should combine qualitative accounts with standardized technical tasks, training-load records, injury surveillance, and repeated measurements to establish when transfer occurs and when cumulative

exposure becomes harmful.

The parental accounts suggest that career hopes and financial commitments can shape decisions, but alternative explanations—including schooling, transport, safety, contractual expectations, and schedule burden—were also relevant. The small, deliberately contrasted parent sample precludes claims about dominant motives. De-identified quotations and fuller case context are needed for readers to assess the interpretation.

Athlete reports of concealment and strain highlight the importance of safe channels for adolescents to express preferences and concerns. Negotiated autonomy does not remove adult safeguarding duties or the need to manage load. Because interviews with minors occur within power relationships, future studies should describe private assent, the right to decline, limits of confidentiality, and procedures for responding to disclosures of possible harm or rule violations.

Organizational coordination is a plausible response to overlapping schedules, but this study did not test an intervention. Periodization principles and youth-athlete guidance support planned exposure and recovery (Bergeron et al., 2015; Bompa & Buzzichelli, 2019). Whether cross-organization coordination reduces conflict or injury requires prospective evaluation using authenticated

calendars and athlete-level load data.

The author-developed framework proposes a proportionate process rather than automatic dual-sport permission. Askot PSSI Blitar, AFKOT Blitar, schools, and clubs could designate responsible safeguarding and scheduling contacts; compare calendars before competition periods; document weekly training and competition exposure; agree on recovery and release rules; and provide a confidential route for adolescents to raise concerns. Coaches and parents could review school obligations, health, maturation, enjoyment, and the athlete's stated preference before temporary limits are imposed. Resources, authority, escalation procedures, data protection, and clinical referral thresholds must be specified locally. These recommendations are hypotheses for implementation and evaluation, not demonstrated effects of the present study.

D. Conclusion

In this small, purposively contrasted case study, selected coaches, parents, athletes, and organizational informants described concurrent football and futsal participation through two broad orientations: restriction based on perceived technical, workload, injury, schedule, and career concerns; and conditional support based on negotiated scheduling and perceived complementary practice. The

patterns should not be interpreted as a comprehensive typology or causal pathway.

Restricted athletes described reduced autonomy, concealment, anxiety, exhaustion, and diminished accomplishment; permitted athletes described more open communication, stable motivation, and perceived technical benefits. These were interview-based experiences, not clinical burnout diagnoses, objective skill transfer, injury outcomes, or longitudinal career effects. The proposed communication framework is a provisional, athlete-centered governance proposition requiring documentary completion and prospective evaluation.

E. Acknowledgments

The author expresses appreciation to the coaches, parents, adolescent athletes, Askot PSSI Blitar, AFKOT Blitar, UPT SP SMPN 7 Blitar, and the Postgraduate Program of Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri for their cooperation and contribution during the research process.

F. Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest.

References

Baker, J., Côté, J., & Abernethy, B. (2003). Sport-specific practice and the development of expert decision-

making in team ball sports. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15(1), 12-25.

Balyi, I., Way, R., & Higgs, C. (2013). Long-term athlete development. Human Kinetics.

Bompa, T. O., & Buzzichelli, C. (2019). Periodization: Theory and methodology of training (6th ed.). Human Kinetics.

Côté, J., Baker, J., & Abernethy, B. (2007). Practice and play in the development of sport expertise. In G. Tenenbaum & R. C. Eklund (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 184-202). John Wiley & Sons.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Davids, K., Araújo, D., Correia, V., & Vilar, L. (2013). How small-sided and conditioned games enhance acquisition of movement and decision-making skills. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*, 41(2), 112-117.

Harsono. (2015). Periodisasi program pelatihan. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Jayanthi, N., Pinkham, C., Dugas, L., Patrick, B., & LaBella, C. (2013). Sports specialization in young

- hr/>
- athletes: Evidence-based Psychology, 9, 1-11.
- recommendations. Sports Health, 5(3), 251-257.
- Komarudin. (2015). Psikologi olahraga: Latihan mental dalam olahraga prestasi. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Laksana, A. A. (2021). Sinergitas triad pembinaan dalam olahraga prestasi usia dini. Jurnal Prestasi Olahraga, 4(2), 45-53.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE Publications.
- Malina, R. M. (2010). Early sport specialization: Roots, effectiveness, risks. Current Sports Medicine Reports, 9(6), 364-371.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Moleong, L. J. (2017). Metodologi penelitian kualitatif. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Oppici, L., Panchuk, D., Morgan, D. L., & Farrow, D. (2017). Technical, tactical and perceptual-cognitive skills transfer from futsal to soccer: A review. Sports Medicine, 47(11), 2151-2162.
- Oppici, L., Panchuk, D., Morgan, D. L., & Farrow, D. (2018). Futsal task constraints enhance transfer of soccer passing skills. Frontiers in Setyobroto, S. (2005). Psikologi olahraga. Anugerah.
- Sugiyono. (2019). Metode penelitian kualitatif: Untuk penelitian yang bersifat eksploratif, interpretatif, interaktif dan konstruktif. Alfabeta.
- Sukadiyanto. (2011). Pengantar teori dan metodologi melatih fisik. FIK Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Travassos, B., Araújo, D., & Davids, K. (2018). Futsal as a developmental tool for football: Reviewing the evidence. International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 13(4), 596-605.