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Introduction

In this chapter we investigate the relationship between ‘race’, whiteness and sport. We do this by providing a critical review of published works on ‘race’, whiteness and sport over a five year period (2009-2015). We acknowledge that many significant and seminal works set the scene for the papers included here and sometimes we expand our search parameters to include some of them. We ask a number of questions regarding whiteness: What is it? How is it manifest? How is it performed? How are its privileges sustained? We adopt the view that White identity is not just phenotypic, but is also performative and contingent. We are also mindful that whiteness processes, while not always acknowledged, are omnipresent; permeating all facets of everyday life, including sport. Indeed, whiteness operates at a number of levels of sport - from grassroots to governance structures – and, as a result, sport is an appropriate lens through which to ask questions of the centrality of whiteness and its implications for how we experience sport.

We begin the chapter by delineating our own biographies and explaining how whiteness impacts our own lives. Next we provide an overview of the concept of whiteness and how it has been applied to sport. We then move to a discussion of our methodology, specifically highlighting our literature search protocol and its return. Following this we map out our critical race theory framework whose advocates have been vociferous in its naming of and resistance to racialised power relations, Whiteness critiques are central to this (Delgado and Stefancic, 1997). Next, we present findings from our literature search in which critical race theory not only informs our critique but also seminal ideas in the way whiteness is considered in sport and related areas. The findings are divided into five themes: White as normal; Otherness; sport media; colourblindness; and researching whiteness. In the final section of the chapter, we assess the state of research regarding ‘race’, whiteness and sport and suggest future research directions.

Though we recognise that ‘race’ in itself is a paradox and that discussing ‘race’ indicates that racism is still a factor in society, we acknowledge its lived reality and everyday social construction (Guinier and Torres, 2003). According to Roberts (2009: 506) the purpose of understanding ‘race’ is to recognise the power of one’s own mind and status, and derive from that power the impetus necessary to reach individual and/or collective goals. She concludes that we are all each responsible for what we do with what we inherit. Roberts’ comments resonate strongly with both authors given our very different backgrounds.

Fletcher was born in the 1980s, in a mining town in northern England. While coming from working class upbringings, by the time his parents had started a family, they had experienced a degree of economic mobility through careers in management and self-employment respectively. Fletcher experienced what he considers to be a privileged upbringing. Relative economic stability meant that he wanted for very little – especially in sport where he was supported unconditionally. This support (alongside some talent) enabled him to represent his county at cricket from the age of 15 to the age of 21. Never acknowledging it at the time, he is now able to see how the workings of whiteness and White privilege facilitated his entry and progression in cricket. There is a general belief in most sports that to progress to higher levels of play your face must ‘fit’. Fortunately for Fletcher, his did. Fletcher’s White identity was shared almost exclusively by the management, coaches and team.
mates, thus ensuring that cricket remained a White habitus, where associated habits and tastes were normal and unproblematic. These privileges were never acknowledged but they certainly existed. Fletcher’s experiences no doubt mirror those of many other White men navigating their way through the structures of sport. However, while Fletcher is now in a position to see and problematise these privileges, many others continue not to see, or are unwilling to.

Hylton was born in 1960s East London to Jamaican parents who were invited to the UK with other willing members of the Commonwealth to fulfil essential jobs in under-served industries. Transport and health were the starting points for this working class family, as job security, settlement, remittances home, and navigating the overt racism of the era became their main priorities. None of this impacted the consciousness of Hylton as a youth through the school curriculum which did not dwell on any of these issues, yet in sport, patterns emerged that only more critical reflections in later years revealed what could be described as racialised behaviours. Assumptions of natural ability in football, athletics, and cricket were flattering facilitators of insiderness and hegemonic masculinity, yet at the same time those assumptions based upon racial stereotypes were also inferring other things about intellectual capacity and propensities for success in academic as well as sporting domains. We should not be surprised that these patterns retain a certain resilience today, especially as such racialised dynamics are taxing enough to unpack for academics let alone other less critical actors in their everyday lives.

Differences aside, we are united by our commitment to anti-racism and social justice, and in our beliefs that the multifarious ideological underpinnings of whiteness lie at the heart of this fight. It is important to stress here that a focus on social justice must be coupled with the belief in the existence of ‘injustice’, before change can occur. As we will identify in the next section, many of the privileges afforded to whiteness rely on its supposed invisibility, hegemony and supremacy. The first step in combating these privileges and their effects, is in explicitly identifying whiteness and making it visible. We believe that sport has a role to play in this.

Sports are not benign, whimsical leisure pursuits, devoid of political meaning; rather they are serious spaces which should encourage critical engagement with issues of ethnic and racial inequalities. Critical studies of sport reveal that, rather than being a passive mechanism for merely reflecting inequality, sport supports agentic potential and is thus actively involved in producing, reproducing, sustaining and indeed, acts as a site for resistance (Dashper and Fletcher, 2014). In social terms, however, sport has often been considered the great social leveller. In fact, sport continues to be cited as an exemplar par excellence of an agent of personal and positive social change. Numerous studies articulate the possibility of sport acting as a legitimate space for political struggle, resistance and change, and as a modality for “self-actualization and the reaffirmation of previously abject identities” (Carrington, 2010: 36).

Until the mid-1990s, the literature on the interconnections between ‘race’, ethnicity, racism and sport lagged behind other areas, most notably gender and disability studies (Long and Spracklen, 2011a). In response to a number of calls for more critical scholarship in the fields of sport and ‘race’ (For example Carrington and Mcdonald, 2001; and Hylton, 2005), there has been a relative proliferation of writing on sport and ‘race-related’ issues since the mid-1990s and into the twenty first century. During this time there has been a marked shift towards thinking about sport more critically, that is, toward thinking of sport as a productive cultural activity and social institution that makes and remakes ideas about ‘race’ and not only a domain impacted by racist discourses and ideologies (Carrington et al., 2015). This has involved examining how ‘race’ intersects with other social identities and inequalities, locating media representation(s) as central in the (re)production of racial ideologies, and thinking more critically about whiteness.
Whiteness and sport

Studies of whiteness arguably lag behind other areas of ethnic and racial studies. This pattern is not isolated to the study of sport. As Frankenberg (1993) previously noted, meaningful conversations with White people about ‘race’ are muted due to a denial of seeing ‘race’ and/or the polite distancing of the topic. Early studies of whiteness asserted that White people do not see themselves as ‘raced’, yet enjoy privileges as a result of their whiteness (McIntosh, 1988; Kincheloe et al., 1991; Harris, 1993). These ideas have been supplemented by the unconscious defence of White privilege through colourblindness (Burke, 2012; Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Leonardo, 2009), learned ignorance (Sullivan and Tuana, 2007; Mills, 1997), meritocracies and broader ideals of level playing fields (Delgado and Stenfancic, 2012; Delgado and Stefancic, 1997; Gillborn, 2008) and notions of racism’s demise emerging in post race discourses (Gilroy, 1998; St. Louis, 2002). The result of conscious or unconscious ambivalence toward White privilege leads to a legacy of what has been described as White supremacy where systematic insidious processes of privileging manifests itself across a plethora of arenas and are not restricted to housing, education, health, economics, media and sporting arenas (Gillborn, 2008; Leonardo, 2009; Mills, 2007).

The term ‘White’ can be “interpreted as encompassing non-material and fluid dominant norms and boundaries” (Garner, 2007: 67). To be White, however, does not mean one will be privileged in the same way, or to the same extent. Within the White racialised hierarchy there are a number of strata with varying degrees of acceptability (Puwar, 2004) or, as Long and Hylton (2002) suggest, different ‘shades of White’. For instance, those who appear phenotypically White, including Irish, Jewish and new migrant communities, such as Eastern Europeans, continue to occupy marginal positions (Long, Hylton and Spracklen, 2014). In this chapter, we use the term whiteness to refer to everyday invisible and hegemonic processes that privilege (and normalise) the position of White identities in society.

Over the last two to three decades, sociology and the sociology of sport have begun to ask new questions about whiteness. Historically, whiteness has been viewed as normal, with many academics alluding to the invisibility of White ethnicities (Dyer, 1997; Ware and Back, 2002; Frankenberg, 2004; Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Of course, this view is demonstrative of academic White logic because White ethnicities are always visible to Black and minoritised others in the way that W.E.B. Du Bois’ idea of the colour line was emphasised (Fanon, 1986[1967]; West, 2001; Du Bois, 1998). Classic writers in racial and ethnic studies such as Du Bois and Fanon began to articulate such ideas later applied in critical race theory that began with the need for positionality and lived realities to inform the critical ontologies required to transform racialised social arrangements (hooks, 1989; Williams, 1997; Crenshaw et al., 2009). So convincing is the ‘White as invisible’ thesis that Nayak (2003) refers to White ethnicities as ‘cultureless’, while Bonnett (2005) has termed White, the ‘Other of ethnicity’. Leonardo (2009) suggests that whiteness gains a significant amount of its power by ‘Othering’ the very idea of ethnicity. These views beg the question of how whiteness acts implicitly through routine and normalised practices on the field and within social environments surrounding sports as a consequence of a White-centred culture.

It is necessary to ask a number of questions of whiteness and the different ethnic groups who are ‘touched’ by its gaze: 1) Where and with whom should the awareness and responsibility for whiteness lie? 2) How responsible and aware of whiteness should those with White identities be? 3) How should Black and minoritised ethnic groups relate to whiteness? 4) How might White people
become conscious and critical of the privileges of whiteness to the betterment of Black and minoritised ethnic groups? (adapted from Roberts, 2009: 497). At the core of these questions is the supposition that “rather than simply describing what whiteness is, it is more useful to explain what whiteness does” (McDonald, 2009: 9). After outlining our methodology, we utilise a critical race theoretical framework for articulating the processes of whiteness.

Methodology

Once a field or sub-field of study has produced a critical mass of scholarly studies it becomes sensible to ‘take stock’ and consider whether the answers to our questions can be derived from existing research (Long and Hylton, 2014; Long et al., 2009). This process also allows us to assess what gaps exist and where researchers might usefully focus their attention. This chapter presents findings from a systematic review of research outputs in the areas of ‘race’, whiteness, and sport over a five year period. According to Long and Hylton (2014), systematic review “involves collating all the evidence within agreed boundaries and then imposing a research design hierarchy to make judgements about quality that will determine whether a study is admitted into the analysis” (p.379). By analysing the content of research outputs over a particular period of time it is possible to establish which topics, issues, theoretical and methodological frameworks are/were of interest/importance at specific periods in time (Dart, 2014).

Our primary focus was academic journals, for as Tomlinson (2006) advocates, they are the “lifeblood” of many disciplines (cited in Dart, 2014: 646). However, we acknowledge that significant work on ‘race’, whiteness, and sport exists elsewhere (e.g. Hylton, 2009; Carrington, 2010; Smith, 2010; Long and Spracklen, 2011a; Adair, 2011, 2015; Burdsey, 2013; Spracklen, 2013; Nauright, Cobley and Wiggins, 2014) and so we have also included monographs, edited collections and research reports in our searches. Our research was guided by three questions:

1. What are the dominant topics and areas of enquiry?
2. How central was whiteness and iterations of it?
3. What are the current limitations with academic work completed on ‘race’, whiteness and sport?

The primary data were retrieved from online databases using key word searches covering a period of five years: 2009-2015 (searches took place in early 2015). The following academic databases were searched: Academic Search Premier and Academic Search Complete, Sport Discus, Leisure Tourism Database, Sociological Abstracts, Physical Education Index and Ingenta Connect. We also searched via Leeds Beckett University’s ‘in house’ database, Discover. Search terms used were:

White OR Sport

Whiteness AND Physical Education

OR

White privilege

Physical Activity
We were interested in whether any of these combinations were featured at any point in each source. Though acknowledging limitations, Dart (2014: 651) argues that words appearing in titles and/or key word searches “give a fairly accurate description of the likely content of the paper”. He continues by noting “any non-identification in the title, or key word list is not to suggest that the paper did not engage with theory … the absence of a clearly identified theoretical framework does suggest it was not a central feature in their paper” (p.660). We do not dispute this, but would add that some themes/issues – whiteness included – are often drawn upon implicitly without being acknowledged explicitly. The absence of any specific reference to whiteness could be interpreted to mean that whiteness was unimportant in these sources. However, as we demonstrate below, even where whiteness is only implied, it was self-evidently an intersecting or epistemological factor. Our aim was never to analyse and critique each source individually. Rather, we wanted to know how popular and central to the scholarly literature that work on whiteness has been.

We acknowledge the limitations of searching via databases so we also followed up references to additional work cited in the sources. Despite our best efforts, it is possible (likely?) that some material has been missed. This notwithstanding, we are confident that our analysis does reflect the research conducted over the 2009-2015 time period.

Our search found 76 articles, published in 31 different journals. Given that most of the established work on ‘race’ and whiteness has emerged from the field of sociology it was not surprising that the most popular outlets were what you would consider to be sociology of sport, leisure and education journals. It was encouraging to find that a number of non-sport related journals published some of these works (see Carrington, 2013 for further discussion).

Table 1: List of sources and number of publications in each source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport in Society</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer and Society</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport, Education and Society</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Sport and Social Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Review for the Sociology of Sport</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Leisure Research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and Racial Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of Sport Journal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first instance we read the abstract for each and created codes based on the content. Coding identified six recurring themes: Critical race theory; White as normal; Otherness; sport media; colourblindness; and researching whiteness. Each source was assigned one (or where there was overlap, more than one) of these themes. We next outline the CRT informed theoretical framework before turning to present our findings.

**Critical Race Theory (CRT)**

Though CRT underpins this chapter it is also one of the key themes that emerged from this review of literature. In this section we introduce fundamentals of CRT before focusing on the theme of CRT and sport in the findings. Where CRT has been used in sport, leisure and cognate disciplines it has
drawn from key authors such as Crenshaw (Crenshaw et al., 2009; Crenshaw, 1995), Gillborn (2011; 2009) Delgado (Delgado and Stenfancic, 2012; Delgado, 2000), Ladson-Billings (Ladson-Billings, 2003), Mills (Mills, 1997), and Bell (Bell, 2004). Derek Bell, prominent critical race theorist and law professor to President Barack Obama, urged people to accept the reality of the permanence of racism in society (Bell, 1992). This was neither a nihilistic statement nor a loose pejorative remark, but one that acts as a fundamental, ontological position for many that have approached CRT from a lived racialised experience. Critical race theory is often described as an emergent, liberatory, ‘race’ centred theoretical framework that sharpened its intellectual tools in the crucible of American ‘race’ relations and critical legal studies. Fundamental state sponsored racialised inequalities were regularly the central agenda for their contestations and discourses of racial liberation. Not only was ‘race’ the central point of attention for critical race scholars, but so was its absence in what others would deem a meritocratic society and in particular the ‘objectivity’ of the law. For many, revealing processes that reified racialised inequalities and privileges for individuals and entities, supported through the law and other social institutions, including sport, helped to facilitate perspectives that acknowledged the fallibility of individuals and structures. Notions of merit, privilege, ahistoricism, counter storytelling, interest convergence, centering ‘race’, intersectionality, and more recently, whiteness have all, to varying degrees, populated strands of critical race theory critiques (Crenshaw, 1995; Crenshaw et al., 2009; Delgado and Stenfancic, 2012; Gillborn et al., 2012).

Most importantly, though not to the exclusion of intersecting forms of social oppression, a critical race theory framework must always centre ‘race’ with a view to challenging racialised dynamics in society. Like other critical race theorists, Youdell (2012: 145) argues that ‘race’ is a,

Feature of our institutions, our social practices, our everyday life, our discourses and our unconscious investments and attachments. Together these produce and reproduce race and race hierarchy as well as the ‘common sense’ that racism is aberrant, in decline and something that can be legislated away.

Youdell echoes the words of Bell and other critical race theorists whom assert the ‘everydayness’ of racism while explaining how its processes and practices are systematically executed in a plethora of fashions (Omi and Winant, 2002; Guinier and Torres, 2003; Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Feagin, 2010; Zamudio et al., 2011; Hylton et al., 2011). On this note, CRT cautions against complacency in regards to claims of racism being an aberration, ‘a one-off’, any such explanations reduce such behaviours to the level of the individual while ignoring broader, embedded institutional and structural processes and practices. So, ideologies that mask these racialised dynamics such as colourblindness, meritocracy, and racial equality, often deemed to be discourses of the Left, force critical race theorists to remain sceptical about ahistorical incrementalism in struggles for equality, and the idealism of colourblindness and meritocracy. The lived reality of ‘race’ and racism is undeniable for critical race theorists, which is why a realist pragmatism underpins all iterations of the term ‘race’ as it retains little traction in science (Pilkington et al., 2009; UNESCO, 1978). The scare quotes surrounding much use of the term is to acknowledge this paradox, problematise its everyday use in rudimentary and inchoate vocabularies, and prompt continued critical challenges to racism drawing on a more complex and political lexicon (Warmington, 2009).

Bell’s notion of the rules of racial standing emphasises how ‘race’ permeates everyday social relations. Racial relations can be understood in Bell’s terms as a form of ‘standing’ that can empower some while disempowering others. There are five rules of racial standing that Bell outlines; Rule 1) Argues that Black people are often ‘denied standing’ when they discuss issues related to ‘race’ and racism. Their testimonies can often be denied standing when they stand alone and are more likely to
be valued where triangulated with more valued others. Bell uses the term ‘special pleading’ to refer to how Black people’s expertise on these issues are sometimes perceived. This can be writ large in sport where claims of racialised wrongdoing by players, spectators and administrators are looked upon suspiciously; Rule 2) Black witnesses to racism are less effective than those generally implicated in reinforcing racism. In such cases their views receive ‘diminished standing’, except when they are echoed by those privileged by whiteness, who themselves are not denied standing or viewed as engaged in special pleading; Rule 3) Black people are less likely to have diminished racial standing where they criticise other Black people acting to disparage/upset powerful elites. Here their voices are more likely to retain a higher level of gravitas and standing as they are privileged by those implicated by the charges; Rule 4) Where a Black person acts in a controversial way against a dominant group they will actively recruit influential Black others willing to refute the statement or condemn the action. At this point, when Black people are recruited by a dominant group to condemn other Black and minoritised communities, Bell argues that they receive super standing; Rule 5) Reflects a recognition of an increasing critical awareness and sensitivity to racialised processes, as Bell (1992: 125) states that,

As an individual’s understanding of these rules increases, there will be more and more instances where one can discern their workings. Using this knowledge, one gains the gift of prophecy about racism, its essence, its goals, even its remedies. The price of this knowledge is the frustration that follows recognition that no amount of public prophecy, no matter its accuracy, can either repeal the Rules of Racial Standing or prevent their operation.

In sport there have been a number of instances of the rules of racial standing in action that in themselves may seem like ‘one-off’ incidents or issues, though viewed through a historical lens speak to the recurring nature of the negative racial processes in play that elicits the 5th rule of racial standing. For example, consider Kevin Prince Boateng’s position when he walked off the pitch for receiving racist abuse from spectators while playing association football for AC Milan against Pro Patria. It has been argued that had Boateng’s colleagues not followed him off the pitch his decision would not have received the standing that it did. Television pundit and ex-Arsenal striker Ian Wright, commenting on CNN, remarked that,

As a Black player, being racially abused, people will listen to you but they’ll say ‘ahh look at him playing the race card’... I had to deal with that all my life, but if you have the top White players alongside you, like with Prince Boateng when they walked off with him ... that’s fine. But if you walk off as a Black guy people will say he’s got a chip on his shoulder, he’s walked off and doesn’t care about his team.

Not only do Wright’s comments show an awareness of racism in sport and the subordinate position of the Black voice, he implicitly refers to the racial order in football and the working of hegemonic whiteness in the game. His views can be explained by recourse to reflections on his own denied and diminished standing which he uses as the ontological starting point to draw his expert assessment of racism in football and the reason for the success of this intervention by Prince Boateng and his AC Milan colleagues. It is important to note that whiteness is not mentioned by Wright, though its absence in his explanation allows it to hide in plain sight. Elsewhere, Ex-Chelsea player, Ashley Cole’s support of ex-England and Chelsea captain, John Terry, received enhanced standing as he volunteered his support to Terry’s claims that he did not racially abuse Patrice Evra (see Burdsey,
2014 for further discussion). In the past, African American sprinter Jessie Owens received ‘super standing’ as he was publically endorsed by IOC Chief Avery Brundidge to challenge and pacify the threat of Black Power advocates John Carlos and Tommie Smith.

hooks (1989), like Gillborn (2008), prefers to use the term ‘White supremacy’, rather than racism or simply whiteness, to more fully come to terms with the subtle subordination of Black and minoritised ethnic communities. In sport we see this in the clustering of Black bodies in lower positions of administration and leadership, or even the highest levels of performance, without being able to consistently break through glass ceilings (Bradbury et al., 2015). hooks’ analysis identifies a hegemonic value structure that neutralises diverse ways of thinking and doing for more established ones. In this way glass ceilings are more likely to be breached by those who think in the same way as those closer to networks of power in institutions (King, 2004). Bell’s rules of racial standing is evoked here in the way White supremacy imbricates itself on our social structures as it explains the acquiescence and collusion of some of those it works against.

There has been a noticeable development in the application of CRT to sport, physical education and leisure – in particular the study of whiteness and White privilege. Critical race theory has been used by sport and leisure scholars to apply a new lexicon to the study of racialised relations in sport and leisure arenas. Its tenets, that include challenging established epistemologies and ideologies, liberation and the transformation of racialised power relations, and debunking notions of meritocracy, colourblindness and objectivity, has forced scholars to consider the politics of approaches to the sociology of sport, where ‘race’ fits into their issues, and whose knowledge and experiences are valued in these exchanges (Hylton, in press 2015). Critical race theory as a pragmatic framework informs as much as it is informed by substantive scholarship, therefore it is important to recognise that it draws many of its foundational ideas from a range of domains that include critical legal studies, race critical and critical sociological arenas. Thus, critical race theory encourages a transdisciplinary intellectual engagement to the application of its framework and as such its contributions to sport and leisure permeate disciplines not typically associated with these disciplinary domains. For example Winograd’s (2011) work on the sports biographies of African American football players in the journal Race, Ethnicity and Education makes a contribution to the issues on how colorblindness in literature is perpetuated with young people. Others do this specifically in sport, leisure and P.E domains (Hylton, 2010; Hylton, 2015; Fitzpatrick and Santamaria, 2015; Flintoff et al., 2014).

Findings

In many of the themes, we have found that ideas are often drawn from a range of sources. For example, each section below has instances that have drawn directly or implicitly from CRT without it necessarily being the focus of the study. Further, CRT is the only theoretical theme to emerge in this literature search which reflects more its direct engagement with issues of ‘race’, racism and whiteness, which are central aspects of its core ideas. Where authors use a CRT lens explicitly in their analyses of whiteness, contributions vary from arguing the case for sport, P.E and leisure scholars to engaging more seriously with CRT and ‘race’ (Arai and Kivel, 2009; Roberts, 2009; Hylton, 2010) to the commodification of Blackness in the NBA (Griffin, 2012), critique of Olympic legacies (Hylton and Morpeth, 2012), ‘race’ talk in formal P.E settings (Hylton, 2015) and the whiteness of sex segregation and class in women’s ski jumping (Travers, 2011). Drawing on the earlier work of Scraton and Watson (2001), Long and Hylton (2002), Singer (2005), Hartmann (2007), and Hylton (2009),
Arai and Kivel (2009) adopt a CRT lens to critique the notion of whiteness in the context of leisure research. They present a loosely diachronic conceptualisation of whiteness in leisure research, suggesting the idea of fourth wave ‘race’ research in leisure studies. This fourth wave is characterised by attention to the ideological and discursive production of the workings of whiteness and racism. Hylton (2009, 2010) is more explicit in making the case for how CRT can be applied to sport and how CRT is a useful framework for destabilising racial privilege in support of social justice. Ultimately, CRT encourages an activist scholarship that shakes the complacencies of left leaning intellectuals to force them to name ‘race’, racialisation and the place of whiteness within what can be viewed as the oppressive arenas of sport and leisure. Disputes over how history, theory and action intersect (and inhibit) are at the heart of Hylton and Morpeth’s (2012) examination of ‘race’ rhetoric and the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games. Amidst popular rhetoric celebrating the UK’s, London’s and the Games’ multiculturalism, the authors caution the capacity of single mega-events, such as an Olympic or Paralympic Games, to evoke change within institutions – e.g. sport - so historically entrenched with racial inequalities. Indeed, they label the very suggestion that “single-mega-event policies are the answer to broader social issues that magically overtake entrenched racial inequalities” as ‘futile’ (p.3).

Like Singer (2005) and (Hylton, 2011, 2012, in press 2015) Roberts’ (2009), application of a CRT framework builds an alternative view of the purpose of sport and leisure research based on the importance of fighting against injustice. Accordingly, the key to a CRT-informed social justice paradigm is in putting theory and intention into action:

We need to ... engage in antiracism efforts, develop a change in organizational policy, and fully comprehend how critical race theory impacts our scholarship. In this way, both researchers and practitioners may effectively articulate how whiteness preserves social privilege, maintains its position in the hierarchy of power, and persists in its dominance [in sport and leisure] entitlements. Positive change is not possible without moving social justice postulates into action. (p.507)

**White as Normal**

Contemporary research has revealed a widespread denial of the existence or prevalence of racism by participants, practitioners and policy makers alike. There is a tendency among those who hold sport dear to explain away racism as either (or both) inevitable (competition brings out the worst in people) or part of the game. These practices are demonstrative of how a culture of whiteness permeates sport at every level in respect to those with little or no experience of racism being ambivalent about its nature, extent and impact. We found these themes appearing in teaching and coaching, participation as a player, spectator or volunteer, to management and governance.

Many of the contributions in this theme questioned the commitment of sporting institutions to make positive and meaningful changes in how they tackle racial inequalities. Long and Spracklen’s (2011a) analysis of anti-racism legislation in sport suggests that impact has only been partial, in that commitment to racial equality does not routinely permeate the structures of organisations. This reluctance to acknowledge racial inequality could also be seen in contributions focusing on the under-representation of minoritised ethnic communities in positions of influence (e.g. coaching and management) in sports organisations (Agyemang and DeLorme, 2010; Cleland, 2014). Trying to understand this problem, Bradbury (2013) seeks to explain the relationship between processes and practices of institutional racism and the continued under-representation of Black and minoritised
ethnic groups in leadership positions in football in Europe (see also Bradbury, 2011). He, like Lusted (2009) and Cunningham et al. (2012), argues that practices of institutional racism reproduce whiteness in sport and are underpinned by patterns of hegemonic White privilege embedded within the core structures of decision-making bodies at the highest levels of football.

These issues are further reinforced by White coaches holding more negative perceptions of Black and minoritised ethnic athletes than Black and minoritised ethnic coaches do of White athletes (Cunningham et al 2012). Discussions of under-representation were also highly gendered. The vast majority focused on males, but some did present female experiences. Borland and Bruening’s (2010) examination of the underrepresentation of Black females as head coaches in collegiate basketball adopts an intersectional approach to exploring whiteness. They argue that college athletic departments are hegemonically White and male.

Other studies in education identified how the Eurocentricity of White pedagogies helped to maintain the whiteness of sporting spaces, while simultaneously Othering ‘ethnic minorities’ (see also Mowatt and French’s (2013) comments on the underrepresentation of Black women in research). Flintoff’s (2014, 2015) analyses of Black and minoritised ethnic student-teacher experiences of P.E teacher training courses argues that P.E teacher education is overwhelmingly White. Via the use of individual narratives, Flintoff documents the experiences of Black and minoritised ethnic students in these courses, highlighting how they feel excluded and Othered by, among other things, the White curriculum, White colleagues and White students (see also Azzarito (2009), Douglas and Halas (2013), Wiggins (2014), Hylton (2015), and McDonald (2014) who emphasise how the relationship between sport and education can also serve to (re)produce ideas about ‘race’). Rossi, Rhynne and Nelson (2013) and Darnell (2012) argue a similar case in Australian, and Sport for Development contexts.

A number of less prominent case studies emphasise how racial processes lead to racialised outcomes in terms of access and participation in sport. Harrison (2013), for example, illustrates how processes of everyday racism work to secure skiing’s social spaces as predominantly White, thereby restricting the participation and representation of Black skiers (see also Travers 2011). Similarly, in Canada, Rich and Giles’ (2014) research into the Canadian Red Cross Swim Programme identifies that the programme does not currently offer cultural diversity training for instructors - most of whom are White. The programme perpetuated a racialised discourse on leadership that revealed (a) all participants should perceive risk and demonstrate leadership like Whites/Eurocanadians, and (b) behaviors that reflect White/Eurocanadian beliefs are normal alternative ways of behaving (see Wiltse 2014 for an alternative reading on ‘race’ and swimming).

**Otherness**

In this context, Otherness became synonymous with those revealed to be in the margins, occupying liminal spaces or removed from centres of influence characterised by whiteness. Resistance and Blackness, Asianness, and ‘abnormality’ were prominent themes (Davidson, 2012). A number of contributions in this theme discussed Blackness as struggle, often in relation to colonial oppressors. However, Carrington (2010) warns that the inclusion of more Black participants in sports in the West, coupled with wider political struggles for recognition, have not stopped sport from acting as a site for political struggle between Black people and White elites. For example, Carrington (2010) suggests that early public displays of Black sporting prowess were highly influential in challenging western racial logic, including that of Black degeneracy, in what Carrington terms ‘the Myth of
Modern Sport’ (p.25), a Eurocentric model of sport’s global diffusion, which presupposes the physical, mental and emotional superiority of the White ‘race’ over other ‘races’.

The point of departure for other studies positions Blackness as something to be managed by the superiority of White logic. Douglas (2012) explores the ways in which White people in tennis (fans, administrators and journalists) represent and objectify Black tennis players. McDonald and Toglia (2010) and Griffin (2012) consider how Blackness and Black masculinity have been commodified by the NBA where representations of Blackness and whiteness are manipulated and reproduced by the NBA and media. Lorenz and Murray (2013) also argue that the NBA’s dress code is a mechanism whereby Blackness is policed within a framework of White acceptability (see also McDonald and King’s (2012) case study of the ambiguous relationship between Barack Obama’s election campaign and sport).

The existence of South/British Asian communities in sport and leisure has become more commonplace over the last fifteen years. Studies of South/British Asian males have focused mainly on football (Johal, 2001; Burdsey, 2007a; Burdsey and Randhawa, 2012), cricket (Williams, 2001; Burdsey, 2010; Fletcher, 2011; 2012; 2015; Fletcher and Spracklen, 2014; Raman, 2015) and boxing (Burdsey, 2007b) and have examined issues related to racial stereotypes and conflict, regional and national identities, British citizenship, integration and assimilation, hybrid and diasporic identities, and experiences of playing sport, supporting national teams and attending sports stadia. Studies examining South/British Asian females and sport have focused predominantly on football (Ahmad, 2011; Farooq, 2011; Ratna, 2011, 2014), but also include sports such as basketball (Farooq-Samie, 2013) and kabaddi (Bains, 2014). Each notes how traditionally South/British Asian women were believed to be constrained from entering sporting spaces because of religious practices and cultural norms. They identify family and partner disapproval, fear of going out alone and community pressures as potential barriers. However, they also look beyond such barriers, instead stressing the relative agency of many South/British Asian females in accessing and progressing in sport.

Farooq-Samie’s (2013) examination of Muslim female basketballers argues that much of the research has depicted Muslim females as victims of their religion and victims of the veil. She argues how, via sport, many Muslim women are exerting their agency to present their bodies in much the same way as White women. Similarly, Bains’ (2014) study of kabaddi among members of the British Indian diaspora turns the idea of sporting participation on its head by arguing that it is their non-involvement in kabbadi that forms an important part of their identities as Punjabi women in the UK. Unlike much existing research into gender and sport, for Bains, kabbadi “is an arena where patriarchal relations are negotiated and maintained but, unlike many other sporting spaces...it is not a contested site for women where they struggle for representation” (p.155).

The supposition that leisure and sport spaces can support processes of social inclusion, yet may also serve to exclude certain groups is continued in Long, Hylton and Spracklen’s (2014) analyses of new migrant communities in the UK. They explore how leisure and sport spaces are encoded by new migrants, but how struggles over those spaces and the use of social and cultural capital are racialised. Moreover, Spracklen, Long and Hylton (2015) argue that White European migrants find it easier to access leisure and sport provision when compared to other migrants - e.g. Black Africans. Being phenotypically White affords some degree of privilege over Black migrants, but their White appearance only gains them contingent inclusion (for further discussions on contingent whiteness see Hylton and Lawrence, 2014).

Davidson’s (2012) account of the Gay Games adopts a completely different perspective. She argues that in moving beyond the celebration of gay and lesbian affirmation, the Games’ push for
normalisation produces a biotechnology of whiteness, class privilege and racism. She suggests that the Gay Games movement is a political technology of White supremacy whereby a particular form of privileged gay pride has been commodified to present a corporate image of a normative, hegemonic form of whiteness (p.365).

Sport media

The impact of the media on creating and reinforcing stereotypes and as a vehicle for everyday racism and oppression is well documented across many disciplinary areas. In their review of sport and physical activity participation among Black and minoritised ethnic communities, Long and Hylton (2014) found that most studies challenge the notion of ‘positive’ stereotypes, instead highlighting the “pernicious process of negative racialisation” (p.10). The sport media are a key site in the construction of whiteness (Spracklen, 2013), but historically they have also been influential in challenging assumptions about White and Othered bodies.

Spracklen (2013) dedicates a chapter on whiteness and the sport media, where he argues that sport and entertainment intersect to construct whiteness (see also Hylton 2009). He suggests that sports media – whether traditional television programming or live sports events or modern media outlets such as online blogs and discussion forums – are places where whiteness is constructed, but rarely resisted (p.123). The view that the sport media are institutionally racist is developed further by Price et al. (2013), and van Sterkenburg et al. (2010). Price et al. (2013) identify three key areas in which elements of institutional racism are to be found. First, regulatory practices, in the form of the Press Complaints Commission, have downplayed and ignored problems of discriminatory content; second, that recruitment practices have led to a chronic lack of diversity within the sports journalism profession; and third, that damaging racial stereotypes persist in sports coverage (see Van Sterkenberg et al., 2010; McDonald and Toglia, 2010; and Lorenz and Murray, 2013).

Other case studies include analyses of high profile sports and sport stars - British long distance runner, Paula Radcliffe, association football player, Cristiano Ronaldo and New Zealand rugby among them. In an analysis of Radcliffe, Walton (2010) argues that unlike representations of other female sporting 'heroes' (e.g. Cathy Freeman, Kelly Holmes) media representations tend not to centralise her ethnicity. Walton attributes this to Radcliffe’s whiteness and therefore her ‘racelessness’. Similarly, Grainger, Falcous and Jackson (2012) attempt to analyse how the growing presence of Polynesian players has led to the ‘whitewashing’ of rugby in New Zealand. There is an assumption in rugby union and rugby league that Polynesians are suited to the sport because of their racial distinctiveness. Perceptions of such distinctiveness can, in many cases, be attributed to the sport-media complex which, as Carrington (2010) argues above, has been heavily influential in constructing a number of (damaging) racial tropes. Grainger et al. (2012) argue that such tropes are not only influential on the rugby pitch but off it too. They observe that many White parents are discouraging their children from taking up the sport as they do not feel that they will be able to compete on the same level as the bigger, stronger and faster Polynesians; thus demonstrating some of the complexities of the racialisation of a sport and that racial ideologies can affect everyone. They also point, moreover, to the influence of these tropes on White coaches and administrators of the game who, with racist notions of biological difference in hand, routinely scout and sign a disproportionate number of Polynesian players. These patterns, they argue, is leading to a ‘whitewashing’ of rugby in New Zealand. To reinforce this debate, Hylton and Lawrence (2014) presented images of Ronaldo to White British men and asked them to reflect on this and their own
bodies. Driven by a theoretical framework of contingent whiteness, they argue that White British men’s interpretations of Ronaldo’s whiteness are inextricably linked to discourses of ‘race’, masculinities and football.

**Colourblindness**

Linked to notions of ‘racelessness’ and ‘invisibility,’ there has been a tendency within sport, physical education and leisure to consider racism as a thing of the past. Where it might exist, it is viewed at the level of the individual, not institutional or structural. Within this context, where racial inequalities do exist they are viewed as the result of the collective cultural inadequacies of those it affects in that they should adhere to the ‘bootstraps’ analogy to pull themselves up. Such ‘colourblindness’, and the attendant disavowal of historical racialised inequalities and ‘race’ privilege, remains a significant mechanism in the maintenance of whiteness and White privilege. If one does not recognise racial inequalities then racial hierarchies will be reified and remain unproblematised.

Conceding that White ethnicities and privileges are regularly unacknowledged, Harrison et al (2010) tested the assumption that Black and minoritised ethnic teachers are more culturally aware and competent in relation to understanding racial issues compared to White teachers. Their article indicates significant differences between White and minoritised ethnic teachers who score higher in both multicultural teaching knowledge (MTK) and multicultural teaching skills (MTS) than the White teachers. This work was reinforced by Winograd (2011) regarding the prevalence of colourblindness in children’s sports literature that uncovered discursive styles that centred whiteness, including the reinforcement of “historically racist stereotypes and images of black men” that position them as animalistic, brutish and unintelligent. Sport-specific case studies that highlight the complexities of these colourblind arguments include Burdsey (2011) on microaggressions (everyday subtle racisms) and professional South Asian cricketers in England (see also Rowe’s, 2011 work on cricket), and Merrett, Tatz and Adair (2011) on South African rugby and cricket respectively.

**Researching whiteness**

The majority of the sources on researching whiteness are written by White researchers who centralise their own identities to elucidate some of the challenges facing White researchers when conducting studies with minoritised ethnic participants. The sources address variously the complexities of conducting qualitative research across racial divides and White anxieties and White guilt. Flintoff and Webb (2012) and later Flintoff, Dowling and Fitzgerald (2014) examine the operation of whiteness within P.E Teacher Education (PETE). Flintoff and Webb note that ‘race’, ethnicity and whiteness are largely absent from P.E literatures, and present some cautionary notes on the complexities of White researchers working with minoritised ethnic communities. The authors draw on their own deficiencies, reflecting how by drawing on a ‘racialised other’ deficit discourse in their pedagogy, and by ignoring ‘race’ in their own research on inequalities in PETE, they have failed to disrupt universalised discourses of ‘white-as-norm’, or addressed their own privileged racialised positioning. The latter is the focus of Fletcher’s (2014) reflections on conducting research with both White British and British South Asian cricketers in England. Fletcher argues that reflecting critically on our biographies and positionality is the first step in recognising how whiteness operates in order
that we can begin to work to disrupt it. He warns how White researchers (of sport) are, at times, culpable of reinforcing dominant racial discourses rather than challenging them; and suggests that we must consider the racialised context(s) of our own experiences and not presume that ‘race’ is experienced only by Black and minoritised ethnic individuals (see also Rossi et al.’s (2013) study of indigenous communities in Australia; and Spracklen, Timmins and Long’s (2010) study of northernness, Blackness and whiteness). Spracklen et al., argue that a researcher’s own histories and identities are pivotal in how they are accepted as legitimate ethnographers and insiders, but those histories and identities also pose a critical challenge to researchers and those in the communities with whom researchers interact.

**Discussion**

We have provided a thematic overview of the findings from our analysis. In the final section of this chapter we attempt to provide a critique of these sources and suggest future directions for research.

We maintain that sport is an especially problematic institution from which to examine ‘race’, and whiteness because it is posited as an exemplar of colourblindness, meritocracy and egalitarianism (Hylton, 2010). Indeed, the ‘level playing field’ metaphor has been justified through a range of public campaigns to eradicate inequalities from sport. For McDonald (2014) while these programmes can be credited with successfully reducing some of the toxic nature of racialised language, they have simultaneously oversimplified racism to the behaviour of individuals. To position racism as a set of individual prejudices and behaviours, which are now policed through “unfettered social policy to equality and anti-racism” (Hylton, 2010: 341) obscures and conceals the historical, institutional and structural nature of racism.

The ability to disrupt normative hegemonic institutional thinking about ‘race’ (in)equalities is partly why academic researchers remain highly influential in prompting institutional change. However, as we identify above there is a tendency for White researchers to apologise for being White; citing their White identity as an obstacle to successfully capturing minoritised experiences. Clearly, a White researcher’s ethnic identity will influence how they engage with sport issues. However, our reflexivity should not get in the way of us doing innovative work. Berry and Clair (2011) for instance, suggest that reflexivity can stifle project development. They argue that the tendency of researchers to reflect on their vulnerability while in the field means that many researchers will retreat away from complicated and controversial topics; reverting instead to ‘common ground’ where their positionality is felt less. In so doing, they lament the loss of knowledge and loss of ethnographic understanding that will likely result from researchers being ‘blocked’, or denied access, due in part to their White identities. The very idea of White researchers attempting to access the life-worlds of Black and ethnic minoritised populations could be interpreted in this way. However, researching across cultural divides should not be treated with such trepidation. Unless we push certain boundaries of acceptability, these boundaries will never be redefined and valuable data never created (Fletcher, 2014).

Few of the sources attempted to develop on existing theories of whiteness, or indeed, suggest any new theories of whiteness. As illustrated above, most involved White researchers reflecting on their own positions of power, while suggesting similar caution to others who are predominantly White in the cognate disciplines. However, Arai and Kivel (2009) conceived of a fourth wave theory of ‘race’ and whiteness underpinned by CRT in leisure research that mandated scholars to re-examine ‘race’ and racism, challenge White hegemony and how it is internalised. Others attempted to shift thinking
on whiteness toward a poststructural detangling of the homogenised experiences of White people in debates about whiteness. This is an important step taken that not only offers a more nuanced view of racialised power relations, but also offers a more theoretical view of how power and privilege work in contingent fashions (Spracklen et al., 2014; Long et al., 2014; Hylton and Lawrence, 2014).

The other sources that did attempt some kind of critique of whiteness tended to advocate for movement towards a social justice paradigm; often underpinned by CRT. The reluctance (?) of sport, P.E and leisure researchers to develop theory reflects a common criticism of the sociology of sport literature, in that much of this work rarely uses sport as generative of social theory and at best shows how concepts and ideas developed in other contexts can be applied to sport (Carrington, 2010). In so doing, sport scholars are making little effort to contribute theoretical outcomes that can benefit other fields, namely ethnic and racial studies, sociology and social policy.

There is a growing recognition among policy makers and others that a progressive policy framework for eradicating racial abuse and inequalities in sport represents the start of the process rather than being an end in itself. Long and Spracklen (2011a) argue that if racisms are to be eradicated from sport those involved in the process need to have a nuanced understanding of the racism(s) to be contested. Their argument is based on the assumption that “anti-racism is essentially reactive” because “it is defined by the racism it opposes” (p.7). In other words, if the commitment to racial equality is to be more than a form of paying lip-service, then it is also necessary to engage with the deep-rooted cultural relations of power that sustain racially exclusive practices. Without such a shift, then the danger is that the campaign for racial equality in sport may become little more than a managerial response by bureaucratic organisations compelled by law to show they have policies on equity in place, but understanding little and doing less about the place of whiteness and the entrenched cultures of racialised exclusion (Carrington et al., in press). Getting policy makers and activist scholars en masse to contemplate legislative change – particularly changes that might compromise their own claims to power – “will need a systematic campaign of lobbying, raising awareness and offering solutions” (Long and Spracklen, 2011b: 255). Indeed, advocating that anti-racism is not solely for the benefit of Black and minoritised ethnic people is unlikely to sit well among those whose position is currently hegemonic – i.e. White people (Thomas, 2011). Indeed, as we have seen throughout this chapter whiteness can be manifest in a variety of privileges, such as in governance, the classroom, being scouted, entry to clubs, coaching, just as the outcomes of such racialised processes can result in predominantly White structures such as the constituency of clubs and organisational hierarchies.

Moving forward

The methodology for this study limits a definitive assessment of the treatment that whiteness has received in the work of sport scholars over five years. Yet what it does offer is a broad overview of approaches to whiteness and the main problems explored and explained. In many ways the work on ‘race’ in sport research remains under-researched and under-theorised while the overwhelming focus of work on ‘race’ and racialisation tends to focus on the presence of racism(s). This is not unimportant work, though its reiteration suggests that its nature and extent is continually a theme being mapped and remapped by and for those unfamiliar with its dynamics in the everyday. In some ways, this is reflective of a sector where ‘race’, racism and racialisation are not realities for most and therefore requiring of explanation and validation.
Where CRT argues that a focus on ‘race’ often speaks to the lived experiences and understanding of activist scholars engaged in these issues, the marginalisation of it in sport reflects more the lack of diversity in the academy and its higher echelons of governance. The knowledge creators and policymakers that would prosper from those ideas emerging, that embrace a reflexivity toward personal identities and the way whiteness privileges, can use these ideas in a positive way. As a result of this a focus on issues concerning whiteness remains a more challenging critical step for many academics, and policymakers, who do not see themselves as ‘raced’ and are therefore ‘raceless’. In such cases it is understandable why dominant paradigms, curricula, organisational environments and social justice agendas in sport and related areas reproduce epistemologies with blindspots to racialised power relations, hierarchies and intersecting forms of racialised oppression. Analogous to this, the work on heterogeneity, diaspora and contingencies offer immense potential to build upon the methodological reflexivities that some researchers have recently engaged with. They move our theoretical understanding forward in terms of not just naming whiteness, but also articulating how it plays out in the everyday realities of racialised people and therefore offering insights into how to disrupt it.
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