Citation:
Spracklen, K and Hylton, K and Long, J (2006) Managing and monitoring equality and diversity in UK sport: An evaluation of the sporting equals Racial Equality Standard and its impact on organizational change. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 30 (3). 289 - 305. ISSN 0193-7235 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723506290083

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:
https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/919/

Document Version:
Article (Accepted Version)

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please contact us and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

MANAGING AND MONITORING EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IN UK SPORT

Managing and monitoring equality and diversity in UK sport: an evaluation of the Sporting Equals Racial Equality Standard and its impact on organizational change

Dr Karl Spracklen, Dr Kevin Hylton and Prof Jonathan Long

Leeds Metropolitan University, United Kingdom

00 44 113 2832600 x 3608

k.spracklen@leedsmet.ac.uk

Abstract

Despie greater attention to racial equality in sport in recent years, the progress of National Sports Organizations towards creating equality of outcomes has been limited in the United Kingdom. The collaboration of the national sports agencies, equity organizations and national sports organizations (including national governing bodies of sport) has focussed on equality standards.

We revisit an earlier impact study of the Racial Equality Standard in sport and supplement it with another round of interview material in order to assess changing strategies to manage diversity in British sport. In particular, it tracks the impact on organizational commitment to diversity through the period of the establishment of the Racial Equality Standard and its replacement by an Equality Standard that deals with other diversity issues alongside “race” and ethnicity. As a result we question whether the new, generic Equality Standard is capable of addressing racial diversity and promoting equality of outcomes.

Introduction

In an introductory survey of interest in the issue of sport, “race” and national identity within the British academy, Carrington (2004, p. 1) claims significant progress has been made since the “intellectual lacuna” of the 1990s. In particular, the work of Back, Crabbe and Solomos (2001), Garland and Rowe (2001), Carrington and McDonald (2001), Williams (2001) and Ismond (2003) has established a strong critical, epistemological tradition on “race”, ethnicity and diversity in social studies of British sport. For Carrington (ibid.), “this body of critical literature has also been important in helping to effect social policy changes in the area of racial equity within [British] sport’s governing bodies”. This change, however, if it is indeed a change, may not be one significantly realised by the interventions of academics in the policies, practices and management structures of British sport. Other research has highlighted the role of policy makers and senior managers in accepting and accommodating equality and diversity practices (Coalter, 2000; Craig, 1997; Hylton, 2001), the importance of high-profile anti-racism campaigns such as Kick It Out established by people in British sport (Back et al., 2001; Garland & Rowe, 2001), and government agency-led intervention (Spracklen, 2003).

In this paper, we aim to broaden understanding of the conceptualising of racial equality and diversity in sport and leisure, through an analysis of the development and impact of equality standards in British sport. These standards have been developed by the public bodies responsible for the governance of sport in the UK, in collaboration with national sports equity organizations campaigning for greater equality and diversity in sport and, in the case of the Racial Equality Standard, the UK Commission for Racial Equality (CRE, 2000). Previous research published in this journal by two of this paper’s authors - an analysis of an impact study examining the

Racial Equality Standard, undertaken on behalf of the UK Commission for Racial Equality's Sporting Equals project (Long, Robinson and Spracklen, 2005; Long, Robinson and Welch, 2003) – suggested that "externally derived initiatives can provide useful support [for sports]… tackling racism… [but] the evolution toward organizations characterized by the principles of racial equality is patchy" (Long, Robinson and Spracklen, 2005: p. 56). This paper builds on the previous analysis with a series of semi-structured interviews undertaken as follow-up to explore and analyse changing strategies to manage diversity in British sport. In particular, we aim to track the impact on organizational commitment to diversity through the period of the establishment of the Racial Equality Standard and its replacement in November 2004 by an Equality Standard (Sport England, 2004) that deals with diversity issues in terms of gender and disability as well as "race" and ethnicity. Following Chalip (1995, 1996) we also investigate the impact of policy development, policy frameworks and organizational culture, using a theoretical approach informed by critical race theory (Hylton, 2005; Nebecker, 1998). This will lead into a return to contested and contingent notions of whiteness embedded in British sport (King, 2005; Long & Hylton, 2002; Spracklen, 2003), which we argue limit the ability of managerial interventions to effect cultural change and diversity (Bagilhole, 1997; Solomos & Back, 1995).

Although a full account of the recent history of British sport and the wider policy framework is beyond the scope of this paper, it is necessary to establish a context for the discussion on the two equality and diversity standards. It is also appropriate to establish a theoretical framework for that discussion. Therefore, before we turn to the findings of the impact study and the follow-up qualitative research, we

will give a brief history of the policy context, followed by an account of the theoretical and analytical framework applied in the latter half of the paper.

Context

The history of equality and diversity in UK sport policy, process and practice over the last 30 years has been elucidated at length in the work of Green (2004a), Houlihan and White (2002), Hylton and Totten (2001) and Oakley and Green (2001), among others. All these authors have identified the emergence of sport as a public policy concern in the early 1970s, when central government intervention resulted in the establishment of the Great Britain Sports Council with a focus on "encouraging participation" (Green, 2004a, p. 368). Between the establishment of this Sports Council and the present government, policy in the UK towards sport shifted between polarities of increasing participation and improving performance, the emphasis being dependent on wider societal and political attitudes. The belief that sport had a moral or instrumental use in promoting equality and diversity was tempered by the realisation that sport hardly reflected the diversity of British society (Hylton and Totten, 2001) and the opinion of politicians and senior policy-makers that winning medals was more important than any other aim (Houlihan & White, 2002). However, in 1997, with the election of the first centre-left Labour Government for eighteen years, it seemed that sport would be linked to a social inclusion agenda. Certainly, the rhetoric of Labour's policies on sport in the late 1990s suggests social inclusion, equality and diversity are central to sports policy (Hylton & Totten, 2001, p. 47). However, it should also be noted, as Green (2004a) argues, that Labour's policies, whilst strong on the rhetoric of diversity, have merely entrenched the importance of elite performance in the structures and cultures of British sport.

That rhetoric, however, was embraced by policy-makers in UK Sport and Sport England, the direct descendents of the Great Britain Sports Council, and led to attempts to embed sports equity in funding arrangements (Hylton & Totten, 2001, p. 59). At the same time, football supporters and individuals within the football governing bodies started to take matters of racial equality seriously enough to launch the Kick It Out and Show Racism the Red Card anti-racism campaigns. In 1998, Sport England's Racial Advisory Group recommended the establishment of a sports equity organization to promote racial equality in sport, and the UK Commission for Racial Equality set-up Sporting Equals in partnership with Sport England (Spracklen, 2003). This organization worked through the Commission for Racial Equality to lobby policy-makers and senior managers in sport to encourage them to develop anti-racism campaigns and positive action to promote racial equality both in and through their sports. This matched the rhetoric from central government, which, through documents such as *A Sporting Future for All* (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2000), stressed the need to develop policies and strategies to manage and encourage diversity in British sport (Houlihan & White, 2002; Spracklen, 2003). Further, the emergence of a social inclusion discourse contributed to a crowded space in relation to equality and diversity.

While Sport England and UK Sport were establishing a policy-led sports equity approach to managing and developing diversity in sport, the Commission for Racial Equality was developing a standards approach to monitoring and evaluating organizational capacity and commitment to racial equality. These standards were primarily aimed at the public sector, but were being applied indirectly to British sport because public sector local authorities were and are central to most grassroots sports development in the UK (Hylton, 2001). For Sporting Equals, it was a logical move to

re-write the CRE's standards and apply them directly to governing bodies of sport and other national sports organizations: a move, however, that saw oragnizations in the third or voluntary sector being put through an assessment designed for organizations in the public sector. With the backing of Sport England, this is what Sporting Equals did with the launch of *Achieving Racial Equality: A Standard for Sport* in 2000. Crucially, evidence of achievement against the objectives of these standards (the 'Racial Equality Standard') was later linked by Sport England to continued funding of governing bodies, which led to every governing body funded by Sport England bar one achieving the Preliminary Level of the Racial Equality Standard by the end of March 2003 (Spracklen, 2003). Information on the requirements of the Preliminary Level of the Racial Equality Standard is presented in Table One.

Sporting Equals commissioned Leeds Metropolitan University to undertake a study of the impact of the Racial Equality Standard on the policies, structures and cultures of national sports organizations. This study (Long et al., 2003) is discussed in more detail below. It suggested, however, that the impact of the Racial Equality Standard had been partial, and commitment to racial equality in practice did not permeate down the structures of organizations. Moreover, the work done to achieve Preliminary Level of the Racial Equality Standard by those organizations did not tackle resistance to equality and diversity in their respective cultures. Nevertheless, the principle of the Racial Equality Standard was welcomed and recognised by sports organizations (Long et al., 2003), and subsequently UK Sport and the four home country sports councils adopted and adapted the standards approach to make it applicable across a wider range of equality and diversity issues: in November 2004, a new Equality Standard was published, which embraced gender and disability as well as "race" and ethnicity.

Analytical framework

Hylton (2005) calls for an engagement and dialogue with Critical Race Theory (CRT) in any analysis of policies and programmes to promote racial equality in sport and leisure. Specifically, he asks that researchers meet the challenge of a more critical theorising and centralising of “race” in their analytical frameworks. In the public sector, underlying the development of equal opportunities policies since the 1950s has been a worldview that draws its reasoning from a racialised, race-biased discourse (Gordon, Miller and Rollock, 1990; Nanton, 1989). This discourse has as its basic principle an oversimplified reductionist tenet that reinforces biological arguments, homogeneity and universalism. In sport and leisure policy this marginalisation of “race” is manifest in the lexicon of policy makers who have promulgated a vocabulary that legitimates rather than challenges the notion of “race”, monolithic racial identities and the black ‘other’ (Cross & Keith, 1993; Gilroy, 1987; Goldberg, 1993; St Louis, 2004; Thomas & Piccolo, 2000). CRT challenges theses traditional dominant ideologies around objectivity, meritocracy, colour-blindness, race-neutrality and equal opportunity (Gardiner & Welch, 2001; Henderson, 1998; Nebeker, 1998; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001).

A CRT lens turned upon the mainstream writing of sport and leisure studies throws light upon a domain that traditionally reflects the power and knowledge interests of white social science. and enables us to get a clearer understanding of the major structures (power, culture) involved in the organization of sport, which is crucial when racial-equality is the ultimate target. A focus on power processes, white hegemony, racism and equality, account for some of the contemporary concerns that have perplexed “race” theorists and complicated the study of “race”; concerns that at the same time have been consistently ignored by mainstream theorists. For example,

the challenge to interrogate phenomena such as whiteness and “race” in the historical and contemporary developments of sport and leisure, and how processes within sport and society conspire to reinforce or liberate oppressions, is one worth taking (Long & Hylton 2002; St Louis, 2004).

Organizational responses to equality and diversity, and the challenges to policy development, management and structural and cultural change have been mapped by a number of researchers around liberal/radical (Bagilhole, 1997; Forbes, 1991; Jewson & Mason, 1992), minimalist/maximalist (Cunningham, 1992) or gestural/proactive axes (Horne, 1995; Young, 1989). Bagilhole (1997) suggests these responses form a related (and contested) set of categories that mirror political commitments to equality of opportunity, equality of condition and equality of outcome. It is within this set of categories that we will analyse the conceptualising of diversity in sport and leisure, through the development and impact of equality standards in British sport. In particular, Bagihole’s understanding of the relationship between liberal/radical and opportunity/outcome will be utilised.

Saggar (1992) and Bulmer and Solomos (2004) support the argument that the policy studies literature has not reflected issues of “race”, ethnicity and diversity. This Saggar puts down to the area being overlooked or to the underestimation of sociological change in the last three or four decades. They are of the mind that research into public administration per se is generally focused upon positivistic explanatory methods. The positivist techniques adopted by many involved in policy studies, that exclude or marginalise issues concerning “race”, ethnicity and diversity, are used as a result of the dominant need for predictability and rational logic. There is a perception that the intricacy of issues surrounding equality are often so complex that emphatic, clear cut solutions are unlikely due to practical or political expediency

(Jewson & Mason, 1992). This tendency to try and predict solutions in the absence of a wider consideration of explicit community aspirations and needs is likely to result in misplaced resources and missed opportunities for black people, thus reinforcing their disadvantaged position in sport.

Criticism in this area has suggested that policy analysts draw upon a limited range of methodologies to inform decisions where issues have not been fully understood or crystallized (Chalip, 1995). The link between sport and society (and therefore politics) should be clearly established here, as it has been by many writers who argue for the maintenance of this basic axiom in the provision and control of sport (Chalip, 1995; Henry, 1993; Houlihan, 1997). For Chalip the challenge is not to continue to develop a science of pseudo-logic, but to identify points of logic and illogic so as to examine the values and assumptions implicit within, and excluded from, policy debates. Good [sport] management concerns itself with social values and the welfare of others. This indeed echoes and amplifies points raised by Saggar (1992), Cross and Keith (1993) and others that there is a clear tradition of research in the policy sciences that at the same time as including a range of ideas has excluded many issue-based critical and theoretical concerns that would have enhanced the study of “race”, ethnicity and diversity in policy contexts.

To date, research and theoretical studies of “race” and ethnicity have relied upon the use of interpretive research studies and the critical theoretical application of this body of knowledge in the social sciences (Cross & Keith, 1993; Goldberg, 1993; Harvey, 1990; Ismond, 2003; Swinney & Horne, 2005). The epistemological links in “mainstream” policy research with other forms of approaches, such as interpretive and critical traditions, seem to have less currency in the study of matters political because of their link with ‘non-rational’ or ‘irrational’ social sciences (Bulmer & Solomos,

2004). Chalip (1996) goes a step further in suggesting that as policy analysis is normally conducted for the people who wield power, critical policy analysis has not yet established itself nor been embraced by policy analysts as it ultimately challenges the social order and the status quo. This, and the tension between established forms of positivist logic and the more critical, interpretive sciences gives a backdrop to why some bodies of knowledge are more acceptable in the study of public sector provision and policy than others (Bulmer & Solomos, 2004).

What these diversions into policy research and critical race theorising show is that interventions to promote racial equality in sport are ultimately dependent on the cultural and social contexts of sport. Any evaluation of work such as the equality standards in the UK needs, then, to be informed by an awareness of the specific and contested racialisation of British sport (Back et al., 2001; Carrington & McDonald, 2001). This racialisation is as much about embedding and (re)presenting ideas of hegemonic whiteness (Dyer, 1997; Gabriel, 1998; Gilborn, 2005) as it is about normalising racialised Others (Denzin, 2002; Douglas, 2005; Fusco, 2005; Woodward, 2004). Talking about the value of diversity is not the same as having diversity. For as Hage (1998: p.139) argues, in relation to liberal responses to multiculturalism, “it is in the opposition between valuing diversity and being diverse that [whiteness] reproduces itself”.

Research

The research in this paper draws upon the published findings of a study conducted in 2002 on the impact of the Racial Equality Standard (Long et al., 2003), and follow-up semi-structured interviews conducted at the end of 2004, coinciding with the launch of the new Equality Standard. The 2002 impact study consisted of an initial postal survey of all national sports organizations funded by Sport England who

had started work on the Racial Equality Standard in England, followed by semi-structured interviews with a sample of policy-makers in those organizations (n=13) and another sample of individuals involved in different levels of the organizations or the sports (n=24). These individuals were purposively selected to provide knowledge of the organizations and sports (for a more detailed exposition of process see Long et al., 2003).

The follow-up research at the end of 2004 consisted of detailed semi-structured interviews with individuals who had taken part in the interviews in the initial study. Where those individuals had left their post, their replacements were asked the questions. Although not comprehensive, the research did give voice to people with a range of responsibilities for equality in different types of organization. As such, our respondents provide an important and informative insider perspective (Bulmer & Solomos, 2004). As part of this follow-up research, policy-makers in the organizations collaborating on the Equality Standard – UK Sport; the four home country sports councils in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales; the Central Council for Physical Recreation (CCPR – the body representing the national sport organizations); the English Federation for Disability Sport; the Womens Sport Foundation; and Sporting Equals – were also interviewed (one respondent per organization, identified as the key policy-maker or senior manager responsible for equity).

As with the initial impact study, the semi-structured interviews were undertaken using a pro forma of topics and categories based on our understanding of policy and practice and the complexities of managing equality and diversity in governing bodies (cf. Long, Robinson and Spracklen, 2005; Long et al., 2003). The respondents were contacted and briefed that we were updating the initial impact study,

and informed consent was secured before interviews took place at the respondents' convenience. Because of the potentially sensitive nature of interviewing individuals representing organizations being funded by other organizations with a stake in the Equality Standard, the responses have been treated anonymously, where appropriate and possible.

The 2002 Study[i]

By this stage, most (87%) of the organizations surveyed had equity policies, and two-thirds of those also had associated action plans. However, when it came to practice, relatively few had compulsory requirements for paid staff and volunteers to attend training in racial equality; the majority had no paid staff from minority ethnic populations; and few had specific budget allocations for racial equality work. In the more detailed semi-structured interviews at different levels of sports organization (from club level to national sports organization), most respondents saw best value in having a single, overarching equity policy to deal with all matters of equality and diversity, with action plans for specific areas such as racial equality. The majority did though recognise that a lack of awareness of different cultures was an issue for their sport, but a similar number felt there was merely a lack of interest in their sport among minority ethnic groups. Although a quarter of the organizations surveyed felt unduly obliged by Sport England to take action on what they considered to be a low priority amongst other demands, the majority supported Sport England's linkage of funding to action taken on promoting racial equality.

Despite a whole range of bodies being responsible for racial equality in sport, most of the respondents believed national governing bodies of sport had a primary responsibility in that direction. Moreover, respondents at the core of sports organizations unanimously felt that sport had a clear role in tackling racism in society

more widely, reflecting liberal attitudes to equality (Bagilhole, 1997). However, there were concerns about the wider ownership of policy and tokenism on the part of some: radical approaches to ensuring equality of outcome and challenges to the existing power relations dominated by a white hegemony were absent in the discourse about what sport could do and should do. At a local level, the whole Standard process had had relatively little impact. Developments and programmes were still at an early stage – it was felt that cultural change across organizations would take time. Many sports lacked baseline data against which to measure progress.

2004 – Follow-up Study.

a) Sports organizations

Although all of the respondents, except one new in post, were aware of the Sporting Equals Racial Equality Standard, most were unaware of the new generic Equality Standard. Those that had heard of the Equality Standard had differing opinions on its usefulness. One respondent welcomed it "as it takes on board our key organizational issue of disability", but another respondent believed disability and other specific equality issues could lose out: "I'm against the lumping together of policies, both in policy terms and programme funding. Will NGBs champion generic equity rather than actual programmes [about disability, racial equality, gender etc.]?" In another sports organization, three of its development officers saw benefits in having a generic Equality Standard, but the fourth officer was not so sure, and feared that racial equality, his area of responsibility, would become "diluted". His fears were repeated by a club officer in another sport, who believed it was "useful to have a separate racial equality policy to give greater emphasis on the issue." These concerns can be understood in terms of the tension between liberal and radical discourses on equality (Bagilhole, 1997), but also as a real fear by individuals that a dialectic of

ethnic minorities as the Other and whiteness as the norm (Gilroy, 2000) was replacing action with rhetoric. In other words, there was a disjuncture between policy (commitment) and practice (action).

Since the Sport England deadline for achieving the Preliminary Level of the Racial Equality Standard, nearly all the respondents had noticed no significant change in their organizations' equity policies. Disappointingly, in the 12 months preceding the follow-up study, nearly all the respondents reported little or no action or development of those policies. Although some sports organizations reported on initiatives that had been successfully planned and delivered, the majority felt there had been little or no change: "I've seen posters in clubs but they would probably benefit from a more proactive follow-up to see what action's been taken." One respondent said that there had been "zero progress" in her sport and another felt that there were "still issues with implementation." Another noted: "policy is worthless without practical structures in place… the Racial Equality Standard has had no impact in real terms." Another, more cynically, remarked that "we're able to tick the boxes". This view was not shared by all the respondents, and there was an even split between those who felt the Sporting Equals Standard had had a positive impact and those who believed things would have happened anyway without it. As one respondent remarked: "Another voice banging the drum is helpful to work that [we] were committed to doing."

All the respondents welcomed the increased importance of equity policies and equity action, but there were some concerns over a lack of resource and a lack of capacity and capability to deliver. As in 2002, most respondents were in favour of linking success on the new Equality Standard to funding, but a significant number warned of the problems of tokenism and over-burdening staff and volunteers with

paperwork. Again, following Horne (1995), Bagilhole (1997) and Sweeney and Horne (2005), commitments to equality of opportunity were acknowledged, but commitment to equality of outcome was absent. Furthermore, some felt the culture of their sports was part of the problem: "[Our sport] has issues. It's perceived as white, middle-class. It needs to promote itself as a wider participation sport." However, notions of the whiteness of British sports, linked to specific histories and contested constructions of identity, seemed to be absent from most respondents' thinking on equality.

b) Policy-makers

Policy-makers responsible for the development and implementation of the Equality Standard (UK Sport, CCPR, the four home sports councils and the three sports equity organizations) naturally viewed this as a progression from the Racial Equality Standard, building on its strengths and learning from its weaknesses. UK Government plans to amalgamate the CRE with the Disability Rights Commission and the Equal Opportunities Commission had set a generic equality and diversity policy agenda. As one respondent put it: "It reflects equity moves in wider society… it will provide an improved focus – more outcomes focussed. Race equality has set the 'standard' to build on." This claim about the focus on outcome is, however, questionable: this policy-maker had embraced the rhetoric of equality of outcome but the Equality Standard mirrored the previous standards in concentrating on policies and process. One respondent believed that the new Equality Standard was "a cost saver", and went on to claim that their organization, although comfortable with the generic approach, "had doubts about a single equity body [overseeing the Equality Standard]."

Most of the respondents recognised that in the past, policy-makers had not worked together on equality and diversity in sport, which had led to some

fragmentation and duplication of effort. Most recognised the positive impact of the Racial Equality Standard, but two criticised it, one arguing this approach did not lead to any “real cultural change in organizations”. This idea of cultural change was a recurring theme, and links to the wider debate within CRT about the way in which specific white power relations and identities are normalised and priviliged. Cultural change was emphasised in discussion about both the internal and external ecology of equity in each organization. All respondents recognised that a Standard by itself is not sufficient, and should be part of a wider equality and diversity management framework that “changes attitudes and ways of working” and works “bottom-up as well as top-down”. All believed resourcing was crucial to making the Equality Standard and this wider framework a success, but that resource was as much about people and knowledge as finance. One respondent believed that offering support was more important than linking achievement to funding: “Sanctions don’t have to be tied to funding: there could be a more proactive interventionist approach to achieve aims, such as funding more equity staff within national governing bodies.”

There was some confusion over structures, relationships and responsibilities between the different organizations with a stake in the Equality Standard. One respondent from a sports equity organization said: “It needs to be clear co-ordination and leadership nationally – but I’m not sure who’s leading! There are a lot of people involved but we need someone to champion equality.” Another respondent pointed out that the home country sports councils were at different stages of development and action on equity and the roll-out of the Equality Standard, and there were other issues to do with the capacity of the equity organizations and Sport England. This sceptical stance may, perhaps, be understood as a way of evading responsibility for doing anything to promote equality (Bulmer & Solomos, 2004) – putting the blame for

inertia on someone else. As one respondent put it: “Sport England want to push ahead and get people signed up, but their deadlines for this are ridiculous.”

Discussion

Our analysis of the attitudes and opinions of people either having to deliver results against the Racial Equality Standard, or involved in the production of the new Equality Standard, shows that the fundamental problem is that of the limitation of intervention (cf. Long, Robinson and Spracklen, 2005; Spracklen, 2003). Both sets of standards have been designed to measure achievement against management-focussed objectives at their initial levels (the equality of opportunity identified by Bagilhole, 1997), with a focus on equality of outcome at their higher levels. What this meant for the success of the Racial Equality Standard was a rapid and calculated move by sports managers and policy-makers to embed the objectives of its Preliminary Level in their policies and plans (but not their practices). If this did not happen, they knew their sports would lose funding. But this process, even though it hardly started to deal with difficult questions about managing and promoting equality and diversity, was seen by some in sports management as an imposition by the Government, through Sport England, of a performance management framework of audit and inspection (see Green, 2004b, for a similar assessment of elite sport policy). That is, people within English sport believed in the autonomy of their particular sports, and believed the specifics of their histories could be understood in terms of resistance to bureaucracy and officialdom. Essentially, governing bodies of sport in England and the UK are bodies that provide mutual aid and support to their members. This is their historical purpose and, despite pressures to professionalize (Green, 2004b), most of the governing bodies remain reliant on volunteers who get involved in governance because they care about their sport. This, of course, is intriguingly suggestive of

white, middle-class myths of Englishness, liberty and freedom from state interference (Easthope, 1999).

The more outcome-oriented objectives of the higher levels of the Racial Equality Standard (increasing participation rates) were never linked by Sport England to funding, and two years on from the initial impact study, it was clear that little work had been done to get sports to a position where they could achieve those levels: to enable organizations to enter into a process of change to make them more diverse and equitable. All the evidence, in fact, suggests that little attempt has been made in British sport to formally monitor and manage diversity beyond the production of equity policies (cf. Chalip, 1995, 1996; Sweeney & Horne, 2005) and the 'gestural' appointment, in some sports, of senior officers responsible for equity (Horne, 1995).

The response of policy-makers developing the Equality Standard has been to recognise this problem of limitation of intervention. But it is not clear that a consensus has emerged in the policy arena about how the new Equality Standard is to be applied to sports: whether, that is, sports would be expected to show progress against the Equality Standard's objectives if they are to retain or be awarded funding from UK Sport and the four home country sports councils. In that sense, the problem of intervention has been dealt with by avoiding the question, and it is no surprise that people involved in the delivery of sport have little knowledge of the new Equality Standard or its potential impact on the management of their sports. Following Horne (1995) and Bagilhole (1997), if the Racial Equality Standard coerced sports managers into a reactive engagement with equality and diversity, then the new Equality Standard may well end up being gestural unless there is a clear framework in place that balances intervention, encouragement and support.

What our research shows is that there is a lack of problematization when it comes to managing and promoting equality and diversity. Following Bagilhole (1997) and others who have identified contested (liberal and radical) understandings of equality in policy and process, it becomes clear that attitudes to managing and promoting equality and diversity in sport are confused. How far sport in the UK is willing or able to reach equality of outcome is debatable. All the people interviewed agreed equality and diversity was a good thing, but understanding what that meant, and how it applied in particular to their sport, was absent from the predominant performance management discourse of auditing achieved objectives against the standards (cf. Power, 1997; Rose, 1999). For example, the sport of rugby league has publicly backed equality and diversity initiatives, and there is some evidence that the game is increasing in popularity amongst black men in London (Spracklen, 2005). But the game is still one that is, structurally and culturally, predominantly maintained by and for white, working-class, northern English communities (Spracklen, 2001): communities that also embody and reproduce hegemonic masculinity (Spracklen, 1996; 2001).

By being responsive to the need to challenge embedded and normalised white hegemony outlined by critical race theorists (Hylton, 2005), we can begin to understand this failure amongst policy-makers and sports in the UK to problematise equality and diversity. The failure is built into the discourse of the Equality Standard, which demands evidence of action but not evidence of change, and which positions itself as a framework to help British sport work with “them”: groups defined in opposition to the mainstream of sport. It can be seen that despite challenges and contestations of power typified by anti-racist campaigns like Kick It Out (Back et al., 2001), the cultures of English and British sports themselves are often part of a racist

hegemony. Real issues around under-representation and lack of involvement in the sites of power (the decision-making committees, the professional development and management teams) are presented as norms through stereotyping of 'racial' qualities and 'cultural' differences, and appeals to historical circumstances and traditions (Carrington & McDonald, 2001; Spracklen, 1996). Apart from the deliberate obstruction of racists, much of the effort to promote racial equality is hampered by a lack of understanding in sport of the dominance of 'whiteness' (Long & Hylton, 2002) and the marginalisation of black experience. As we have argued previously, this dominance of 'whiteness' is to be found in its taken-for-granted representation as the human norm (Dyer, 1997), or what Maynard (1994, p. 20) refers to as the "everydayness of White privilege". Spracklen (2003, p. 44) has argued that "sport expresses a sense of community and belonging associated with the people who control the myth-making apparatus. In England, this means that sport plays a crucial formative role in the creation of middle-class, white, male myths."

It is these 'myths' that then set the norm and serve to exclude. The fear expressed by some respondents that the new Equality Standard would somehow work against or limit race equality is partly cynicism about top-down management, but partly an expression of deep-rooted unease with the whiteness of sport in the UK: an unease amongst champions of racial equality in various sports who feel the new Equality Standard is, through agency or complacency, bolstering hegemonic whiteness (Long & Hylton, 2002), helping it meet the challenge of various anti-racism campaigns and rein-in work that had started to question the taken-for-granted (Maynard, 1994). Of course, many of the policy-makers behind the new Equality Standard, and many of the other respondents, welcomed the new generic approach – but it should be noted that since the announcement that the new Equality Standard

was to replace the Racial Equality Standard twelve months ago, little work on racial equality in English sport (where that work had been guided by the Racial Equality Standard) has taken place, and our research indicates that some of the fears are supported by evidence of inaction. Crucially, the status of diversity in the policy frameworks of British sport is not matched by an equivalent status in the way in which sport is managed and delivered, where standards are seen at best as supporting and justifying work already being done, but at worst an unwarranted interference in the way "things have always been done" (cf. Long, Tongue, Spracklen and Carrington, 1995; Welch, Spracklen and Pilcher, 2004).

Returning to Chalip (1995, 1996), we can see the points of logicality and illogicality in managing equality and diversity in sport through the standards process. We have already mentioned the lack of sustained and systematic monitoring of participation and involvement. Other issues that have emerged in our research that seem to fit Chalip's framework are the contested claims that all equality issues are equivalent and should be treated as such, and the idea that public sector standards can be applied to bodies that are essentially mutual aid organizations. Chalip's notion of illogicality can also be used to account for the gap between the rhetoric of diversity and being diverse (Hage, 1998), between opportunity and outcome. We have only touched on the concerns of CRT here, but we believe it offers a way of exploring the invisibility and taken-for-granted nature of whiteness in sport and exploring the problematising of the management of equality and diversity, and the practice of equality and diversity, in and through sport. For the new Equality Standard to work, challenging and changing attitudes and 'mind-sets' amongst sports managers and policy-makers will be as crucial as getting the overarching framework right.

References

Back, L., Crabbe, T., & Solomos, J. (2001). The Changing Face of Football: racism, identity and multiculture in the English game. Oxford: Berg.

Bagilhole, B. (1997). *Equal Opportunities and Social Policy*. London: Longman.

Bulmer, B., & Solomos, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Researching Race and Racism.* London: Routledge.

Carrington, B. (2004). Introduction. *Leisure Studies, 23*(1), 1-3.

Carrington, B., & McDonald, I. (Eds.). (2001). *"Race", Sport and British Society.* London: Routledge

Chalip, L. (1995). Policy analysis in sport management. *Journal of Sport Management, 9,* 1-13.

Chalip, L. (1996). Critical policy analysis in New Zealand. *Journal of Sport Management, 10,* 310-324.

Coalter, F. (2000). *The Role of Sport in Regenerating Deprived Urban Areas.* Scotland: The Scottish Office Central Research Unit.

Commission for Racial Equality (2000). *Achieving Racial Equality: A Standard for Sport*. London: The Stationery Office

Craig, S. (1997). *Working Towards Racial Equality in Sport: a good practice guide for local authorities.* London: England Sports Council.

Cross, M. & Keith, M. (Eds.). (1993). *Racism, the City and the State.* London: Routledge.

Cunningham, S. (1992). The development of equal opportunities theory and practice in the European Community. *Policy and Politics, 20*(3), 177-189.

Denzin, N. (2002). *Reading Race*. London: Sage.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2000). *A Sporting Future for All.* London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Douglas, D. (2005). Venus, Serena and the Women's Tennis Association: when and where "race" enters. *Sociology of Sport, 22*, 256-282.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White.* New York: Routledge.

Easthope, A. (1998). *Englishness and National Culture*. London: Routledge.

Forbes, I. (1991). Equal opportunity: radical, liberal and conservative critiques. In E. Meehan & S. Sevenhuijsen (Eds.), *Equality Politics and Gender* (pp. 17-35). London: Sage.

Fusco, C. (2005). Cultural landscapes of purification: sports spaces and discourses of whiteness. *Sociology of Sport, 22*, 283-310.

Gabriel, J. (1998). *Whitewash: racialised politics and the media*. London: Routledge.

Gardiner, S., & Welch, R. (2001). Sport, racism and the limits of 'colour blind' law. In B. Carrington & I. McDonald (Eds.), *"Race", Sport and British Society* (pp. 133-149). London: Routledge.

Garland, J. & Rowe, M. (2001). *Racism and Anti-Racism in Football.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Gilborn, D. (2005). Education policy as an act of white supremacy: whiteness, critical race theory and education reform. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(4), 485-505.

Gilroy, P. (1987). *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack.* London: Routledge.

Gilroy, P. (2000). *Between Camps*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goldberg, D. (1993). *Racist Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Gordon, W., Miller, F., & Rollock, D. (1990). Coping with communicentric bias in knowledge production. *Educational Researcher, 19*(3), 14-19.

Green, M. (2004b). Changing policy priorities for sport in England: the emergence of elite sport development as a key policy concern. *Leisure Studies, 23*(4), 365-385.

Green, M. (2004b). Power, policy and political priorities: elite sport development in Canada and the United Kingdom. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 21*(4), 376-396.

Hage, G. (1998). *White Nation: fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural society*. Annandale: Pluto Press.

Harvey, L. (1990). *Critical Social Research.* London: Unwyn-Hyman.

Henderson, K. (1998). Researching diverse populations. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(1), 157-174.

Henry, I.P. (1993). *The Politics of Leisure Policy.* London: Routledge.

Houlihan, B. (1997). *Sport, Policy and Politics: A Comparative Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Houlihan, B., & White, A. (2002). *The Politics of Sports Development.* London: Routledge.

Horne, J. (1995). Local Authority black and ethnic minority provision in Scotland. In M. Talbot, S. Fleming, & A. Tomlinson (Eds.), *Policy and Politics in Sport, Physical Education and Leisure* (pp. 159-176). Eastbourne: Leisure Studies Association.

Hylton, K. (2001). *Where are the Black Leisure Managers? ILAM Conference Report.* London: Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management.

Hylton, K. (2005). “race”, sport and leisure: lessons from critical race theory. *Leisure Studies, 24*(1), 81-98.

Hylton, K., & Totten, M. (2001). Developing ‘sport for all’? Addressing inequality in sport. In K. Hylton, P. Bramham, D. Jackson, & M. Nesti (Eds.), *Sports Development: Policy, Process and Practice* (pp. 37-65). London: Routledge.

Ismond, P. (2003). *Black and Asian Athletes in British Sport and Society: A Sporting Chance?*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

King, C. (2005). Cautionary notes on whiteness and sports studies. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 22* 397-408.

Jewson, N., & Mason, D. (1992). The theory and practice of equal opportunities policies: liberal and radical approaches. In P. Braham, (Ed.), *Racism and Anti-racism: Inequalities, Opportunities and Policies* (pp. 218-234). London: Sage.

Long, J., & Hylton, K. (2002). Shades of white: an examination of whiteness in sport. *Leisure Studies, 21*(2) 87-103.

Long, J., Robinson, P., & Spracklen, K. (2005). Promoting racial equality within sports organizations. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* (forthcoming).

Long, J., Robinson, P., & Welch, M. (2003). *Raising the Standard: An Evaluation of Progress*. Leeds: Leeds Metropolitan University.

Maynard, M. (1994). “Race”, gender and the concept of ‘difference’ in feminist thought. In H. Afshar & M. Maynard (Eds.), *The dynamics of race and gender* (pp9-25). London: Taylor Francis.

Nanton, P. (1989). The New orthodoxy: racial categories and equal opportunity policy. *New Community, 15*(4), pp.549-564.

Nebeker, K. (1998). Critical race theory: a white graduate student’s struggle with this growing area of scholarship. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 25-41.

Oakley, B., & Green, M. (2001). Still playing the game at arm's length? The selective re-investment in British sport, 1995-2000. *Managing Leisure, 6,* 74-94.

Power, M. (1997). *The Audit Society: the rituals of verification.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saggar, S. (1992). *Race and Politics in Britain.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Solomos, J. & Back, L. (1995). *Race, Politics and Social Change*. London: Routledge.

Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T., (2001). Critical Race Theory and Method: counter-storytelling. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(4), 471-495.

Sport England (2004). *The Equality Standard: A Framework for Sport.* London: Sport England.

Spracklen, K. (1996). *Playing the Ball: Constructing community and masculine identity in rugby.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Leeds Metropolitan University.

Spracklen, K. (2001). 'Black Pearl, Black Diamonds': exploring racial identities in rugby league. In B. Carrington & I. McDonald (Eds.) *'Race', Sport and British Society* (pp. 70-82). London: Routledge.

Spracklen, K. (2003). Setting a Standard? Measuring progress in tackling racism and promoting social inclusion in English sport. In A. Ibbetson, B. Watson & M. Ferguson (Eds.) *Sport, leisure and social inclusion* (pp. 41-57). Eastbourne: Leisure Studies Association.

Spracklen, K. (2005). Re-inventing ‘the game’: rugby league, ‘race’, gender and the growth of Active Sports for young people in England. In P. Bramham & J. Caudwell (Eds.) *Sport, Active Leisure and Youth Cultures* (pp. 155-169). Eastbourbe: Leisure Studies Association.

St Louis, B. (2004). Sport and common-sense racial science. *Leisure Studies, 23*(1), 31-46.

Swinney, A., & Horne, J. (2005). Race Equality and Leisure Policy Discourses in Scottish Local Authorities. *Leisure Studies, 24*(3), 271-289.

Thomas, H. & Piccolo, F. (2000). Best Value, planning and racial equality. *Planning Practice and Research, 15*(1/2), 79-95.

Welch, M., Spracklen, K., & Pilcher, A., (2004). *Racial Equality in Football: A Survey.* London: Commission for Racial Equality.

Williams, J. (2001). *Cricket and Race.* London: Berg.

Woodward, K. (2004). Rumbles in the jungle: racialization and the performance of masculinity. *Leisure Studies, 23*(1), 5-17.

Young, K. (1989). The space between words: Local Authorities and the concept of equal opportunities. In R. Jenkins & J. Solomos (Eds.), *Racism and Equal Opportunities in the 1980s* (pp. 93-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Table One

EVIDENCE CRITERIA: PRELIMINARY LEVEL

Objective	Evidence
Commitment, Policy and Planning	
Make a clear public commitment to achieve racial equality	Copy of signed Charter, information about the signing, photographs of the signing, news release and subsequent articles/web site/publicity.
Develop a written statement or policy on racial equality which reflects the aims and objectives of the organisation	Copy of agreed equity statement and/or equity policy or racial equality policy.
Develop racial equality action plans or objectives within existing strategies and set appropriate racial equality targets	Copy of equity action plan – plan must have appropriate targets.
Ensure that all communities are aware of your commitment to racial equality	News release on Charter signing and distribution list as a minimum, plus any articles/publicity. Any extra publicity efforts about work on racial equality, eg policy/initiatives is encouraged but not mandatory.
Participation and Public Image	
Collect information about the age, sex, disability and ethnic origin of people who take part in your sport	You should supply the data and the forms/letters you used plus an explanation of how and why it was collected
Analyse the data and calculate participation rates, by age, sex, disability and ethnic origin, in order to obtain a profile of your organisation	A report (no more than a few paragraphs) or part of a longer report such as the annual report, which analyses participation trends between different ethnic minority communities, different genders, ages, areas of your sport and against the national demographic. Also include some explanation of methodology and relate the analysis to your equity targets and their review – make recommendations for future action!
Develop a complaints and disciplinary procedure, with either a nominated officer or sub-committee taking lead responsibility	Copy of your complaints procedure, disciplinary procedure with appropriate references to your equity policy and issues of racial, sexual and other discrimination and harassment. If your procedures don't have those references you need to supply some draft amendments you intend to add to the procedures. You need to explain how the procedures relate to each other and how the procedures are publicised
Collect positive images of racial equality in your sport, and in your organisation, as well as examples of good racial equality practice	Leaflets/posters/photos in newsletters/websites that use positive imagery. A minimum of two examples. Plus any picture library and information on any good racial equality practice – initiatives on the ground (only mandatory if you are a large sport).
Administration and Management	
Obtain approval for the racial equality action plan from the management committee	Minute clearly stating the equity action plan was approved by the board or equivalent.
Collect information about the age, sex, disability and ethnic origin of people involved in management, coaching, administration and service delivery in your organisation	You need to provides data for coaches, or a sample of eg national coaches. In addition, you need to undertake an internal audit of staff (paid employees), the Board and other key committees
Assess the racial equality training needs of all staff involved in the development, delivery and management of your organisation	You need to submit a report that identifies what training you plan to give or has been given to coaches, paid staff and key volunteers. You need to identify priorities, include timescales and identify funding or gaps in funding. Where training has already been delivered you should include details of that training – who attended, when the training took place, and what was delivered

(from unpublished submission guidance notes supplied by Sporting Equals, 2003)

[i] For a more detailed exposition see our earlier paper (Long, Robinson and Spracklen, 2005)