

Peter Craig

Sport Sociology

3rd Edition



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne



Los Angeles | London | New Delhi
Singapore | Washington DC | Melbourne

SAGE Publications Ltd
1 Oliver's Yard
55 City Road
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road
New Delhi 110 044

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte Ltd
3 Church Street
#10-04 Samsung Hub
Singapore 049483

Editor: Matthew Waters
Editorial assistant: Molly Farrell/Lyndsay Aitken
Production editor: Sarah Cooke
Copyeditor: Sharon Cawood
Proofreader: Audrey Scriven
Indexer: Martin Hargreaves
Marketing manager: Michael Ainsley
Cover design: Francis Kenney
Typeset by: C&M Digitals (P) Ltd, Chennai, India
Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd,
Croydon, CR0 4YY

© Peter Craig 2016
© Chapter 5 Joanne Hill 2016
© Chapter 6 Joanne Hill and Amanda Jones 2016
© Chapter 9 Ping Wu 2016
© Chapter 11 Mike Bartle 2016

First published by Learning Matters 2008
Second edition 2010
This edition published by Sage Publishing 2016

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015953008

British Library Cataloguing in Publication data

A catalogue record for this book is available from
the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4739-1947-1
ISBN 978-1-4739-1948-8 (pbk)

At SAGE we take sustainability seriously. Most of our products are printed in the UK using FSC papers and boards. When we print overseas we ensure sustainable papers are used as measured by the PREPS grading system. We undertake an annual audit to monitor our sustainability.

3

SPORT'S ORGANISATION AND GOVERNANCE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the organisational structure and ongoing development of modern sport and will further extend the analysis of the social processes that have influenced the structure of modern sport introduced in Chapter 2. Its principal aims are therefore to further extend your sociological understanding of how the familiar structures of contemporary sport were, in part, the historical product of an emergent middle class that influenced modernity through the imposition of an interconnected set of ideologies based on the introduction of rational and bureaucratic controls over vast swathes of social life. One of the outcomes of this process was the construction of a complex web of national and international organisational structures and forms of sport governance that are now widely accepted as a given reality but which are also, at times, deeply conflicted and contradictory. Another is to explore how ongoing political, social and economic changes are continuing to transform sport's organisational structure and its processes of governance.

As the preceding chapter highlighted, powerful social stratifications based on class, gender and race have been a persistent (but also contested) reality within the development of modern sport. The growing cultural and social significance of sport (often allied to its use in educational settings) also created a largely unquestioned belief that sport had the capacity to help inculcate moral virtues within the rapidly urbanising population and deliver a range of social benefits. Given its powerful presence within popular culture, the imagination of the general public

and its assumed positive social impacts, it is not surprising that when sociologists and historians turned their attention to sport, they mostly focused on a systematic analysis of how the rationalised elements of modern sport were/are dialectically connected to modernity and how this distinguished it from manifestations of recreational play and games within previous historical epochs. Illuminated by these analyses, work such as that by Loy, Kenyon and McPherson (1980) and Luschen (1981), established sport as much more than a set of voluntary and relatively trivial games. Instead, sport needed to be understood as a highly significant and complex social and cultural construction existing in spheres of being that can be both physical and abstract; competitive and playful; institutionalised and autonomous; commodified and part of the human commons. Founded on its modern codified, rationalised and institutionalised constructions, over the past five decades sport sociologists have delved ever deeper into its meaning and structure through a diverse range of conceptual and empirical analyses. In locating aspects of these analyses within perspectives drawn from some of the founding fathers of sociology, such as Durkheim, Marx and Weber, and more recently in the social theory that draws on more contemporary theorists such as latterly Giddens, Bourdieu and Foucault, sport sociologists have also determined that these social constructions do not and cannot exist other than through their active and reflexive production and reproduction through people's everyday actions (Giulianotti, 2004, 2005). The powerful social bonds connecting fans, athletes, teams and sporting localities routinely demonstrate that sport is rooted in the norms and obligations of social reciprocity and citizenship. In recent years, the work of Bourdieu (1984, 1988) and Foucault (1976, 1980) have been particularly influential in providing a theoretical framework demonstrating that sport therefore cannot be socially analysed in the absence of a much broader understanding of the structure of society as a whole.

Those organisations charged with the governance and management of sport have, on one level, a high level of autonomy, yet, as this chapter will detail, how policies and strategies are developed and implemented through sport's national and international organisational network is often fragmented and poorly interconnected across stakeholder organisations. One of the important insights you will develop is that sport is not a unified area of social activity and there is a complex array of stakeholders who view sport from very different perspectives and who seek to impact on the structure of sport in ways that maximise the interests of specific political, economic and social groups. Though the discussion largely draws on examples taken from a British social context, the analysis will extend into wider political, economic, social and cultural arenas, modes of sports organisation and governance relevant to an understanding of international sport.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

On completing this chapter, you should be able to:

- give examples of the historical development of modern sport's codification and organisation

- identify and explain the six areas of government intervention in sport identified by Houlihan (1997)
- explain how sport's organisation and systems of governance are impacted by an international network of organisations
- outline some of the major influences on and changes to the organisational structure and governance of sport in Britain and internationally.

3.2 SPORTS ORGANISATION AND GOVERNANCE: SOME BRIEF REFLECTIONS ON SOCIAL THEORY

One of the most important issues that sociology has always sought to understand is modern society's distinctive structure and how its social institutions operate in order to impose social controls on people's behaviour. In developing their various theories and concepts, sociologists are constantly seeking to create an objective analysis that helps identify these structures and understand the nature of social order that emanates from them (Eitzen, 2000). Social theory is therefore an explanation of a relationship or relationships in the real world. Houlihan (2003, p. 12) suggests that theories need to be constantly assessed in respect of how they provide the best currently accepted explanation of the available evidence of a relationship or natural phenomenon. Miles (2001, p. 1) goes further than this when he suggests that effective social theory is capable of having a real impact on how we perceive our own individual place in that world and on how our own experiences actively reflect broader processes of social change.

The development of social theory within sport sociology is an important conceptual task because although people often intuitively feel they know how the world of sport operates, due to the limited nature of their own social location and experience, they rarely, if ever, see the complete picture. Many, if not all, intuitively 'theorise' about the meaning of life all the time. This is because in order to participate in the social world we need to have an understanding of our place in that world. Inevitably, this understanding is determined by the social circumstances of our arrival into and subsequent growing up in that world. 'Theorising' in this respect is the reflective process by which we position ourselves in the world – that is, to be located and with a sense of identity. As already explained, people are active and conscious participants in the social construction of sport, yet they must also operate within the existing structural constraints imposed by the very real structures of social organisation and systems of governance that define their social world. The task of sport sociologists studying these processes is therefore to critically use theory and evidence to extend our understanding of the social world – so that it helps us to have a more complete, rigorous and evidence-based analysis of sport.

To achieve this, a number of issues need to be recognised. First, there are all sorts of power relationships and structural constraints which, for most, are obscured or invisible and yet which can have major impacts on the choice and

meaning of social activities. The idea of the ‘hidden curriculum’ in school illustrates this point well. Pupils attend lessons in maths, science, PE, geography, etc. to gain specific subject knowledge, but by doing so they are sometimes ‘learning’ other things, such as that boys are often segregated from girls at certain times; the teacher is a figure of authority; they need to stick to timetables and be in a certain place at a certain time; school ‘work’ can be monotonous, but dedication to a task will bring its own rewards; personal organisation (books, kit, lunch) is required; passing exams supposedly leads to better employment opportunities; academic knowledge is valued as ‘superior’ to vocational expertise, and so forth. In sport more specifically, being ignorant of the latest exploits of the top football teams or who the latest winners are within major sport competitions risks you being socially sidelined as out of touch with your peer group.

Power relationships and structural constraints in school have been extensively investigated because school is an important social institution that most people experience, continuously, throughout a formative time in their lives – childhood and youth (see, for example, Abercrombie and Warde, 1998). On physical education (PE) in school, Penney (2000, p. 59) reminds us that education is not neutral nor value free and nor, more specifically, are any of our curricula or teaching in PE. It is the hidden curriculum that selects agendas, interests and values to legitimise. Penney argues the case for greater equity in schools (and PE in particular) where equity is ‘giving value to and celebrating social and cultural differences of individuals and in society’ (Penney, 2000, p. 60), but in doing so he acknowledges the reality of inequality. Existing inequalities and how they are reproduced through organisational structures and forms of governance privilege certain people (or groups) and marginalise others.

Second, as noted in Chapter 1, society is not a fixed social structure, but rather it is dynamic and evolutionary. As it is generally accepted that the pace of life and therefore the rate of change is speeding up, it becomes even more important to have theoretical ‘tools’ to help understand these changes.

Third, as Andrews (2015) and Bairner (2012) both acknowledge, the sociological analysis of sport offers an important additional perspective to the scientific investigations of sport performance. Physiologists can explain with increasing confidence athletic achievement in relation to the body as a ‘machine’, with its physical development potential for enhanced performance through training regimes, technological support and strict adherence to nutrition controls. Psychologists also reside predominantly in a positivist paradigm with its espousal of universal laws of mental and emotional attributes. It is no coincidence that elite athletic performance in nearly every major sport is supported by ‘experts’ in these areas – biomechanists, nutritionists, technical coaches with specialist remits. This is entirely consistent with the insights provided by sociologists such as Durkheim and Weber about how the modern world has adapted to an industrialised setting of rationality, and yet, this view of sport is unbalanced without the insights provided by social theory. Thus, to accept that sport can be understood through scientific investigation of the body and the mind is to miss the obvious point that we all live and operate every day in a social environment. Sport sociology acknowledges that any person’s

involvement in sport is potentially enhanced and/or constrained by their social circumstances. Some of the extremely important roles of social theory and research are therefore to identify the structuring dimensions of our lives and the (usually invisible) agendas commensurate with those structures and agendas that determine who does what sports, where and with whom. To summarise, theory supported by research can therefore:

- provide a framework for asking questions about the social world
- provide a ‘toolbox’ of concepts and ideas for understanding the social world
- help us predict and explain what is happening in the world
- help us make informed decisions and choices.

3.2.1 Sport and its institutional structure

For a number of sociology’s most influential theorists, such as Emile Durkheim, Thomas Merton and Talcott Parsons, a major concern was to detail how modern society was institutionally structured and how these social institutions function effectively so that society’s social order is maintained and reproduced across its different generations. In fairly basic terms, their view was that most members of society need to be encouraged to act in the ‘best interests’ of society as a whole rather than as self-interested individuals.

One of the main premises of this theoretical perspective is that people will, through their interaction with the appropriate social institutions and the allied processes of socialisation, mostly accept and internalise, albeit sometimes reluctantly, the need to adhere to a wide range of publically visible and expected norms of behaviour (e.g. the paying of taxes or the acceptance of an umpire’s decision). Adherence to these norms, however, is not merely left to the impact of successful socialisation. As members of a society, these social norms are also necessarily imposed on them through the requirements of the legal order (such as the police and courts of law) and the bureaucratic rules and controls on everyday life that endlessly seem to emerge from governments (national and local) and their civil service departments.

Social reality (albeit a social construction) (Berger and Luckmann, 1966) has therefore a given ‘common sense’ that reinforces assumptions, that become almost unquestioned, about the nature of the social world and the requirement for its citizens to accept some level of social control over their lives as a requirement for a stable and prosperous society. The leading proponents of this theoretical framework, such as Durkheim, Merton and Parsons, all had a significant influence on much of the early sociological analysis of sport (Loy and Booth, 2002). In adopting a structural-functionalist perspective, this work broadly accepted the premise that the social world could be understood as a system of integrated and interconnected working parts. Although, as Andrews (2015) details, this is no longer the case, such work was primarily empirical and focused on establishing ‘social facts’, and for reasons that will become clearer in

later chapters it had a greater initial influence on American sport sociologists than on those working within a European context (Craig, 2015). The goal was to establish whether there was empirical proof for popular assumptions regarding sport's capacity to 'function' positively as a social institution and contribute to the Parsonian mandate to achieve necessary functional prerequisites. The specific interests of the work were in demonstrating whether or not the ambitious set goals that are often placed at sport's door are realistic and attainable. These included how sport could be used to integrate members of society, provide an arena of positive goal setting, create opportunities for the attainment of positive character-building attributes, make a contribution to the health and wellbeing of individuals in society, create community and foster a sense of shared national identity.

The results of these analyses (maybe not surprisingly) were, by and large, mostly inconclusive. By the late 1970s, the processes of socialisation and sport's role in it started to take a more critical turn as the linkages between participation in sport, class and gender inequality, racism and other socially problematic behaviours (cheating, violence, sexual abuse, etc.) became matters of public and academic concern. The outcome was that many social theorists started to reject some of the premises of this functionalist approach, and suggest that the idea of social order based on a consensus was largely mythic and that the dominant social order is more reflective of the ways that those who have economic wealth and power control the social system so that it always acts in their 'best interests' and not in the interests of everyone.

Within sport sociology, interest turned towards issues such as globalisation, the feminist critique of male power, the mass migration of peoples and cultures, and the rise of consumer society. Conceptually, this 'critical turn' also meant that many of the assumptions about the enduring order of the modern world needed to be radically revisited, especially in respect of the power relations between social groups (Hargreaves, 1986; Gruneau, 1993). Indeed, for some sport sociologists (Rail, 1998) the term modernity has itself become problematic and they suggest that we are entering a new form of social order – postmodernity. The point to be drawn from all of these debates is that ideas about the organisation, control and management of our social world and the world of sport, need to be considered as highly contested. Drawing on a more contemporary social and economic issue, the major economic crises that have beset many countries from 2008 to the present day have created a set of highly charged political debates around who is to blame and who should pay the costs of getting the country's finances back in good order (Bauman, 2011; Standing, 2011).

Though these critiques have reduced the prevalence of a purely functionalist approach within sport sociology, research that draws on this perspective continues to provide insights into a number of issues: the changing institutional structure of globalised sport (Maguire, 1999); the use and regulation of performance-enhancing drugs and surgical body enhancements; and the impact of technology on all aspects of sport (or indeed postmodern sport), especially in relation to new forms of consumption and organisation, particularly in respect of transformative forms of social control and surveillance.

3.2.2 Sport's organisation and governance: new directions and transformations

Analysis of how sport's organisation and governance have been impacted by the transforming modes of social organisation evident within our contemporary world has drawn significantly from the work of Castells (1998, 2012). For Castells, society and its modes of organisation are shaped by its system of values and institutions. Power within society and within sport, and the capacity to maintain the existing social order or to effect change, are determined by the structural capacity to impose one's will. In most modern societies, the capacity to wield power through the institutions of governance is partly determined by political debate and democratic elections, which, for a fixed amount of years, determine where power lies and which political party governs. That noted, you might also be aware that unlike our politicians, many of our most powerful and influential international sports bodies (e.g. the IOC and FIFA) do not democratically elect their leaders (instead, they are usually voted in by a small number of regional representatives) and despite the capacity of those leaders to wield very significant levels of power, neither they nor their organisations are subject to external scrutiny (Hoberman, 1984, 1986; Jennings, 2012).

KEY TERM

Power: Power has many sources but can be understood as the ability of individuals, or members of a group, to achieve aims and further the interests they hold (Giddens, 2001, p. 696).

As with various events that have recently occurred in many countries of the world, the impact of the Internet, social media and social movements demonstrates that the nature of power and politics needs to be understood as being historically and culturally specific (Castells, 2012). Both are deeply affected by globalised levels of social changes in patterns of governance and economic interdependence, the structure of organisations (public and private), cultural traditions and conventions. Castells' thesis revolves around his analysis of the effects of these changes on people's everyday lives, especially in regard to ideas around citizenship and the rise of what he terms 'the network society' (Castells, 1998, 2012). Though this network developed as a mode of organising our globalised economic activity, it is now extending its logic to other domains and organisations such as those that characterise sport. As we will examine later, the sport network is made up of international, national and local sport organisations, governments, transnational corporations and other social institutions that have little option but to work collectively in strategic alliances (Sugden, 2002). Because of this, the ways in which we understand the processes of governance and the uses of power and social control need to be constantly subject to critique and, if necessary, modified.

3.3 THE CODIFICATION AND ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF MODERN SPORT

While the development or evolution of modern sport was undoubtedly under way before the start of the 19th century, most sports historians suggest that it was within the emergent modernity of Victorian Britain that the development of modern organised and codified sports began most strongly (Mason, 1988; Holt, 1989). The very tenor of modern times facilitated the growth of the 'new' sports. The increasingly industrial, urban, organised and outward-looking world power of Victorian Britain (that extended internationally via its Empire and proximity to its European rivals) was built on its beliefs in rationality, control and a managed social order and, unsurprisingly, its recreations and entertainments gradually came to reflect these world views as well (Blake, 1996).

At this time, athletic games (as opposed to the more traditional 'field sports' such as hunting, etc.) were made up in the main by the football sports that were to become soccer and the codes of rugby-football; modernised bat and ball games such as cricket, baseball and tennis; and the family of athletic activities that are now included under the title of 'track and field'. Such was the growing power of these sporting forms that in an almost unquestioned process, the belief in the moral virtues and social benefits apparently attainable from such sports became an ingrained element of modern culture. It should of course also be noted that during this formation the intended participants were white men and within many of these sports access by women was extremely limited and many were replete with deep-seated racist attitudes. By the middle of the 20th century, these modern understandings of sport had more or less become universally adopted across the international community of nations.

Other less populist sporting pastimes had undergone organisation prior to this period and the motivations for this were somewhat different from those noted above. To maintain their exclusivity and elite status, 'aristocratic' sports, such as horse racing, cricket and golf, remained governed by well-established and exclusive member-only clubs. Their social representation was explicit – the control and ownership of these activities was the province of the upper classes, though some members of the aspirational middle classes who had significant access to wealth (from the profits of their developing businesses and industries) were also given access (albeit often grudgingly). Alongside its social rationality, in terms of its reinforcement of class distinctions, this approach was also often driven by pragmatic concerns. Horse racing and boxing were, and still are, important social vehicles for gambling, and with the wealthy willing to wager large sums on the outcome of races and fights, there was a need to ensure that the outcomes were fair (Holt, 1989).

It was in keeping with the spirit of the time that within both Europe and a rapidly modernising America, athletic sports increasingly became a popular recreational option. However, as already stated, this development was mostly for men rather than women. In broad terms, the prevailing viewpoint of those seeking to get a wider section of the population involved in sport was, if sports were good enough to shape the moral character of the social elites exiting public

schools and universities, then they also had the potential to positively impact the lives of men from the middle and working classes. In an age dominated by ‘self-improvement’, the newly codified sports facilitated a competitive and ambitious spirit, and as they grew in popularity there was an increasing pressure to provide popular access (Holt, 1989; Birley, 1993). By the start of the 20th century, sport, as it remains to this day, had become an established part of popular culture and modern imagination. These new forms of sport opened up increased levels of participation and fanship based on the ‘facts’ that sports were now regarded as:

- godly and moral (through ‘muscular Christianity’)
- ‘healthy’ through their promotion of physical exercise
- socially important as they ‘taught’ key virtues such as discipline, courage, selflessness, self-reliance, aspiration to excellence, and so forth
- economically important.

Student Reflection Task 3.1

From your reading of the above discussion, you should now understand that the organisation, bureaucratic control and codification of modern sport were never simple developmental social processes. It was and is, especially as the world globalises to ever greater levels of interconnection, a complex process in which agreed rules, a participation ethic, established authority, clear identity and popular support combine to produce a range of sporting activities that still conform to many of the ideological representations that emerged through the modern age. Through the processes inherent in its modernisation, sport is therefore both a product of modern society and an essential institution in the reproduction of the modern social order across the classes and generations.

Task: Take a few minutes and reflect back over your personal journey into sport and see if you can identify and then note down your ideas about the following issues:

What has been the impact of your family circumstances, your school experience (especially the influence of your PE teachers) and the structure and availability of sports facilities in your local community on your involvement in sport?

What have you ‘learned’ about the world of sport in regard to its rules, competitive nature and codes of conduct?

Do you think the world of sport that you experience is different from that of your parents?

Drawing on these reflections, take a look back over the preceding discussion and see if you can identify whether your experiences and ideas support or challenge the analysis that has been put forward.

Conforming to the world view of Victorian modernity, organised sport became a widely admired part of British cultural life that was soon to be emulated by many countries around an increasingly interconnected world. By the early decades of the 20th century, sport was global and had captured the popular imagination of the modern age. It was this template, forged in the mid- to late 19th century, that set the course that British, and indeed world, sport has followed to the present day. The founder of the modern Olympic Games, Pierre de Coubertin, drew on his admiration of these developments to fashion what was to become the largest, most impressive and influential cultural festival that the modern world has ever seen. Until the 1960s and 1970s, the aspirations, expectations and concerns of the Olympics were discernibly recognisable as those appropriated from how Victorian modernity shaped and defined the organisation of modern sport. Values that are still easily recognisable in the articulation of Olympism are detailed in the Olympic Charter:

Olympism is a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind. Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy found in effort, the educational value of good example and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles. (Olympic Charter: Fundamental principles, para. 2)

Given these powerful cultural representations of sport that had grown to such prominence within British society and its very significant influence internationally (through its colonial power and Empire), it is an unsurprising social fact that British sport had a pivotal influence on the organisational character and system of rational governance that came to define the structure and practice of modern sport (Mason, 1988). In Britain, the main vehicle for the codification and spread of the newly codified games was the developing educational system, led in its initial stages by the public school sector. While the momentum behind this was, in the first instance, a desire to manage the boys who were in their charge, the evident benefits both for the schools and the boys meant that these 'proto' sports were almost guaranteed to eventually spread from these schools to a wider level of social adoption. By 1864, the Clarendon Commission, which had been set up to inspect and report on the major public schools, commended them for their capacity to instil in the boys *a love of healthy sports and exercise*. Conforming as the sports did to a moral understanding of the body that came to be known as 'muscular Christianity', and with the boys from the schools going on to university, the army and navy, into the civil service, into business and the professions at home, as well as serving throughout the Empire, it is not surprising that the success of the Victorian model of modern athletic sports soon began to have an impact internationally (Mangan and Walvin, 1987).

An historic example of the founding of governing bodies that were to have the right to control and organise a sport is the Football Association (FA) in 1863 followed by the founding of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) in 1904. Interestingly, the British FAs initially refused to

join this federal structure, however they did eventually do so in 1905. The foundation act of 1904 was signed and authorised by representatives of the football associations of France – Union des Sociétés Françaises de Sports Athlétiques (USFSA); Belgium – Union Belge des Sociétés de Sports (UBSSA); Denmark – Dansk Boldspil Union (DBU); the Netherlands – Nederlandsche Voetbal Bond (NVB); Spain – Madrid Football Club; Sweden – Svenska Bollspells Förbundet (SBF); and Switzerland – Association Suisse de Football (ASF).

There are many other examples of the emergent international organisation of sport. Founded in 1866, the Amateur Athletic Club was eventually followed by the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF) in 1912. As athletics was already a well-established element of the modern Olympics, the impetus for this was that many of the national athletic federations competing internationally saw the need to create a governing authority who would be responsible for the validation of standardised rules, technical equipment and the formal recording and verification of world records.

The Amateur Swimming Association, founded in 1869, was followed by the founding of FINA (Fédération Internationale de Natation) which took place at the end of the 1908 London Olympics. It is interesting to note that initially there were only eight national swimming federations who agreed to be signatories. However, in just over 100 years, FINA has grown to have 208 national association members.

The Bicycle Union of 1866 was followed by the founding of the Union Cycliste Internationale (UCI) in 1900. The UCI is now the world governing body for the sport of cycling, recognised by the International Olympic Committee (IOC). The UCI was founded in Paris in 1900, and its headquarters are now located at UCI's World Cycling Centre in Aigle, Switzerland.

The Rugby Football Union was founded in 1871 followed by the International Rugby Football Board in 1886 (which interestingly and rather parochially only had three of the countries of the UK as its founding members – Scotland, Wales and Ireland). After some pressure from the other nations, England eventually joined in 1890 with Australia, New Zealand and South Africa becoming full members in 1949. France became the first non-Commonwealth member in 1978 and since then the game has continued to expand globally with membership divided across three tiers of organisational status.

Lawn tennis was codified in 1874 followed by the formation of the International Lawn Tennis Federation (ILTF) in Paris in 1913.

Today, it is the international federations (IFs) that are tasked with the organisation and control of sport at world level. While they have independence and autonomy from other global sports organisations in respect of the administration of their sports, the reality is that these external bodies can and do have a major influence on the way in which sport is organised internationally and nationally. For many international sports federations, the seeking of IOC recognition is crucial as access to the world's premier sports event is vital to attract sponsor and media interest. To achieve IOC recognition, they must however ensure that their statutes, practices and activities conform to the principles of the Olympic Charter.

It is the IFs that have overarching responsibility for the management and monitoring of their various sports. This includes: the validation of any changes

regarding the rules of the sport, including the rules of 'fair play'; athlete eligibility for international selection; the supervision and legal protection of their athletes; the sport's promotion and development; and the everyday administration of their sport, including the regular organisation of international competitions, and contractual negotiations with media and corporations regarding sponsorship and broadcast rights.

All IFs whose sport is part of the Olympic programmes for the summer and winter Games also have the status of International Olympic Federations and the right to participate in annual meetings of the IOC Executive Board with the International Olympic Summer Federations and with their winter Games counterparts. In order to discuss common problems and decide on their events calendars, the summer Olympic federations, the winter Olympic federations and the recognised federations have formed associations: the Association of Summer Olympic International Federations (ASOIF), the Association of International Olympic Winter Sports Federations (AIOWF), the Association of IOC Recognised International Sports Federations (ARISF) and the General Association of International Sports Federations (GAISF), which also includes other sports federations.

3.3.1 The International Olympic Committee (IOC)

The Olympic Movement is a broader organisational entity than the IOC and encompasses a diverse range of organisations, athletes and other persons who agree to be guided by the Olympic Charter. The IOC is the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement. In more formal organisational terminology, it is an 'international non-governmental, non-profit organisation' and owns all rights to the Olympic symbols, flag, motto, anthem and Olympic Games. The IOC's primary responsibility is the supervision of the organisational structures that are established by each host to ensure the effective and safe organisation of a specified summer and winter Olympics. There are currently in excess of 200 National Olympic Committees (NOCs) covering all five continents represented by the Olympic rings. One of the major responsibilities of an NOC is to run national programmes designed to propagate the 'fundamental principles of Olympism'. The NOCs come together at least once every two years in the form of the Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC) to exchange information and make recommendations to the IOC regarding the use of funds derived from television rights and other corporate 'partners'. The NOCs are split among five continental associations, which have a powerful influence on the selection of sites for the summer and winter Olympiads:

- Africa: ANOCA (Association of National Olympic Committees of Africa)
- America: PASO (Pan American Sports Organization)
- Asia: OCA (Olympic Council of Asia)
- Europe: EOC (European Olympic Committees)
- Oceania: ONOC (Oceania National Olympic Committees).

What these brief histories and organisation structures detail is that by the early part of the 20th century a diverse array of sport's national and international governing bodies had been set up to regulate and organise play, agree venues and the duration of play, establish codes of conduct for players and spectators, and establish how far commercial interests are able to impact on the sports. A further fairly obvious impulse that facilitated the growth, organisation and standardisation of sports was the potential of these sports to become open to forms of commercial development and exploitation. The growing middle classes were entrepreneurially capitalistic, and it soon became evident, especially in the context of the growing levels of people living in the developing towns and cities, that there were money-making opportunities inherent in the provision, organisation and promotion of the increasingly popular sports.

Another of the defining legacies of this process was that most sports were run as independent, self-directing bureaucratic organisations that had little or no direct connection to the broader social and political processes of democratic organisation, governance and public accountability that underpinned most of the other significant aspects of modern society. It was not until the 1950s and 1960s that public concerns regarding the limited investment of public funds and a poorly co-ordinated (or in some cases non-existent) national structure responsible for the development of sport became a matter of political concern. In alignment with the dominant social democratic ideology of the time in countries like Britain, one important outcome of this concern was the formation of a national Sports Council. The initial development of the Sports Council in 1965 largely kept it within the control of the government. This was altered in 1971 when it was decided to insulate the Council from political control (Henry, 1993). Although this meant that the Council had a significant degree of political autonomy, because the government remained in control of its funding, how far this independence extended has remained open to question (Henry, 1993). By the mid-1970s, the Council had become an integral element of the organisational structure of sport in Britain and, under its 'Sport for All' banner, was supporting a vast variety of participant sports.

In organisational terms, sports councils in the UK are best described as *quangos* (or, more formally, *Quasi-Autonomous Non-Governmental Organizations*). Governments tend to set up a *quango* for two interconnected reasons. One is a recognition that the *quango's* arena of interest and responsibility is in the national interest (e.g. the promotion of sport, the arts). The other is a political decision that the government of the day does not want to have direct responsibility for its organisation, administration and financing. In the UK today, the vast majority of public money that is channelled into sport comes from the national lottery and sport typically has only a relatively small call on funds from public taxation.

Coalter (2007a, 2007b) has convincingly argued that it is an established political fact that sport has become integrated into public policy discourse and formation – a point that has not been lost on the United Nations (2003, p. 3), which has recognised that sports programmes can be 'a cost-effective way to contribute significantly to health, education, development and peace and a powerful medium through which to mobilize societies'. In his assessment of sport's

relationship to public policy, Houlihan (1997, p. 61) suggests that when governments do intervene in sport (directly through legislation or indirectly through policy frameworks), the impetus tends to arise as a reaction to specific social problems. He identifies that governmental concerns generally fall into six distinct areas: protection of the interests of powerful social groups; health promotion and benefits; social integration; military preparedness; promotion of international prestige and nationalism; and sport and economic regeneration.

3.3.2 Protection of the interests of powerful social groups

A good example of how powerful social groups were protected was the introduction of laws protecting landowners from unauthorised use of their land for various sporting and recreational purposes. In the UK during the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries, there was a succession of 'Game Acts' that safeguarded the interests of the landed gentry and their hunting and shooting interests. For many during this time, sporting activities were often understood to refer to organised hunting, fishing and shooting, directed at the killing of animals for 'sport'. As the 20th century progressed, legal restrictions on the general public, which prevented them having access to land or water for non-hunting purposes, such as recreational walking or water sports (or even family picnics), became progressively reduced. In the UK, the fairly recent 'Right to Roam' legislation illustrates that public access to all non-proscribed and non-cultivated areas has become ever more democratised. In addition, legislation on hunting animals with dogs evidences how legal restrictions and permissions are constantly being contested by opposing interest groups. In common with many countries when confronted with the 'democratic' might of the general population, the traditionally powerful sections of society are no longer able to easily use governmental controls to guarantee their own interests. At the same time, it would be naïve to ignore the fact that these groups remain powerful and are constantly seeking ways to get legislation revised or turned over.

3.3.3 Health promotion and benefits

These policy interventions are often targeted at low-income (lower-class) families and health issues associated with industrialisation and urbanisation. From the time of its early popularisation, the health benefits of sport and exercise have been made claim to. Sporty images of the 'healthy athlete' are often contrasted with the lives of those whose health is impacted by poor diet, poor housing and limited access to medical care. Framed in this way, responsibility for health and living a healthy lifestyle are seen as a matter of individual education and personal responsibility. In our contemporary age, sport has become seen by governments seeking to limit the costs of their 'health service' as a major vehicle for health initiatives designed to make positive impacts on levels of inactivity, obesity and mental health (Hanlon and Carlisle, 2012).

Although the organisation of health promotion through sport is largely the domain of national organisations, sport and physical activity as an element of health promotion also has significant status within transnational governmental organisations such as the European Union (EU). Though the EU clearly accepts that the promotion of ‘health-enhancing physical activity’ (HEPA) is concretely stated to be ‘a matter primarily for Member States’, there is also a clear recognition in EU policy frameworks that there should be a European-wide approach to the promotion of health-orientated sport and physical activity.

The argument for this sort of promotion is not surprisingly primarily a financial one as the beneficial effects of physical activity have the potential to offset some of the growing financial burden that is being caused by increasing levels of physical inactivity and allied physical and mental health problems (Public Health England, 2014). These costs are extensive and, as an example, within England they have been estimated as exceeding €3 billion per year or €63 per inhabitant (Cabinet Office, 2002). This noted, these issues are international in scope and significant. As detailed in the following statement, the Council of Europe recognises that within the EU a majority of Member States have now put in place recommendations for an increased provision of HEPA:

In an effort to support the Member States, the Union has been promoting physical activity through its policies and financial instruments in particular in the fields of sport and health, and has provided evidence-based guidance to policy makers in the form of the EU Physical Activity Guidelines. These guidelines, drafted by a group of 22 experts from around Europe representing various disciplines and broadly representative of informed scientific opinion, were confirmed by EU Sport Ministers in 2008. They reiterate WHO Recommendations on the minimum level of physical activity and emphasise the importance of a cross-sectoral approach to HEPA and provide 41 concrete guidelines for action. (Council of Europe, 2013, p. 3)

To date across the 28 member countries of the EU, specific HEPA programmes have been launched across a variety of policy areas or governance sectors. These include sport, health, transport and education.

3.3.4 Social integration

An example of this was how the doctrines of ‘muscular Christianity’ and ‘self-improvement’ were used to instil discipline within the urban working classes in British cities (via the Education Acts of 1870 and 1902) (Hargreaves, 1986; Houlihan, 1997). Furthermore, there is a wider dimension in play here, where the recognition of, and involvement in, common activities enable and promote social cohesion. However, ‘integration’ at this level may remain entirely tokenistic, with sections of British society playing the same sports, but doing so through the separate organisation of teams and leagues (Trimble et al., 2010).

3.3.5 Military preparedness

The introduction of physical training into elementary schools across Britain (with classes often instructed by ex-army, non-commissioned officers) came as a response to the perceived poor performance of the British Army during the Crimean War of 1853–56. In fact, poor nutrition, illness and disease were far more detrimental to the war effort than was the physical preparedness of the soldiers who embarked on a journey to the Crimea. As a reaction to these concerns, a system of physical training for the military was introduced, which subsequently migrated to elementary schools for working-class children. Middle- and upper-class boys in the public school system had an extensive games culture already established by this time. How these collectively became the antecedents of physical education now being a compulsory element of the educational curriculum in most countries is explored in more detail in the following chapter.

3.3.6 Promotion of international prestige and nationalism

While the popular appeal of sport always meant that it had close associations with expressions of nationalism and patriotic sentiment (Edensor, 2002), the celebration of, and investment of public money in, elite athletes and national teams were, until relatively recently, distinctly limited. Today, nationalism, whether it is located in the highly choreographed opening and closing ceremonies of the world's sporting mega-events or in the highly partisan public celebrations of sporting victories, is well established. Governments and politicians around the world are happy to spend significant amounts of public funds in the expectation that they will get to bask in the reflected glory and sense of national pride created by the heroic return of successful athletes (Bairner, 2001; Hargreaves, 2002).

3.3.7 Sport and economic regeneration

Although this issue will be examined in more detail in Chapter 10, it is important to recognise a point quite closely related to the one just made which is that the economic significance of sport is now so great that no government can easily ignore it. The London Olympic Games in 2012 (DCMS, 2015) and the Glasgow Commonwealth Games in 2014, the World Cup (2014) and the forthcoming Olympics in Rio de Janeiro have all been subject to the expectation that major sports festivals will provide tangible economic regeneration and leave a beneficial and lasting legacy. Indeed, as recent evaluations by the UK government detail, the London Games of 2012 have been broadly assessed as a success in this respect (DCMS, 2015). The controversies in Brazil regarding the World Cup and the Olympics and the significant failure of the Athens Olympics in 2004 to deliver any lasting economic benefit demonstrate that these positive economic outcomes and improvements are far from assured.

Time, however, does not stand still and, as Giddens (1990) has detailed, one of the defining characteristics of the modern world is its restlessness and constant change. Over the past few decades, there have been a number of major political, economic, social, cultural and organisational changes that have dramatically altered some of the fundamental elements of modern society (Calhoun, 2012; Wallerstein et al., 2013). Some examples that you will be familiar with from your own lives and sporting experiences are globalisation; the seemingly endless growth of mass consumption; and the diverse ways that computer-mediated technologies have become an integral element of everyday life. While these changes have created a great deal of debate within sociology (Calhoun, 2012) and within sport sociology (Andrews, 2015; Giulianotti, 2005), the analytic focus at this stage is not to explore these arguments in detail (they will return as major areas of interest in many of the chapters that follow) but to use their recognition as a basis to examine how the changes have impacted (and are continuing to impact) the organisational structure and governance of sport.

3.4 THE GOVERNANCE OF MODERN (NETWORKED) SPORT

As you may well have recognised from the preceding discussion, the ‘governance’ and complex organisational structure of sport are full of potentially confusing relationships. As Jarvie (2010, p. 154) has detailed, governance in sport can be broadly understood as ‘consisting of self-organising interorganisational frameworks’. In one of the most important academic explorations, Henry (2007) stresses a note of caution on use of the term ‘governance’. While even a brief exploration of the academic literature will demonstrate that it is a widely used concept, the actual meaning of the term, as the quote above probably demonstrates, is rather imprecise. This concern acknowledged, Henry (2007) goes on to argue that it remains a useful analytic for sport sociologists, as it extends our ideas and analysis beyond that of ‘government’ into three areas of policy development that span the globalised network of sport organisations. The first highlights a need to understand the systemic nature of contemporary sport governance. While national governments and powerful international sport bodies such as the IAAF or FINA can have a significant influence on their respective sports of athletics and swimming, the process of governance also necessarily involves interactions with a complex array of other stakeholders. As Henry (2007, p. 8) details, these include ‘media companies, governmental organisations, sponsors, athletes associations and transnational bodies such as the European Union’. When sport sociologists examine these interactions and their policy implications, their focus is often on the nature of these interactions and how they are impacted by power structures. The second area of policy development tends to focus on managerial processes and how these might create or hinder ‘corporate, or good organisational governance’ and the practice of managerial values and ethics such as ‘transparency,

democracy, equity and accountability' (Henry, 2007, p. 8). The third area of focus is the political dimensions of governance and how policy objectives are achieved through the funding and 'provision of sporting facilities or opportunities ... legal controls' and 'a mixture of moral and fiscal controls' (p. 8).

From a sociological perspective (rather than a managerialist one), sports governance exists in an interconnected global context and therefore needs to be understood as being under constant pressure to adapt to a wide range of competing pressures as the public, commercial and voluntary sectors of sport provision and their representatives vie for influence. The systemic nature of sport's complex web of national, international and supranational interests means that national governments and their state apparatus have, on the one hand, a now well-established political responsibility for sport policy that can exert a powerful influence on sport, while, on the other hand, governments tend to have no formal responsibility for the actual organisation, management or delivery of sport. Moreover, as anyone directly involved in sport will recognise, three additional organisational and corporate entities (media companies, commercial transnational sport companies and event management agencies) have an important commercial and funding influence on sport. Apart from event management companies, most of these corporations also have businesses that are, in terms of their actual products, quite separate from sport. An example here is how companies such as Coca Cola – whose products have no direct connection with the 'playing of sport' – compete to be corporate sponsors of major sporting events such as the Olympics and use global sports stars to promote their products. The deepening influence of commercial and media companies on all aspects of modern sport will be discussed more fully in Chapters 8 and 9.

3.4.1 Sport policy and governance

The following statement by Tessa Jowell (then the UK Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport) captures a fairly typical governmental and political commitment to the development of sport: 'My ambition for sport in the UK is to start a 20-year process of re-establishing this country as a powerhouse in the sporting world' (Cabinet Office, 2002). Within these policy claims is the now common (indeed required by the IOC) strategic intention to support the use of significant sums of taxpayers' money to 'produce' not only Olympic medallists (a major concern for all host countries) but also a Games that can assert to the rest of the watching world the power and prestige of the country. However, this policy, as is true for all sport-related policies, can only be delivered if the necessary resources and organisational structures are then put in place. As times pass and as governments and policy commitments change, there is always a level of uncertainty as to the deliverability and sustainability of such ambitions. As Thibault and Harvey (2013, p. 1) have detailed (from a Canadian perspective), a number of important questions need to be posed when assessing governmental commitments to sport. These are:

[T]o what extent should governments support high performance athletes, and through which channels? To what extent should municipalities provide access to sport infrastructures, free of charge or through user fees, to their citizens and community clubs? Should the federal government financially support national sport organizations (NSOs)?

As the UK readily discovered in its planning and staging of the Olympics and its failed bids to stage the World Cup, global sports mega-events are not merely about sport, they are also highly manipulated politicised processes whereby smiling politicians and powerful sports oligarchs get to pose in front of the world's media alongside successful athletes draped in the national flag and bedecked with the golden symbols of success. For these politicians and sport oligarchs – even the most genuinely sport-loving ones – these photo opportunities are about improving their own political capital. The cynical political use of sport is, however, only one reason why national and local governments need to be involved in sport. As many sport sociologists (e.g. Harvey et al., 2009; Craig and Craig, 2012) have said, governments have increasingly sought to co-opt sport as an instrument of social cohesion, especially in fractured local communities where many people from different cultures and backgrounds live lives that are deeply polarised and conflicted. Sport is also often considered to be a catalyst for economic development (Craig and Craig, 2012). This was certainly true in respect of how the UK government attempted to justify its investment of billions of pounds in the hosting of the 2012 Olympiad in London. As well as providing a boost to its tourist industry, the 2012 Olympics were explicitly used to stimulate the regeneration of the economic and social infrastructure of East London (e.g. transportation, green and sustainable technology, housing and sport facilities). There are also numerous historical (the boycott of South African sports teams in the Apartheid era) and contemporary examples (the Sochi Winter Olympics post Russia's annexation of the Crimea) of involvement where sport can also become regarded as an important instrument of 'foreign policy' and 'international co-operation' (Harvey, 2008, p. 227) or sanction.

Drawing on the work of Page (2006), Thibault and Harvey's (2013) analysis of sport policy contends that government policies need to be considered as having a dual social reality in that they are both a statement of intention and/or a statement of direct action. Page (2006) argues that these intentions and actions can represent at least four levels of meaning. At the most general level, policy 'intentions', such as those highlighted above, present the public with a series of general principles about their intentions regarding the running of public affairs. As was detailed in the opening discussion of the historic development of sport, it was not until the 1970s that most Western democratic countries started to revise the generally accepted view that sport was a matter of individual choice and separate from the world of politics. The dominant view was that the state should play a very limited role in the world of sport. This liberal political consensus came under increasing pressure as countries such as the USSR and the German Democratic Republic started to invest significant sums in the development of high-performance athletes. The political agenda was to demonstrate to the rest of the world the superiority of state

communist societies. Today, a completely non-interventionist representation of the state's role in sport has now substantially vanished from an understanding of sport's governance within most advanced industrialised countries. The dominant issue today is not whether governments should intervene in sport; the issues are rather more focused on maximising the utility of policies by rigorous evaluation and dissemination of best practice.

The second level of policy meaning is the communication of the government's specific policy intentions and how these are publically managed. For instance, while the Minister of Sport in the UK government's Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) has no direct control over the funding process for elite sport, a number of sport's national governing bodies (NGBs) have recently appealed to the Minister of Sport to have their funding cuts revisited. Basketball was one of these sports and, given its capacity to recruit young people from inner-city and ethnic communities (notably black and East European), it was able to convince the minister to actively intervene to revise the level of funding.

The next level of meaning relates to the sphere of actions that are allied to the policy framework. Actions in this sense are understood as the specific policy instruments or tools that are intended to deliver specific policy aims and targets (Page, 2006). Typical policy instruments used by governments are: direct financial subsidies, revised tax rules (often something that is directly negotiated by transnational corporations seeking to minimise their tax commitments within a particular country), planning regulations (e.g. around the building of sports stadia) and direct political pressure through highly publicised political statements.

The last level relates to the accountability and behaviour of public officials (sport and state) who are directly involved in the delivery of policy (Page, 2006). As Pal (2010) outlines, when the delivery of policy is examined it is as important to consider inaction as well as the intentions and actions of those responsible. As he notes, policies are 'a course of action or inaction chosen by public authorities to address a given problem or interrelated set of problems' (2010, p. 2). Drawing on this idea, it is therefore equally as important to examine a government's or an organisation's decisions not to act on a specific policy issue or objective as it is to look at actual policy delivery and action. As will become more evident shortly when the discussion turns to the growing interconnection between sport, physical activity and health, there is an unclear boundary between what people see as policies and what are regarded as 'programmes'. For Pal (2010), policies should be primarily regarded as 'guides to a range of related actions in a given field' (2010, p. 2), whereas 'programmes' should be regarded as a planned range of actions delivered through an objective and accountable management and organisational structure that is intended to deliver the identified policy goals.

If a reminder is needed, it should again be emphasised that sport policy is now global in character (Palmer, 2013). For Palmer, social theory has, as yet, not been used substantively enough in examining sports policy at a global level. Two of the significant issues highlighted in this work are: (1) how the policy frameworks underpinning the planning and delivery of sports mega-events have substantive and enduring implications for the cities and nations that host the events; and (2) their potential to create systemic human rights violations (e.g. the Beijing

Games and the Rio Games), while at the same time having the capacity to act as a powerful medium exposing repressive regimes to global public scrutiny. Globally, contemporary sport governance evidences an economic orientation towards sports participants who are seen as individuals (or customers/clients) who are represented through economic discourses that define them economically in respect of the utility of their sporting investments (Palmer, 2013). Though it is still fairly easy to identify a political rhetoric extolling the social benefits of sport, this view now has to compete with what social commentators (e.g. Standing, 2011) regard as pervasive adoption by many politicians and their political parties of a neo-liberal free market ideology. In fairly simple terms, it is an ideology that emphasises competitive success (win or get your funding cut), consumer choice allied to the privatisation of sporting provision and an allied reduction in the necessity for government expenditure to support either the facilities or the costs of participation.

One of the outcomes is that the separation between policy approaches, professional practice within sports coaching, development and management, and the prevailing dominance of a political economy based on free market and corporate ideological leadership is becoming ever more diminished. As Brazil prepares for the Olympics and reassesses the deep social problems that emerged from its staging of the World Cup, the contradictions evident in these ideological prescriptions (sport as a social good and sport as a commodified consumer product) are clearly visible in the government's reassurances to the IOC and the Games' corporate sponsors and in the growing levels of social unrest and protest over the costs and local benefits of running the Olympiad.

Student Reflection Task 3.2

Your task is to find out more about your government's support for sport by going to its website. If you choose to use the UK as the basis for your analysis, a good starting point will be the DCMS website (www.culture.gov.uk). Once there, follow the links to 'What we do for sport', select three of the following categories and carefully examine what is presented:

- Sport England (if you are in Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland, these regions of the UK have their own sports council websites)
- UK Sport
- equality in sport
- community sport
- funding sources for talented athletes
- professional sport
- sports facilities
- world-class competitors.

(Continued)

(Continued)

Based on what you have found out and the issues identified in the above discussion, carefully consider the following issues and allied questions:

If your national government had to limit its expenditure on sport, should it prioritise the promotion of exercise and a healthy lifestyle or the development of elite athletes who can compete effectively in world sport? Use the categories detailed by Houlihan above to help structure your enquiry.

From what you can find out, consider the following question: How do the stated policies and their strategies for the development of sport include working with other stakeholders within sport's 'governance network'?

3.5 EMERGENT POLICY DIRECTIONS: SPORT, PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AND HEALTH

Across the countries of the UK (England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland), but also typifying the position in many countries, the public bodies responsible for sport governance are constantly establishing and revising strategic aims (that are not always compatible) for the development of sport. These strategies are often supported by significant levels of investment of public monies in sport.

The high cost of funding elite sport means that support for elite sport development programmes inevitably becomes politically contentious within and outside of sport. As Roche (2000) outlines, there is a range of arguments, some supporting the investment in elite sport because of the benefits that sporting success at international level brings, while others stress the negative effects that it can incur as it inevitably draws funding away from community-level sport. In common with most political decisions, governments face a complicated task of weighing up the interests of a complex network of groups that will directly benefit from or suffer as a result of funding decisions. As we have already alluded to above, a prominent governmental concern is the issue of growing levels of inactivity and the threat this has for the health and wellbeing of the population.

In addressing this concern, one of the leading stakeholders in the formation of public health policy within the UK, Public Health England (PHE), has set itself the target of creating a 'step change in the public's health' (PHE, 2014). To achieve this, it has established a ten-year strategy with seven priority areas. These include tackling the behaviours that lead to an increased risk of poor mental and physical health, with a specific focus on physical inactivity as a critical condition for the delivery of these priorities (e.g. dementia, obesity and giving every child the best start in life) (PHE, 2014, p. 4).

In policy terms, there has been a substantive amount of work undertaken to identify a set of guidelines relating to the volume, duration, frequency and type of physical activity required across all age ranges to achieve general health benefits (PHE, 2014). This policy framework has been formulated to impact

the delivery agenda of the health service, local authorities and a range of other organisations, including sports agencies, who are responsible for the design, delivery and promotion of physical activity.

The last decade has seen a massive increase in the amount of ‘screen time’ that young people (Must et al., 2007) are having. For governments and sports representative bodies, this has led to an increased focus on the levels of exercise (or lack of it) that the country’s increasingly sedentary population is now engaged in. One recent assessment of the four nations of the UK suggests that there is a significant variation across all countries allied to a big difference between men and women in regard to regular participation in the recommended amounts of daily exercise (DoH Physical Activity Team, 2011):

TABLE 3.1 *Physical activity by gender and country*

Country	Men	Women
England	40%	28%
Northern Ireland	33%	28%
Wales	36%	23%
Scotland	43%	32%

Note: In England and Northern Ireland, these assessments are based on the physical activity guideline of 60 minutes or more of moderate intensity each day, whereas in Wales and Scotland they are based on the physical activity guideline of 60 minutes or more of moderate intensity for five days a week.

The depressing outcome of this research is that around two in three women and almost a third of men are damaging their health through a lack of physical activity. The impact of this on the quality of life for individuals and their communities is going to be an ever increasing problem as physical inactivity is now recognised as the fourth largest cause of disease and disability. The economic costs of this are also a significant concern for the UK government (and the regional assemblies and Scottish Parliament) as they are estimated to be around £7.4 billion a year. If current trends continue, their impact will be an unsustainable increase in the costs of health and social care that, if not addressed, will inevitably lead to the destabilisation of public services in general.

Despite, in many respects, women’s competitive sport now attaining higher levels of participation and some significant but still modest increases in media coverage, as this research highlights, the level of women’s engagement in sport and physical activity is still problematic. As the WSFF has detailed, there are multiple barriers impacting on girls’ and women’s participation in sport-related physical activity. These include: lack of choice, overly competitive sports environments, concerns over body image, lack of confidence, their friends not taking part, and responsibilities for family and social care taking priority over personal time (WSFF, 2015).

There are good reasons why those involved in the organisation and governance of sport need to take the emergent health agenda seriously. Hanlon and Carlisle

(2012, p. 12) point to three important interconnections between sport and the promotion of health and wellbeing. Sport can be a ‘resource for healthy living’ through increasing levels of physical activity and counteracting a sedentary lifestyle; within a routinely stressful social environment, sport can also improve mental health and be a key dimension in psychological resilience; it is being increasingly recognised that equitable access to healthy activities ‘is an excellent barometer of how well things are going in a society’.

MINI CASE STUDY

Taking one major sport as your starting point, research and identify the major components of the organisational network that impact on the ways relevant national and international governing bodies of sport organise and control this specific sport.

In undertaking this task, you should look to identify the following:

- How did the sport’s historical and national codification impact its organisation and development up to the present day?
- What are the dominant concerns of the sport’s current governance (nationally and internationally) and how do they relate to the debates identified above regarding the conflict of interest between developing pathways for elite athletes within the

sport and a potential for sport to make significant impacts on your country’s social or health issues?

- In respect of this latter point, is there any evidence that sport is now subject to many different and competing interests? Some issues to consider here are: is the sport being used to deliver health or developmental agendas as well as those relating to levels of participation and elite performance? What is the influence of the sport’s sponsors on the structure and governance of the sport?
- Is the governance of the chosen sport open to public accountability and do you think the current organisational structures are adequate for the sport in the context of a transforming and ever more global world?

3.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has overviewed the creation of codified sports and their associated forms of national and international organisation. It has also examined how the organisation of sport has become an important arena of governmental interest. Sport organisations and their systems of governance operate within a historically complex, dynamic and changing network. How this network operates is also subject to three very different sets of pressures: national political concerns and issues that are often subject to democratic accountability; the concerns and issues of

international sports federations which have significantly reduced levels of public accountability; and the commercial pressures that transnational corporations and media companies can exert through their huge financial investments in sport. The complex relationships between the sporting organisations within the network and their competition to achieve their own aims and objectives, while protecting the vested interests of their sport(s), mean that the sociological analysis of sport needs to start with the clear recognition that sport is not governed by a single set of codes, organisational structures or strategies. The modernisation of sport and its codification through the 19th and 20th centuries has, despite some resistance, continued to evolve to meet the needs of the ever more integrated and globalised sporting world of the 21st century. The reorganising, reshaping and re-ordering of sports participation have largely remained in line with many of the utilitarian values and moral codes that culturally conditioned these processes (Adams, 2014). As Adams (2014, p. 551) goes on to explain, there is a broad consensual political reality that spans sport's international organisational landscape. This social and political construction reflects a broad agreement about the necessary transition from hierarchical 'government' or market-based modes of co-ordination to governance based on self-organising, inter-organisational networks characterised by interdependence. Today, sport's national and international governing bodies are systemically connected to a 'plurality of actors' that routinely migrate from country to country, share knowledge and expertise, and are expected to deliver increases in efficiency and the effectiveness of programme delivery.

The reality is that sport now operates through an array of interconnected networks and partnerships that are considered to be the most effective modes of policy-making delivery and action. The national and highly autonomous organisational structures that characterised sports codification and forms of control and organisation have now been superseded by a system of network governance that 'describes the inclusion of a range of actors and agents in diffusing or eroding power in the policy process away from those who govern (in government) to the governed (those who make up specific polities)' (Adams, 2014, p. 552).

Though this democratisation of sport governance is something to be broadly welcomed, there are some words of caution to be stated here as the view that these processes represent a genuine sense of empowerment enabling diverse communities to have their views represented, is open to some significant scepticism, and in local, national and international contexts entrenched levels of enduring power inequalities are still deeply influential.

In terms of the effective control and development of sport, especially when viewed through the lens of globalisation, the sport network is too large, too complex to fulfil competing interests, to be easily managed, transformed and made publically accountable. On this last point, Sugden (2002) has explained how these interconnected global and national networks operate problematically within the context of professional football. While, as recent events involving FIFA suggest that this is still evidently the case, this does not mean that a serious and sustained attempt should not be made to reform the way in which sport, especially international sport, is governed and controlled, in part, it is sport sociology's role to provide a robust and evidence-based assessment to support this process.

Moreover, due to the dissolving of national cultural boundaries through an ever pervasive Internet and social media and the likelihood that modern sport's dependence on fossil fuels will become ever more problematic (see Chapters 11 and 12), the next few years will inevitably put new pressures on the organisation and governance of sport. The as yet unknown answer to sport's response to these changes is whoever's interests will prevail. Will sports organisation and governance become increasingly dominated by powerful commercial interests? Will social pressures cause national governments to significantly re-orientate sport policy away from the production of elite athletes to a policy framework directed at maximising the social and health benefits of sport? Or will as yet unforeseen combinations of political, social, economic and cultural forces come to bear? On a closing and more optimistic note, these outcomes will inevitably be informed by the millions of people around the world who love sport, and, as Giddens has correctly noted (1991), 'the future has yet to be colonised'.

KEY THINKER: BARRY HOULIHAN

For political scientists such as Houlihan (2003, p. 47), the development of 'a comprehensive understanding of the social significance of sport in contemporary society' requires a number of analytical approaches that 'encompass not just the politics of sport but also politics *in* sport'. For almost three decades, Houlihan's body of work has attempted to explore these internal and external political and policy processes within sport and sport governance. In doing so, he has not only provided a detailed critique of these issues but also supported their analysis with an extensive set of empirical evidence demonstrating the changing economic and social importance of sport and how this, in turn, has influenced and been influenced by the state, its bureaucratic structures and its political/policy interests.

One of the clear and unambiguous outcomes of this work is the absolute rejection of the idea that sport can be separated from the concerns of governments and annexed off into non-politicised parts of civil society (Houlihan, 1991). In one of his earlier works, Houlihan (1997) draws on a range of international comparative studies to highlight how many governments around the world now regard sport as a resource that they are able to co-opt (willingly or otherwise) into the delivery of important public policy initiatives around health and lifestyle management, juvenile justice programmes, community cohesion projects and recreational to elite sport development programmes. These are issues that he returned to regularly in subsequent years (Houlihan, 2000; Houlihan and Green, 2011; Houlihan, 2014).

Though some of the political motives behind this increasing involvement with the world of sport are often complex and shifting, they nonetheless indicate that within a number of government departments sport is being linked to an assessment of the social and cultural wellbeing of communities and the nation (Houlihan and White, 2002).

For sport, the plus side of these policy arrangements has been a significant increase in funding and there seems to be some cause for optimism in that sport

development is now regarded as a mainstream activity/policy instrument integral to a diverse range of governmental policy fields. However, as Houlihan and White (2002) argue, this also means that sport faces some important challenges. Sport, especially elite sport, needs the financial investment of governments but this investment inevitably brings with it a loss of autonomy. Once sport organisations become dependent on government funding, it means that they also have to adapt to the reality of having to deal with the variability of governments, political parties and their changing policy priorities. Strains on the public finances mean that public scrutiny and accountability also inevitably follow. Houlihan and White (2002) therefore suggest that the reliance on government funding by elite sport means that more complex organisational arrangements are emerging that are increasing the separation of elite athletes and their funding from other areas of the sport and its governance. The outcome of this is increasing fragmentation and a widening of bureaucratic controls. By its very nature, elite sport is a very expensive enterprise and the cost of supporting elite athletes can be seen as running counter to public welfare interests, as funds get diverted to supporting the few rather than helping the sporting development of the many. This conflict has never been resolved and in an era of 'austerity politics' sports bodies are still beset with political tensions as they seek to resolve the competing and very different interests of 'grassroots' sports participation, especially in terms of how it is now routinely aligned with a health agenda, and the continued support and preparation of elite athletes.

In some of his recent work, Houlihan has usefully turned his attention towards the issues of development (Houlihan and Green, 2011) and policy frameworks relating to anti-doping governance within sport (Houlihan and McNamee, 2013).

The breadth and empirical depth of Houlihan's contribution to a sociological understanding of the political interests impacting sport, its organisational structure and processes of governance has been and remains one of the most important within the field of sport sociology.

3.7 FURTHER READING

To further extend your understanding of the concept of social control, read:

Eitzen, D.S., 2000. Social control and sport. In J. Coakley & E. Dunning, eds. *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage.

For an extensive and well-argued sociological analysis of global sport policy, try:

Adams, A., 2014. Social capital, network governance and the strategic delivery of grassroots sport in England. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 49(5), pp. 550–574.

Palmer, C., 2013. *Global Sport Policy*. New York: Sage; and/or Houlihan, B., 2014. Sport policy analysis. In: I. Henry & L. Ko, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Sport Policy*. London: Routledge.

To get a broader perspective on the interconnections between policy, sport/health and social inequality, see:

Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K., 2010. *The Spirit Level*. London: Penguin Books; and/or Zieff, S., 2011. Increasing physical activity for health one cultural critique at a time. *Quest*, 63, pp. 118–129.

There is a wide range of national and international policies and strategies available from sports organisations responsible for the governance and policy development of sport. To access these, it is best to visit their websites where all these up-to-date policies and strategies are easily downloadable.

3.8 REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, N. & Warde, A., 1998. Inequality and selection in education. In: A. Giddens, ed. *Sociology: Introductory Readings*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 323–329.
- Adams, A., 2014. Social capital, network governance and the strategic delivery of grassroots sport in England. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 49(5), pp. 550–574.
- Andrews, D., 2015. Assessing the sociology of sport: on the hopes and fears for the sociology of sport in the US. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 50(4–5), pp. 368–374.
- Bairner, A., 2001. *Sport, Nationalism and Globalisation: European and North American Perspectives*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bairner, A., 2012. For a sociology of sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 29, pp. 102–117.
- Bauman, Z., 2011. *Collateral Damage: Social Inequalities in a Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, M., 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Birley, D., 1993. *Sport and the Making of Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Blake, A., 1996. *The Body Language: The Meaning of Modern Sport*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., 1988. Program for a sociology of sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, pp. 153–161.
- Cabinet Office, 2002. *Game Plan: A Strategy for Delivering Government's Sport and Physical Activity Objectives*, at www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/files/game_plan_report.pdf. London: UK Government Cabinet Office.
- Calhoun, C., 2012. *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. 3rd edn. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Castells, M., 1998. *The End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castells, M., 2012. *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Coalter, F., 2007a. *A Wider Social Role for Sport: Who's Keeping the Score?* London: Routledge.
- Coalter, F., 2007b. Sports clubs, social capital and social regeneration: 'ill-defined interventions with hard to follow outcomes'? *Sport in Society*, 10(4), pp. 537–559.
- Council of Europe, 2013. *Council Recommendation on Promoting Health-enhancing Physical Activity across Sectors*. Ref no. 2013/029, Brussels, 25 November.

- Craig, P., 2015. Sport sociology. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Craig, P. & Craig, C., 2012. *Sport and Conflict Resolution: Challenging the Mythology and Methodology of Current Policy and Practice*. Belfast: Political Studies Association Annual International Conference.
- Department of Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS), 2015. *A New Strategy for Sport: A Consultation Paper*. London: DCMS.
- Department of Health (DoH) Physical Activity Team, 2011. *Start Active Stay Active: A Report on Physical Activity for Health from the Four Home Countries' Chief Medical Officers*. London: DoH.
- Edensor, T., 2002. *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. Oxford: Berg.
- Eitzen, D., 2000. Social control and sport. In: J. Coakley & E. Dunning, eds. *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage.
- Foucault, M., 1976. *Discipline and Punish*. London: Allen Lane.
- Foucault, M., 1980. Truth and power. In: C. Gordon & M. Foucault, eds. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writing 1972–1977*. London: Pantheon Books.
- Giddens, A., 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A., 2001. *Sociology*. 4th edn. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giulianotti, R., 2004. *Sport and Modern Social Theorists*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giulianotti, R., 2005. *Sport: A Critical Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gruneau, R., 1993. The critique of sport in modernity: theorising power, culture and the politics of the body. In: E. Dunning, J. Maguire & R. Pearson, eds. *The Sport Process: A Comparative and Developmental Approach*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hanlon, P. & Carlisle, S., 2012. *After Now: What Next for Healthy Scotland?* Glendaruel: Argyle Publishing.
- Hargreaves, J., 1986. *Sport, Power and Culture: A Social and Historical Analysis of Popular Sports in Britain*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hargreaves, J., 2002. Globalisation: sport, nations and nationalism. In: J. Sugden & A. Tomlinson, eds. *Power Games: A Critical Sociology of Sport*. London: Routledge.
- Harvey, J., 2008. Sport, politics, and policy. In: J. Crossman, ed. *Canadian Sport Sociology*. Toronto: Thomas and Nelson.
- Harvey, J., Horne, J. & Safai, P., 2009. Alterglobalisation, global social movements, and the possibility of political transformation through sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 26, pp. 383–403.
- Henry, I., 1993. *The Politics of Leisure Policy*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Henry, I., 2007. Globalisation, governance and policy. In: I. Henry & the Institute of Sport and Leisure Policy, eds. *Transnational and Comparative Research in Sport*. London: Routledge.
- Hoberman, J., 1984. *Sport and Political Ideology*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Hoberman, J., 1986. *The Olympic Crisis: Sport, Politics and the Moral Order*. New Rochele, NY: AD Caratzas.
- Holt, R., 1989. *Sport and the British: A Modern History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Houlihan, B., 1991. *The Government and Politics of Sport*. London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B., 1997. *Sport, Policy and Politics: A Comparative Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B., 2000. Politics and sport. In: J. Coakley & E. Dunning, eds. *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage.
- Houlihan, B., 2003. *Sport and Society: A Student Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Houlihan, B., 2014. Sport policy analysis. In: I. Henry & L. Ko, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Sport Policy*. London: Routledge.

- Houlihan, B. & Green, M., 2011. *A Handbook of Sports Development*. London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B. & McNamee, M., 2013. *Anti-doping Governance, Research and Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B. & White, A., 2002. *The Politics of Sports Development: Development of Sport or Development through Sport?* London: Routledge.
- Jarvie, G., 2010. *Sport, Culture and Society*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.
- Jennings, A., 2012. Investigating corruption in corporate sport: the IOC and FIFA. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 46(4), pp. 387–398.
- Johnson, N., 2007. Building an integrated society. In: M. Wetherell, M. Lafleche & R. Berkeley, eds. *Identity, Ethnic Diversity and Community Cohesion*. London: Sage, pp. 24–33.
- Júnior, W., 2015. Assessing the sociology of sport: on Brazil and Latin American perspectives. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 50(4–5), pp. 530–535.
- Loy, J. & Booth, D., 2002. Functionalism, sport and society. In: J. Coakley & E. Dunning, eds. *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage.
- Loy, J., Kenyon, G. & McPherson, B., 1980. The emergence and development of the sociology of sport as an academic speciality. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 51(1), 91–109.
- Luschen, G., 1981. The system of sport: problems of methodology, conflict and social stratification. In: G. Luschen & G. Sage, eds. *Handbook of Social Science of Sport*. Champaign, IL: Stipes.
- Maguire, J., 1999. *Global Sport*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mangan, J and Walvin, J. (eds), 1987. *Manliness and Morality: Middle-class Masculinity in Britain and America 1800–1940*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mason, T., 1988. *Sport in Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, S., 2001. *Social Theory in the Real World*. London: Sage.
- Must, A., Bandini, L.G., Tybor, D.J., Phillips, S.M., Naumova, E.N. & Dietz, W.H., 2007. Activity, inactivity, and screen time in relation to weight and fatness over adolescence in girls' obesity. *Obesity*, 15(7), pp. 1774–1781.
- Page, E., 2006. The origins of policy. In: M. Moran, M. Rein & R. Goodin, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 207–227.
- Pal, L., 2010. *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times*. 4th edn. Toronto: Nelson Education.
- Palmer, C., 2013. *Global Sport Policy*. London: Sage.
- Penney, D., 2000. Physical education: in what and whose interests? In: R. Jones & K. Armour, eds. *Sociology of Sport: Theory and Practice*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education, pp. 58–66.
- Public Health England (PHE), 2014. *Everybody Active, Every Day: Protecting and Improving the Nation's Health – An evidence-based approach to physical activity*. London: PHE.
- Rail, G., 1998. *Sport and Postmodern Times*. New York: State University Press of New York.
- Roche, M., 2000. *Mega-events and Modernity: Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Standing, G., 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Sugden, J., 2002. Network football. In: J. Sugden & A. Tomlinson, eds. *Power Games: A Critical Sociology of Sport*. London: Routledge.
- Thibault, L. & Harvey, J., eds, 2013. *Sport Policy in Canada*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Trimble, L., Buraimo, B., Godfrey, C., Grecic, D. & Minten, S., 2010. *Sport in the UK*. Exeter: Learning Matters.

- United Nations, 2003. *Sport for Development and Peace: Towards Achieving the Millennium Development Goals*. Geneva: United Nations.
- Wallerstein, I., Collins, R., Mann, M., Derluigian, G. & Calhoun, C., 2013. *Does Capitalism have a Future?* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Wilkinson, R. & Pickett, R., 2010. *The Spirit Level: Why Equality is Better for Everyone*. London: Penguin Books.
- Women's Sport and Fitness Foundation (WSFF), 2015. *Top Tips for Engaging more Females in Sportivate*, at www.wsff.org.uk/resources/tools-and-resources-for-deliverers/engaging-more-females-in-sportivate.
- Zehndorfer, E., 2015. Global sport policy. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 18(1), pp. 127–129.