

## **Draft**

### **Gender Equality or Gender Justice: Reframing the ‘What?’ and the ‘Who’ in European and UK Sport Policy.**

**Cathy Devine**

**University of Cumbria**

#### **Abstract**

Universalist claims are often made about sport which is, as a consequence, increasingly written into national and international policy documents as an entitlement of citizenship or even as a human right. Further, in most countries in the world physical education (PE) is a compulsory component of the education of children, and sport is seen as central to this (Hardman and Marshall 2005). Therefore, the ‘who’ of sport must aspire to be egalitarian: relevant to, and meaningful for, girls and boys, men and women. In this context two fundamental questions are asked:

- 1. Do all citizens or humans want to participate in sport? If so, which sport is this: ‘sport for sports sake’, ‘sport for good’, or ‘sport for all’?*
- 2. Given the architecture of sport, PE, and active recreation, what are justice and equality in relation to this?*

Feminist political and citizenship theory is used to explore the ‘what’ of justice and the extent to which the policy discourse of sport, active recreation and PE citizenship in Europe and Britain, addresses gender justice. It is argued that formal sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship rights might be accorded to all individuals and regarded as gender neutral, but that this masks an androcentric conception of movement citizenship. Inequalities of power derive from both the sexual division of labour *and the sexual division of play*. Therefore, women are more likely to be second class sport, PE and active recreation citizens than men resulting in a democratic deficit in relation to movement citizenship.

#### **Key Words**

Gender, equality, sport, physical education, dance, citizenship

#### **Introduction**

*Universalist* claims are often made about sport which is, as a consequence, increasingly written into national and international policy documents as an entitlement of citizenship or even as a human right. Thus, the International Olympic Committee (2010) states that ‘the practice of sport is a human right’,

and the UK Sport's Coaches Code of Practice (2004) that 'coaches must respect and champion the rights of every individual to participate in sport' and should 'assist in the creation of an environment where every individual has the opportunity to participate in a sport or activity of their choice'. Alongside rights go duties, and in most countries in the world physical education (PE) is a *compulsory* component of the education of children, and sport or even competitive sport is generally seen as central to this (Hardman and Marshall 2005). If sport is framed as an entitlement of citizenship or a human right, it follows that it must aspire to be egalitarian: that is, relevant to, and meaningful for, girls and boys, men and women. In this context it is important to ask two fundamental questions regarding the 'who' of sport, PE, and active recreation and the 'what' of justice:

*1. Do all citizens or humans want to participate in sport? If so, which sport is this: 'sport for sports sake', 'sport for good', or 'sport for all'? (See, for example, Devine and Telfer 2012, Devine, 2012, or Eichberg 2009, for an elaboration of the differences between these).*

*2. Given the architecture of sport, PE and active recreation, what are justice and equality in relation to this?*

The attempt to frame and extend justice is one of the defining features of policy, politics and government at the level of the nation state. However, it has been widely argued that nation states are becoming less powerful in the face of both globalisation and localism, and that a system of subsidiarity is the most appropriate way to view modern democracy. Thus, on the one hand, the early 21C is characterised by globalised marketplaces, governance structures and civil society. The converse of this is localism which may manifest in a range of forms some more democratic than others. For example, social democratic welfare states within some rich countries are down-sizing and many remaining state functions are 'contracted out' from local government to the private sector or civil society. In this context, the frame in which justice is addressed is shifting. Consequently, it is important to consider both: how justice equality and democracy are shaped internationally, and how devolved or 'contracted out' justice equality and democracy are delivered at a sub-national level. This paper will therefore analyse the role of the European sport, PE, and active recreation framework in shaping; and the British sport, PE, and active recreation infrastructure in delivering; gender justice in sport, PE, and active recreation.

Feminist political and citizenship theory is used to explore the extent to which the policy discourse of sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship in Europe and in Britain, addresses gender justice. It is argued that notwithstanding the extensive use of the Council of Europe (COE) (1992, 2001) definition of sport<sup>1</sup>,

and despite or even because of the widespread adoption of the language of gender mainstreaming and gender equality, a discourse of androcentric sport citizenship has captured European and British sport, PE, and active recreation, policy and practice. This is hindering further progress towards gender justice in sport, PE, and active recreation, conceptualised not only as economic redistribution, cultural recognition, and political representation, within the normalised frame of competitive performance sport or ‘sport for sports sake’; but also as a critical metapolitical remapping and reframing of sport, PE, and active recreation culture.

A number of feminist and political theorists have addressed the contested landscape of gendered citizenship, gender justice, gender equality and gender mainstreaming. Three different approaches to gender justice are often conceptualised as: equality (redistribution), difference (recognition), and critical synthesis or transformation (emancipation). Adapting this analysis it is argued that formal sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship rights might be accorded to all individuals and regarded as gender neutral, but that this masks an androcentric conception of sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship. Inequalities of opportunities and power derive from both the sexual division of labour *and the sexual division of play*. Therefore, women are more likely to be second class sport, PE, and active recreation citizens than men resulting in a democratic deficit in relation to sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship.

Thus, gender justice in EU and British sport, PE, and active recreation policy usually aims, at least rhetorically, at a citizenship of equality but in relation to the normative universal sportsman or ‘active person’; and/or a citizenship of difference involving a sexual division of play, but a sport, PE, and active recreation hierarchy rather than parity, where women might be considered to only ‘take part’. However, fully realised gender justice involves the critical remapping or reframing of sport, PE, and active recreation culture, in order to achieve a truly plural, universal and democratic conception of movement citizenship.

## **Theoretical Frameworks**

There is a substantial body of work on feminist citizenship and political theory in the generic non-sport literature and this paper will draw primarily on the work of Pateman, Lister and Fraser.

### **The Sexual Contract**

Pateman’s classic text, ‘The Sexual Contract’ (1988) charts the historical development of social contract theory arguing that the very legitimacy of civil government is based on the construction of difference between men and women.

As such, the ‘movement *from Status to Contract*’ (Sir Henry Maine, 1861, cited in Pateman, 1988, p. 9) historically represents the shift from paternalism (rule by the father) to patriarchy (rule by men). However, Pateman argues that this story of men’s freedom assumes a sexual contract which is simultaneously the story of men’s freedom from paternalism (traditional *paternal* patriarchy) and women’s subjection by all men. Civil society is not, any more, structured by kinship and the power of fathers, but rather, women are subordinated to men as men, or to men as a *fraternity*. Pateman terms this ‘modern *fraternal* patriarchy’ and argues that civil freedom depends on patriarchal right. Notwithstanding this shift, evidence of paternal patriarchy still exists in the UK in, for example, the Marriage Certificate which records the name, surname, and rank or profession, of the father only of both bride and groom (HM Government, 2012).

One of the most important aspects of social contract theory relates to the ownership of ‘property in the person’ and in this respect women were not historically party to the contract but, crucially, were the subject of it. In short, their bodies were the property of men. As Pateman puts it ‘the contract establishes men’s political right over women...establishing orderly access by men to women’s bodies’. Classic feminist theory and action has revolved around the struggle for women’s ownership of ‘property in the person’ in relation to, for example: marriage, divorce, domestic violence, sexual harassment, rape, contraception and abortion. We can also consider the extent to which, in the context of sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship, gender justice enables women and girls to exercise ‘property in the person’ including defining *for themselves* the range and scope of sport, PE, and active recreation culture with which they engage. The old feminist adage ‘a women’s (and girls) right to choose’ could be appropriated here given its contemporary resonance for sport, PE, and active recreation provision.

The relevance of Pateman’s work relates to the extent to which the notion of a gender neutral movement citizen may in fact obscure a modern fraternal patriarchal view of sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship. Thus civil society in relation to sport, PE, and active recreation may be cast as gender neutral but in fact valorise traditional male sport forms. In itself this may not be problematic if sports participation is viewed as a minority interest. However, if the ‘reach’ of these sport structures within civil society is considered to be universal (as in the ‘right to sport’) or compulsory (as in PE) then women’s and girl’s ownership of ‘property in the person’ requires ‘equal voice’ between women and men, girls and boys. That is, a plural democratic movement citizenship.

Further, it may even be argued that sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship and social contract *require* a sport, PE, and active recreation sexual contract. As

such, part of the purpose of modern fraternal patriarchal sport might be to 'own', regulate and/or exclude women's bodies, and/or demonstrate their secondary status, constructing females, in the words of De Beauvoir (1949), as 'The Second Sex' (of two). This then might be considered to be a form of modern fraternal patriarchal 'protection' (from sports which are too 'physical' or presumed sedentary lifestyles) and discipline (androcentric sporting equality, and exercise as a 'technology of femininity') but not 'entitlement' (plural movement citizenship), thus excluding them from equal voice and full sport, PE, and active recreation citizenship.

### Feminist Perspectives on Citizenship

Citizenship is contractual insofar as identity as a citizen derives from the notion of membership of a community and all communities have boundaries which serve to include and exclude, entitle and protect, and discipline and control. Further, the notion of citizenship is often seen as a way of reconciling the individualism of the political right with the collective aspirations of the left, and has contemporary relevance for a range of reasons. Globalisation of markets and governance structures has led to the notion of the post national or global citizen and the discourse of citizenship is extensively evident in UN, EU and EC policy documentation. Globalised citizens' rights effectively collapse into human rights in that they are universal and accrue to all persons. In addition, the global financial crisis at the beginning of the 21C and 'austerity' politics has renewed the focus on who counts as a citizen within some nation states. Further, the demise of 'big state' in the UK for example, has been ideologically linked to the notion of 'big society' where the private sector and civil society are expected to take on 'contracted out' services previously delivered by the state. In this situation, it is important to consider how justice is safeguarded: it may also be considered to be 'contracted out' or there may be a residual state function in relation to shaping equality (economic, social and cultural) rights (Devine, 2012).

Feminist citizenship theorists start from the premise that that the concept of citizenship, whilst presenting as gender neutral, is actually deeply gendered. Lister's ground breaking work detailing feminist perspectives on citizenship documents the contested concept of citizenship and the extent to which the notion of universality has masked an essentially androcentric citizenship. As Lister puts it 'behind the cloak of gender-neutrality...there lurks in much of the literature a definitely male citizen, and it is his interests and concerns that have traditionally dictated the agenda' (2003, p4). As such, the notion of the gender neutral citizen serves to obscure the fact that the concept of this citizen is, in fact, androcentric, and historically based on a 'sexual division of labour' where men are included and women either internally subordinated or effectively

excluded from citizenship. Thus it is important to investigate who counts as a citizen, or at the universal global level, as a person.

Citizenship traditionally has been constructed around a dominant 'citizen-the earner' and subordinate 'citizen- the carer' (Lister 2003). The classic sexual division of labour between paid and non-paid domestic labour has been eroded to a significant extent, however, the benefits of citizenship still accrue disproportionately to paid workers. In addition, in the UK, 'austerity' policies are resulting in disproportionately greater increases in female unemployment given the downsizing of the state sector (Saner, 2012). Given that women are disproportionately paid and non-paid domestic or part time workers, time poor, and earn on average less than men; they are de facto still second class citizens. Notwithstanding this, David Willetts, the UK's Universities Minister while attempting to explain unemployment amongst men, neatly illustrated the deeply embedded normative view of the sexual division of labour by claiming that 'feminism trumped egalitarianism' and adding 'that women who would otherwise have been housewives had taken university places and well-paid jobs that could have gone to ambitious working-class men' (Prince, 2011). The UK's marriage certificate is a contemporary example of the assumption of a sexual division of labour in that presumably, mothers are either not considered to be in paid employment, or their paid employment is considered secondary in terms of time, status and earning power.

Lister argues for a restructuring of the architecture of citizenship in order to reconcile the two traditional citizenship traditions of civic republicanism and liberal rights in a 'critical synthesis'. This would involve the creation of an inclusive plural citizenship of 'differentiated universalism' in which citizenship would involve both a *status*, and a *practice* that is 'political' participation (or 'voice') (Lister 2003). If this is the case, both paternal and modern fraternal patriarchy would be inconsistent with democratic citizenship given that 'to the extent that (a) universalist principle in fact embodies masculine particularist interests, women will remain excluded or will be included only on male terms' (Lister 2003, p.199). Central to the inclusion of women as citizens in relation to sport, PE, and active recreation is 'that we are able to enjoy bodily integrity and exercise effective control over our own bodies' (Lister 2003, p.201).

Justice: balance and map

Fraser's work on justice involves a re-coupling of redistribution, recognition and representation which she claims have been problematically disaggregated (and recognition most recently prioritised), and a 'critical theory of framing'. She makes explicit the fact that justice should not just apply within naturalised hegemonic frames, which operate to include and exclude; but must also be

considered in relation to ‘metapolitical misframing’ (Fraser 2008, 2009). Thus she argues that justice as balance, that is, redistribution (economic), recognition (cultural) and representation (political) within bounded communities is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for justice. If justice stops here the normalised hegemonic frame operates to ‘gerrymander’ political space. Hegemonic normalised frames should be critiqued and the field or domain within which justice is weighed must be remapped in order to take account of plural, conflicting, contested, ontologies. An important guiding principle in this endeavour is the ‘all affected principle’ which means that ‘all those affected by a given social structure or institution have moral standing as subjects of justice in relation to it’ (Fraser 2008, p.24). Finally, she highlights the importance of considering how justice is addressed: either as a technical expert-led endeavour, or via a critical democratic alternative.

Meta-political injustices according to Fraser occur when political space is divided into bounded political communities and justice is defined as internal to these polities. This may operate to misrepresent as internal matters of redistribution, recognition and representation, what are in fact meta-political injustices of framing or agenda setting, and excludes affected non-citizens who are therefore disenfranchised. As a consequence, Fraser argues, justice must involve an ‘interrogation of the mapping of political space’ (Fraser 2008). This, of course, may be difficult to do if justice and equality are ‘out-sourced’ to partial, relatively powerful, political communities such as sport QUANGOs and governing bodies of sport.

### **The Sexual Division of Play**

There is an extensive body of research which documents the different sport, PE, and active recreation choices of women and men, and girls and boys. It is important to revisit some of this work in order to ensure an evidence base in relation to the architecture of sport, PE and active recreation citizenship.

In England, the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) collects data relating to participation in culture and sport via the ‘Taking Part’ survey which sampled responses from around 14 000 people in 2008/9. The most recent ‘Taking Part’ analysis is of the 2008/9 Survey (Jones, Millwood and Buraimo, 2011a). It is important at the outset to note that dance is excluded from the ‘sport’ category and included in the survey as ‘culture’. Thus, the documentation states, in relation to the sport questions, that ‘hobbies such as camping dancing gardening birdwatching photography etc should not be included at this question’ (DCMS, 2010). Nevertheless, dance *exercise* is included, together with keep fit and aerobics, as ‘sport’. Table 1 shows the top five *sports* for adults by sex and Table 2 shows the sex profile of top five ‘sports’ for women and men. Of the 7

‘sports’ that appear in the top five rankings for men and women the most obvious sexual division of play occurs in football and snooker which are much preferred by men (Sport England funding = £85 635 000 for football), followed by keep fit/aerobics/dance exercise (not including dance which is categorised as culture) which is much preferred by women (Sport England funding = £741 552 for movement and dance).

Table 1: DCMS 2008/9 ‘Taking Part Survey’ (Jones, Millwood and Buraimo, 2011) with SE Funding for 2009-13 (Sport England, no date).

<b>Women: Rank</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>SE Funding<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Men: Rank</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>SE Funding<sup>1</sup></b>
1	Swimming	16.5	11 961 375	1	Health & fitness/ gym	14.7	
2	Health & fitness/ gym	13.4		2	Cycling	14.4	16 588 704
3	Keep fit/ aerobics/ dance exercise ( <i>not dance</i> )	8.8	562 838	3	Swimming	13	8 913 625
4	Cycling	6.4	7 699 296	4	Football	12.6	23 276 580 54 480 000 (Football Foundation)
5	Jogging/ running	4.8	8 149 913	5	Snooker etc	11.3	
SE funding			28 373 422 22%				103 258 909 78%

<sup>1</sup> NGB funding x proportion of women or men participating



Table 2: Sex profile of top five ‘sports’ for women and men. DCMS 2008/9 ‘Taking Part Survey’ (Jones, Millwood and Buraimo, 2011).

	Women (rank)	Men (rank)
Swimming*	57.3 (1)	42.7 (3)
Health & fitness	49 (2)	50 (1)
Cycling*	31.7 (4)	68.3 (2)
Jogging/running*	39.8 (5)	60.2
Snooker	22.1	77.9 (5)
Keep fit/aerobics/dance exercise (not dance)	75.9 (3)	24.1 (15)
Football*	9.2 (14)	90.8 (4)

\*=SE funded

In relation to children, ‘Taking Part’ (Jones, Millwood and Buraimo, 2011b) reveals that ‘[w]hile girls were more likely to participate in cultural activities, boys are generally more likely to participate in sport’ (p.13). Thus ‘[g]irls are more likely than boys to take part in arts, crafts and design, music, theatre, drama and dance; the most notable of these being dance’ (p.4). Further, that ‘[a]cross all the cultural activities, the most noticeable gender differences are in music, theatre and drama, and dance participation. The most striking example is dance activities where considerably more girls take part than boys (61.4% ... compared to 25.9% ... for 5-10 year olds and 72.7%... compared to 32.2% ... for 11-15 year olds)’ (p.11). However, dance as a composite category, is not considered to be a sport and therefore not included in the sport participation data. In relation to activities that are considered to be sport, boys generally have higher sports participation rates. At primary school level (aged 5-10) ‘[t]he most popular sport for boys was football (59.9% ... had taken part ) and the most popular sport for girls was swimming (43.6% ...)’ (p.13) whereas among 11-15 year olds ‘[s]ignificantly more boys participate in their top ‘sport’ than girls do

in their top ‘sport’ (football 73.8% ..., netball 41%...)' (p.14). Thus, even with the exclusion of dance, the sexual division of play in relation to activities considered to be sport is clearly evident.

The Sportscotland data for 2000 (2001, cited Jarvie 2006, p. 309) indicates a near perfect binary sexual division of play where the most popular sports amongst women were also the least popular amongst men. Conversely, the least popular sports amongst women, were also the most popular sports amongst men, as detailed in Table 3. The most recent Sportscotland data (2008) is shown in Table 4 and shows that, of the 7 sports that appear in the top five rankings for women and men, 5 activities fall into the ‘sport for all’ frame (all those in the top five for women) and 2 in the ‘sport for sports sake’ frame (both in the top five for men only). The most obvious sexual division of play occurs in dance, and keep fit/ aerobics (much preferred by women); and football and golf (much preferred by men).

Table 3: Sportscotland data for 2000 (2001, cited Jarvie 2006, p.309).

Most popular	Women (%)	Least popular	Women (%)
Yoga	87	Football	7
Aerobics	75	Fishing	8
Horse riding	75	Rugby	8
Dance	74	Golf	12
Swimming	60	Squash	15
	Men (%)		Men (%)
Football	93	Yoga	13
Fishing	92	Aerobics	25
Rugby	92	Horse riding	25
Golf	88	Dance	26
Squash	84	Gymnastics	29

Table 4: Most popular *Sports* at least once a month 2006-08; women 16+ (peak months) with 2011-12 Sportscotland investment (Sportscotland 2008, 2012).

Women	%	Rank: women (men)	SS Funding 2011-12	Men	%	Rank: men (women)	SS Funding 2011-12
Swimming	17.4	1 (4)		Football 323 750	17.8	1 (9)	286 704
Keep fit/ aerobics	8.5	2 (13)		Golf 1 007 000	14.5	2 (13)	901 327
Cycling 673 555	6.6	3 (3)	220 072	Cycling	13.6	3 (3)	453 483
Dance 4 500	6.2	4 (21)	3 719	Swimming	12.1	4 (1)	
Multigym use/ weight training	3.6	5 (5)		Multigym use/ weight training	6.4	5 (5)	
SS funding			223 791 12%				1 641 514 88%

The most recent data for Wales demonstrates a similar sexual division of play and is presented in Table 5. Further, the Sports Council Wales ‘sportsupdate’ (2009) documents that ‘[f]ootball (47%) remains the most popular club activity for boys by a considerable margin, followed by rugby (32%)’ (p.18), whereas, ‘[d]ance and swimming are the most popular activities for secondary school girls’ (p.18). Further, ‘[i]n the focus groups, girls of all age groups almost unanimously cited dance as their most favoured sport or activity and would like to do more dance in the curriculum. Swimming was another popular activity. However, activities that were disliked were hockey, running and athletics, although both hockey and athletics are more prevalent in the curriculum than dance’ (p. 9). In comparison, the activity that boys would most like to do more of was football. The ‘latent demand’ for girls and boys is presented in Tables 6

and 7. For girls, only two of the 10 activities fall into the ‘sport for sports sake’ category whereas the other eight categories constitute ‘sport for all’ (even though some can be practiced competitively). This contrasts with the data for boys, for whom seven of the 10 activities comprise more traditional ‘sport for sports sake’ activities and the other three constitute ‘sport for all’ (but can once again can be practiced competitively).

Table 5: ‘Any participation in sport and physical recreation activities in the previous four weeks: most prevalent activities.’ Sports Council Wales: 2008-2009 Active Adults Survey.

Women Rank	Sport & PR	%	Men Rank	Sport & PR	%
	Walking (over 2 miles)	34.8		Walking	32.7
1	Swimming	12.5	1	Football	12.9
2	Exercise bike/machine	8.2	2	Weight bearing conditioning	11.4
3	Keep fit/ dance exercise/ aerobics	6.7	3	Swimming	10.3
4	Weight bearing conditioning	4.2	4	Cycling	9.6
5	Cycling	4.1	5	Exercise bike/machine	9.4

Table 6: Latent demand: girls (SportsCouncil Wales, 2009).

Activity	Like to do more	Activity	Like to try
Dance	35%	Trampoline	38%
Netball	32%	Horse riding	26%
Swimming	28%	Dance	22%
Gymnastics	24%	Volleyball	19%
Trampolining	22%	Water-based outdoor pursuits	18%

Table 7: Latent demand: boys (SportsCouncil Wales, 2009).

Activity	Like to do more	Activity	Like to try
Football	46%	Trampoline	23%
Rugby	39%	Cycling	20%
Basketball	21%	Golf	19%
Swimming	19%	Table tennis	17%
Cricket	19%	Basketball	16%

The European Commission's Eurobarometer Survey: Sport and Physical Activity collects participation data for EU countries which is summarised in Table 8 (TNS Opinion and Social, 2010). Once again this shows that competitive performance sport is more popular amongst men but that far more people participate in sport for all activities such as cycling, walking and dancing.

Table 8: European Commission’s Eurobarometer Survey: Sport and Physical Activity: Fieldwork 2009 Publication 2010

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40% of EU citizens play sport at least once a week.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far more people get ‘informal’ physical exercise (SFA) (in such forms as cycling, walking, dancing or gardening) than play organised sport.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Men and women generally do very similar amounts of physical activity.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Men in the EU play more sports than women. This is particularly marked in the 15-24 age group.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two-thirds of respondents (67%) are not members of any sports clubs or centres.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Among those who say that they do sport or physical exercise, most activity is in informal settings, such as parks or other outdoor environments (48%) or simply on the journey to and from work, school or the shops (31%).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fitness centres (11%), clubs (11%) and sports centres (8%) are less popular, also 8% exercise at work and 4% exercise at school or university.</li> </ul>

This same sexual division of play between women’s and men’s, girl’s and boy’s preferences has been consistently reported in the academic research (see, for example, Collins and Kay, 2003; Hargreaves, 1994, 2000; Penney, 2002; Scraton and Flintoff, 2002; Flintoff, 2008; Smith et al, 2009; Wellard, 2007). In the UK, the Women’s Sport and Fitness Foundation and the Institute of Youth Sport, (Gorely et al, 2011) set out in detail the extent of the sexual division of play and report that ‘[t]here is some evidence that many girls retain an interest in being physically active despite their progressive rejection of sport (e.g. Flintoff & Scraton, 2002), and are attracted to alternative activities such as dance, exercise and fitness’ and that ‘a decline in PA participation is evident by the end of primary school, but that this decline becomes more pronounced during the early secondary school years’ when ‘structured activities or sports with rules become more prevalent’. Further that, ‘[t]he nature/context of school PE/school sport can contribute to girls’ disengagement’ and ‘[o]verall, it was felt that an increase in competition in school PE would be unhelpful’. Suggestions for encouraging girls “to be more active in school included: ‘have a genuine choice of activities’ and ‘have a focus on fun’”. The Report found that “[m]ale” sports were associated more with aggression and competitiveness (football,

rugby, boxing) and were perceived to be more evident within popular culture’ whereas ‘[a]ctivities such as gymnastics, dance and netball were cited more as “female” sports’. Although, ‘[t]here was some indication that girls felt they should be able to take part in any activity, regardless of perceived gender-appropriateness’; there was ‘less evidence that girls actually chose to participate in so-called “male” sports’.

Thus, the evidence for a sexual division of play is overwhelming. The empirical data shows that girls and women by far prefer to dance and participate in sport as sport for all, whereas boys (and to a lesser extent men) are much more interested than girls and women in sport as competitive (team) performance sport or sport for sports sake. Egalitarian movement citizenship requires evidence based policy and a sport, PE and active recreation infrastructure which reflects and respects these movement preferences. The alternative is to disregard the ‘voice’ of women and girls, and assume that they are misguided and that there is something intrinsically wrong with their movement preferences.

Of course, girls and boys are not homogenous demographic categories and a small percentage of girls like competitive performance sport while many boys are keen on sport for all activities. Nevertheless, the politics of sport, PE, and active recreation culture requires the mapping of this sexual division of play in order to ensure gender justice in economic distribution, cultural recognition and political representation across movement culture broader than competitive performance sport. Thus, for example, it is important to look at redistribution or equality of funding not just *within* competitive (team) performance sport, or sports traditionally chosen by boys and men (football and rugby for example) but between the different sport, PE, and active recreation activities chosen by the sexes. Arguably, greater injustices operate at this meta-political level and these are rendered invisible because equality initiatives are ‘contracted out’ to already established structures such as the relatively powerful governing bodies of sport.

### **Citizenship: Hegemonic Frame**

Having empirically evidenced the sexual division of play in relation to the architecture of movement practices at the meta-political level, the extent to which this sexual division of play is represented in relation to citizenship rights can be explored. There is a range of academic literature in this area detailing a hegemonic frame of traditional competitive sport which then relates to the hegemonic frame in which justice and equality in sport, PE and active recreation, are addressed. For example, Flintoff (2008) found a ‘dominance of competitive sport practices’ within school sport partnerships, that ‘coordinators work within an equality or difference discourse’ and that there was ‘little

evidence of transformative praxis needed for true inclusivity'. Further, Smith, Green & Thurston (2009) investigating '[a]ctivity choice' and physical education in England and Wales found that 'restrictions (were) particularly felt amongst girls (who were) dissatisfied with over-representation of a small number of traditional team sports'. They reported responses from children including 'It was like last week, they gave us the choice of basketball and rounders and there was twenty-odd of us that wanted to do dance and they said "No, sorry" ' ('Eve'), 'Lots of us enjoy dance don't we?' ('Donna'), and 'We mainly do footy don't we?' ('Carl'). Further, interestingly, that 'They (teachers) don't offer us things that the boys usually do- like football -that some girls are really interested in. They just think that all we're into are "girly" sports...' (Amy).

Hardman and Marshall (2005) reported in their study of PE worldwide '... there is a predisposition to a competitive sport discourse dominated by games, track and field athletics and gymnastics, which account for 77% and 79% of physical education curriculum content in primary and secondary schools respectively.' They commented that '[s]uch sustained orientation raises issues surrounding meaning and relevance as well as quality of programmes provided and delivered' (Hardman and Marshall, 2005, p.7).

Similarly, at the level of national and international policy and politics, despite the sexual division of play, the competitive performance sport discourse is generally hegemonic. Thus, as detailed for example by Collins (2010) and Devine (2012) the Sport England Strategy 2008-2011 (SE, 2008) marked a shift away from the notion of 'sport for good' to 'sport for sports sake', an ontological about turn redefining sport as competitive performance sport with national governing bodies of sport as the bounded political communities responsible for contracted out participation, performance *and equality* targets. A change in government in 2010 intensified this shift as illustrated by the newly appointed Secretary of State for Culture, in June 2010 who stated 'for this government, competitive sport really matters...in its own right' (Hunt, 2010).

In the UK, while the recognition policy for the four home country sports councils states that '[t]he decision on what is a sporting activity will be based on the 1993 European Sports Charter'<sup>1</sup> (Sport England, 2012a) Sport England retains a competitive sport discourse. Thus, the nine sports selected to tackle 16-18 year olds drop off in 2009-2013 are rugby union, rugby league, hockey, netball, tennis, badminton, basketball, football, and gymnastics; that is eight competitive sports, six of which are competitive team sports, and gymnastics. Thus, once again, the competitive performance sport discourse is hegemonic, despite the rhetorical scope of the recognition policy and the empirical data regarding girls' preferences for 'sport for all' activities including dance. Further,



this framing of ‘sports to prevent drop off’ appears ill-advised not just because of the stated sport, PE, and active recreation preferences of girls but also given that in the period between 2007/8 (Active People Survey 2) and Active People Survey 5 (2010/11), once a week participation amongst 18 year olds across the nine drop off sports has decreased significantly from 189,100 (28.2%) to 172,500 (25.6%), a decrease of 16,600 (Sport England, 2011a).

Sport England’s Active People (sic) Survey claims to be ‘the largest ever survey of sport *and active recreation* (authors emphasis) to be undertaken in Europe’ (Sport England, 2012b). However, despite this title and aspiration, crucially, dance, as we have seen, one of most popular, if not the most popular, ‘active recreation’ activity of girls and women is not even considered to be ‘active recreation’. The APS5 Questionnaire Briefing Note states, ‘[t]he database also includes a list of activities which may be considered by the respondent as “recreational physical activity”, but which are not considered to be within the remit of the KPI for participation. These typically include activities such as card and board games, pub pastimes, virtual and computer games, crafts, gardening, DIY and activities which are part of the “arts” remit, including dancing and related performance activities. Any reference to any of these activities is coded in such a way as to omit them from the later questions relating to the KPI for participation’ (Sport England, 2011b, p.8). However, a question concerning dancing and gardening was added to the survey in January 2009 for the second quarter of the APS3 Survey. This does, however, reinforce the exclusion of dancing from the ‘active recreation’ category by stating that ‘I have already asked you about sports and recreational physical activity you may have done. I’d now like to ask if you have done any dancing or any of the following types of gardening’ (p.21). It explains ‘[t]he coverage of the Active People Survey has ... been extended to other domains of *physical activity* (authors emphasis) additional to sport and active recreation (e.g. dance and gardening).’ However, the Active People Survey reports in 2012 that ‘[f]ollowing discussion with the Department of Health the dance and gardening questions will be removed from the questionnaire for the start of Active People Survey 6’ (Sport England 2012c).

In relation to PE in England, despite the sexual division of play, the Secretary of State for Education (Gove, 2010) makes clear that ‘I want competitive sport to be at the centre of a truly rounded education that all schools offer’, that ‘the government is clear that at the heart of our ambition is a traditional belief that competitive sport, when taught well, brings out the best in everyone’ and that ‘[t]he government plans to ‘revise the PE curriculum... to place a *new* (author’s emphasis) emphasis on competitive sports’ (Gove, 2011). This policy direction is clearly evident in the Schools White Paper which states that ‘[w]e will

provide new support to encourage a much wider take up of competitive team sports. With only one child in five regularly taking part in competitive activities against another school, we need a new approach to help entrench the character building qualities of team sport' (Department for Education, p.45). Further, conflating the success of the London 2012 Olympics (an elite sport 'mega-event') with the physical education of children, Prime Minister David Cameron said that '[c]ompetitive team sports will be made compulsory for all primary school children in England' and that '[a] draft new curriculum this autumn would require participation in sports such as football, hockey and netball' (BBC, 2012), despite evidence cited earlier (p.10) regarding girls dislike of competitive team sports especially hockey (Sports Council Wales, 2009). This illustrates the extent to which politicians attempt to resignify PE as sport, and competitive performance sport rather than sport for all, at that. In the context of the empirical data outlined earlier this policy direction is a prime example of modern fraternal patriarchy at work. It advocates androcentric equality at best, at worst it totally ignores the movement preferences of girls and women, or views them as inferior and inconsequential, that is, as less valuable. This position was eloquently illustrated during the London 2012 Olympics by Cameron's casually racist and sexist comment regarding 'indian dancing'. He said, '[t]he trouble we have had with targets up to now, which was two hours a week, is that a lot of schools were meeting that by doing things like Indian dance or whatever, that *you and I* (authors emphasis) probably wouldn't think of as sport' and that 'what we really need is a change in culture in our schools and in society that says sport is good, competitive sport is good, schools games are good' (Press Association, 2012).

At a European level the White Paper on Sport (European Commission, 2007) does distinguish between sport for all, grassroots sport and competitive performance sport, but competitive performance sport is hegemonic (see below). However, the EU Physical Activity Guidelines (European Commission, 2008) specifically critique the hegemony of competitive performance sport and state that '[p]ublic authorities (national, regional, local) spend considerable amounts of money on sport. Taxes as well as sport lotteries are important sources of financing. However it is important that these budgets are used to support physical activity for the population at large.' (p.11). Therefore, '[a]n important objective of a sport policy ... is the development of the "sport for all" movement at the local and national levels' (p.12). Also, that ' "[s]port for all" programs should aim at encouraging participation in physical activity and sport of all citizens, promoting the perception that the entire population is the target and that sport is a human right, regardless of age, race, ethnicity, social class or gender'. Consequently, '[s]port policies should therefore aim at increasing the number of citizens participating in sport and PA' (p.12). Thus, the document explicitly argues for a metapolitical framing of sport for all rather than competitive

performance sport based on the reach, that is the ‘all affected principle’ of sport policy with the organised sport sector being only one of four key actors. However, although the Guidelines were ‘[a]pproved by the EU Working Group "Sport & Health" at its meeting on 25 September 2008’ and ‘[c]onfirmed by EU Member State Sport Ministers at their meeting in Biarritz on 27-28 November 2008’ (p.1) they are still to be widely adopted.

Table 9: European Commission’s White Paper on Sport (EC, 2007)

Proposal	Detail
1	The Commission will make health enhancing PA a cornerstone of its sport related activities
8	The Commission will introduce the award of a European label to schools actively involved in supporting and promoting PA in a school environment
11	The Commission will support grassroots sport through the Europe for Citizens programme
15	...Member States should consider the role of sports in the field of social inclusion, integration and equal opportunities
17	In the Roadmap for Equality between Women and Men 2006-2010, the Commission will encourage the mainstreaming of gender issues into all its sport-related activities, with a specific emphasis on...women’s access to decision making positions in sport and media coverage of women in sport
25	...promote sport and physical education as essential elements of quality education ...target action at improving access for girls and women to physical education and sport
37	...the Commission will carry out an independent study on the financing of grassroots sport and sport for all in Member States from both public and private sources, and on the on-going changes in this area
49	The Commission intends to organise...(an) EU Sport Forum: an annual gathering of all sport stakeholders

Table 10: EU Physical Activity Guidelines for Action (EC, 2008).

6	When public authorities (national, regional, local) support sport through public budgets, particular attention should be given to projects and organisations which allow a maximum of people to engage in physical activity, regardless of their level of performance ("sport for all", recreational sport).
7	When public authorities (national, regional, local) support sport through public budgets, appropriate management and evaluation mechanisms should be in place to ensure a follow-up that is in line with the objective of promoting "sport for all".

8	When public grants are made available for activities with physical activity content, the eligibility and allocation criteria should be based on the activities foreseen, and on the general activities of the organisations applying for funding. A specific legal status, organisational history or membership in larger federative structures should not be considered as pre-qualifying. Funding should be directed toward "sport for all" activities, bearing in mind that organisations with an elite sport component may also make a meaningful contribution to the "sport for all" agenda. Public and private actors should be able to compete for funding on an equal footing.
---	--

No such attempted distinction between different sport forms is evident in the ‘Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union’ (European Union, 2010) which set out the rights and duties of European citizens by stating in Article 20 (p.56) that ‘[c]itizenship of the Union is hereby established. Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union. Citizenship of the Union shall be additional to and not replace national citizenship.’ Further that ‘[c]itizens of the Union shall enjoy the rights and be subject to the duties provided for in the Treaties.’ On equality, Article 9 (p.20) states that ‘[i]n all its activities, the Union shall aim to eliminate inequalities, and promote equality, between men and women.’ In relation to entitlement as a citizen of Europe, the Treaties explicitly refer to sport in Title XII: Education, Vocational Training, Youth and Sport under Article 165. This states that ‘[t]he Union shall contribute to the promotion of European sporting issues, while taking account of the specific nature of sport, its structures based on voluntary activity and its social and educational function’ (p.120) and that ‘Union action shall be aimed at...developing the European dimension in sport, by promoting fairness and openness in sporting competitions and cooperation between bodies responsible for sports, and by protecting the physical and moral integrity of sportsmen and sportswomen, especially the youngest sportsmen and sportswomen’ (p.120) . Once again, this appears to relate primarily to competitive performance sport and consequently the bounded political communities of sport QUANGOs and governing bodies of sport. Given the sexual division of play, this is an androcentric version both of movement citizenship and of equality, within the hegemonic frame of competitive performance sport. The link to the social and educational function of sport could also be considered to overstate the reach of this sport form given its apparently universal intent, and so to gerrymander political space.

## Justice as Androcentric Equality

According to McRobbie (2009), the concept of gender mainstreaming is linked to the work of Walby (2002, cited McRobbie, 2009) who claims that a '[m]ainstreaming equality agenda [has] now [been] taken on board by the UN, by other global institutions, and in particular the EU' has '[e]mbraced [a] human rights discourse', which 'in turn has fully incorporated women's demands for equality', including 'collective, economic and social rights' (p.152). Further, it has become 'a political programme for feminism in a global era' and a 'global movement' (Walby, 2002, p.538, cited McRobbie, 2009, p. 153). Equality policy within Europe and the UK is extensive and includes at the European level the 'Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015' (European Commission, 2010) which adopts the approach of gender mainstreaming, and in the UK, the Equality Act (HM Government, 2010). However, gender mainstreaming according to the Council of Europe (1998, cited European Commission, 2008, p.10) 'is the (re) organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a *gender equality* perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, *by the actors normally involved in policy making*' (author's emphases). This normative view of mainstreaming then appears to relate to equality within hegemonic frames and stakeholders internal to these frames rather than gender justice at a metapolitical level. Given, then, that the hegemonic frame for sport, PE and active recreation is that of competitive performance sport despite the sexual division of play, it is unsurprising that in general, gender justice is interpreted as androcentric gender equality.

This is a necessary but by no means sufficient approach to justice, given the sexual division of play. To a certain extent it could be argued that the privileging of androcentric equality diverts attention from much larger transgressions in relation to gender justice in sport, PE and active recreation. The European Commission does acknowledge the different interpretations of gender mainstreaming and defines gender mainstreaming as 'not restricting efforts to promote equality to the implementation of specific measures to help women, but mobilising all general policies and measures specifically for the purpose of achieving equality by actively and openly taking into account at the planning stage their possible effects on the respective situation of men and women (gender perspective). This means systematically examining measures and policies and taking into account such possible effects when defining and implementing them (European Commission, p.10)'. However, notwithstanding this definition, the normative view of gender mainstreaming appears to involve gender equality rather than gender justice.

This is evident in the ‘Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015’ (EC 2010) which states that ‘[r]igid gender roles can ... restrict the potential of both women and men. Promoting non-discriminatory gender roles in ... education...*and sport* is thus an essential contribution towards gender equality.’ As one of its ‘Key Actions’ The Commission commits to ‘address the role of men in gender equality; promote good practice on gender roles in youth, education, culture and sport.’ Thus, sport is (mis)framed as a key area for equality work, but if this sport is the normative and hegemonic competitive performance sport rather than the broader frame of sport for all or sport and active recreation (including dance), then an act of metapolitical misframing has already occurred. Equality work will then be restricted to work within the hegemonic frame of competitive performance sport and the bounded political communities of governing bodies of sport. Thus, it can be argued that the category ‘sport’ signifying competitive performance sport, operates to gerrymander political space, that is, to over-reach its boundaries and appropriate the political space that should, in the interests of justice, be framed more broadly. This leads to movement justice as androcentric equality, limited to the popular notion of equity as girls and women’s football, rugby and cricket; or even hockey and netball; whilst continuing to ignore the ‘sport for all’ and dance preferences of girls and women.

Given the hegemonic frame, the justice and equality agenda in sport, PE and active recreation tends to be outsourced to ‘sport’ organisations which, perhaps understandably, interpret gender equality in relation to hegemonic competitive performance sport and its foundational form of ‘grassroots sport’. Thus, a report on adolescent girls and sport/PA in Scotland, frames as a problem, that the proportion of girls taking part *in sport* more than twice a week declines from 61% among 8-11 year olds to 46% for 12-15 year olds (Sportscotland, 2006 p.3) and Ofsted/Youth Sport Trust, that by the age of 18, 40% of girls have dropped out of *sport and physical recreation* (authors emphasis) (Ofsted/Youth Sport Trust, 2000, cited Corley et al, p.11). The naturalised hegemonic frame then operates to problematise girls and women so that even the otherwise excellent WSFF/Institute of Youth Sport commissioned report concludes that ‘in general girls attitudes towards and participation in sport/PA remains a problematic issue’ (Gorely et al, p. 111) and attempts, in the face of substantial evidence to the contrary, to make a case for girls enjoyment of competition. However, this important report does ask the key question ‘when do girls turn away from an *active lifestyle* (authors emphasis), and how/why does this process occur?’ (p.3). Crucially, it highlights that ‘[a]s girls got older, they were more likely to say that sport/PA was less fun (nostalgia, perceived less pressure at primary school)’ that ‘[f]or the most part, sport/PA was perceived to become more competitive over time (increased pressure, perceived need to do well/achieve, more organised

competition' (p.52) and 'if we take the transition to secondary school, possible influences on the decline in participation include a perception that sports are more competitive/structured in high school' (p.94). It appears therefore that perhaps the most problematic issue is not, in fact, the attitudes of the girls, but the fact that 'the girls in this research clearly articulated that they felt their voices (and the voices of previous generations of girls) had not been heard' (p.111).

However, the meaning of gender mainstreaming is contested within the academic literature, with a more broad interpretation relating to metapolitical framing. Thus, Rees argues that mainstreaming 'entails a paradigm shift in thinking' and 'requires being able to see the ways in which current practice is gendered in its construction despite appearing gender-neutral' (1998, p. 194 cited Debusser, 2011, p. 40), while Squires (2007, p.68, cited Debusser, 2011, p. 40) regards it as a 'transformative frame of analysis that enables gender relations to be understood as changeable by policy interventions'. Similarly, Walby (2005, p.323, cited Debusser, 2011, p. 41) makes explicit that it 'implies the transformation and reorientation of existing policy paradigms, changing decision making processes, prioritizing gender equality objectives and rethinking policy ends'. In addition, gender equality may also be interpreted in a less literal fashion so that the Council of Europe (1998, cited in Walby 2005, p. 375) states that '[g]ender equality is not synonymous with sameness, with establishing men, their life style and conditions as the norm...Gender equality means accepting and valuing equally the differences between women and men...').

Not all feminist scholars are so positive about gender equality and mainstreaming approaches to justice. McRobbie (2009) is concerned that gender mainstreaming may be a 'respectable version of feminism, "made over" for approval by global governance' (p.154), 'post' or 'faux' feminism, and 'a technocratic-managerial strategy which...becomes a substitute, part of the prevailing logic of 'feminism undone'' (p.155). Frey (2006, cited McRobbie, 2009, p.154) concurs and views gender mainstreaming as 'increasingly... a neoliberal reorganisation strategy in order to optimise "gender specific human resources"...gender equity has mutated into smart management of assumed differences.' Finally, Meier and Lombardo (2008) conclude that 'EU formal definitions of citizenship based on the concept of equality, while promoting legal gender equality and acknowledging the existence of gender obstacles to the enjoyment of an equal citizenship for women, are not by definition translated into policy initiatives transformative of traditional gender roles' and that 'in this respect they could hamper the achievement of a gender equal citizenship in the EU' (p.481).

European Union Council Directive 2004/113/EC relates to the implementation of 'the principle of equal treatment between women and men' (p.1) and is

mirrored in the UK Equality Act (2010). The EU Directive states that the ‘prohibition of discrimination between women and men applies to access to and supply of goods and services, in both the public and the private sectors (p. 1)’ but interestingly does not apply to education. Nevertheless, it specifies that indirect discrimination is ‘a situation where a provision, a criterion or an apparently neutral practice could put persons of one sex at a particular disadvantage compared with persons of the other sex’ (p.2), and ‘gives concrete form to the Commission’s intention to present a proposal to prohibit discrimination based on sex outside the labour market’ (p. 2). A broad interpretation of gender mainstreaming then, might mean that the privileging of androcentric competitive performance sport may constitute indirect discrimination against girls and women given the sexual division of play. It misframes first order questions of distribution, recognition and representation as internal to androcentric competitive performance sport and casts what are actually transborder injustices as internal matters.

### **Misframing and Gerrymandering Political Space**

According to Fraser (2008, p.26), ‘[m]eta-political misrepresentation arises when states and transnational elites monopolise the activity of frame-setting, denying voice to those who may be harmed in the process, and blocking creation of democratic arenas where the latter’s claims can be vetted and redressed. The effect is to exclude the overwhelming majority of people from participation in the meta-discourses that determine the authoritative division of political space.’ This then operates to gerrymander, or manipulate ‘boundaries ... so as to favour one party or class’ (Oxford Dictionaries, 2012).

A critical reading of national and international sport policy with its universal and compulsory claims for sport, together with the hegemonic sport form of competitive performance sport or sport for sports sake, can be considered to misframe sport, PE and active recreation and gerrymander political space in favour of androcentric competitive performance sport. The European Commission’s White Paper on Sport (EC, 2007), and Sport England’s approach to developing participation are interesting examples of this.

The European Commission’s White Paper on Sport (EC, 2007) aims ‘to give strategic orientation on the role of sport in Europe’ (p.2), adopts the COE ‘sport for all’ definition of sport<sup>1</sup> and starts off with a claim to the universality of sport by quoting de Coubertin who in grandiose fashion opined ‘sport is part of every man *and woman*’s heritage and its absence can never be compensated for’ (de Coubertin 1863-1937, cited EC, 2007, p. 2). This global claim, given the sexual division of play, needs at the very least the COE sport definition<sup>1</sup> to avoid



starting in a counterfactual fashion. It then continues, ‘*sport* attracts European citizens, with a majority of people taking part in *sporting activities* on a regular basis’ (p. 2). When discussing ‘the societal role of sport’ it states that ‘according to a November 2004 Eurobarometer survey approximately 60% of European citizens participate in *sporting activities* on a regular basis within or outside some 700,000 clubs’ (p. 3) and that ‘in preparing this White Paper, the Commission has held numerous consultations with *sport* stakeholders’ (p. 3).

The research cited is the Eurobarometer Survey 62 requested by European Commission, involving 25 member states with a sample size of 23 909 and carried out in 2004. In fact, ‘[f]or the majority of countries, the occurrence of regular sporting activity was less than 40%’ (Van Tuyckom et al 2010, p. 1077). Further, there are ‘significant gender differences in sports participation in 12 counties’ so that in ‘Belgium, France, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Spain, and the UK, men were more likely to report being regularly active in sports than women, whereas in Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and the Netherlands the opposite was true’ (p. 1077). A gender analysis of the data implies that: (i) in some European countries more efforts must be undertaken to promote the original goals of the *Sport for All* (author’s emphasis) Charter, and (ii) to achieve more female participation in sports will require different policy responses in the diverse European member states’.

The telling shift from the use of ‘sport’ to the use of ‘sporting activities’ in the introduction to the White Paper appears to, deliberately or otherwise, create the illusion that sport (rather than sporting activities) is a majority pastime, thus legitimating ‘sport’ by using data relating to ‘sporting activities’. Further, sport clubs are highlighted despite the majority of the population participating outside of these, and the *sport* stakeholders come overwhelmingly from within the competitive performance sport hegemonic frame, rather than a broader meta-political ‘all affected’ frame. This use of the *sporting activities* data to legitimate competitive performance *sport* appears therefore to gerrymander political space in favour of competitive performance sport.

The Sport England Strategy 2008-2011 (SE 2008) could also be considered to be an example of misframing sport, or sport and active recreation, and gerrymandering political space. It set out to ‘focus exclusively on sport’ but despite still rhetorically adhering to the COE definition of sport<sup>1</sup>, announced that ‘National Governing Bodies will be at the heart of delivery and funded via a simple single pot’ (p. 2), that they will have ‘greater autonomy over the investment of public funds’ and should have ‘high standards of internal organisation and democracy’ (p. 2). They should also ‘reach and serve all sectors of society’ (p. 2) by ‘developing the girl’s & women’s game’ (p. 4) and

specifically ‘work to increase women’s participation in football’ (p. 22). However, given the sexual division of play, *reaching and serving all sectors of society* requires engagement with the empirical evidence in relation to the sport, PE and active recreation preferences of girls and women (the ‘all affected’ principle) which, even though dance is excluded from the sport and active recreation category altogether, still gives a ranking of only 14 for football (Sport England, 2012b). Here then, sport and active recreation is misframed as sport, this rhetorically is taken to be the sport for all of the COE<sup>1</sup> but is actually interpreted in a much narrower fashion and linked to the bounded political communities of national governing bodies and the ‘game’, presumably a reference to competitive performance sport. Further, ‘democracy’, and ‘reaching and serving all sectors of society’ is cast in relation to the ‘game’ and football, thus gerrymandering political space and ‘public funds’ which ‘serves more to indemnify than to challenge injustice’ (Fraser, 2008, 25). The financial consequences of misframing and gerrymandering are apparent in Tables 1, 4 and 5 which show the proportion of total public funding for the top five ‘sport’ preferences for women and men, going to the top five choices (excluding dance) for women (22%) and men (78%) in England. In Scotland, the disparity is even greater at 12% for women and 88% for men. Thus, it appears that the public funds distributed to the sport and active recreation preferences of men and boys are significantly greater than those distributed to the choices of girls and women. Given the financial inequality already existing between women and men, this appears to be a form of regressive fiscal policy hidden behind rhetoric of gender equality.

Further, as has been documented above, despite the overwhelming evidence for the popularity of dance amongst women and girls, dance ‘*may be considered by the respondent as “recreational physical activity”, (but it is) not considered to be within the remit of the KPI for participation*’ (Sport England, 2011b, p.8). This disenfranchises women and girls and indicates that ‘boundaries are drawn in such a way as to wrongly exclude some people from the chance to participate at all in ... authorized contests over justice’ (Fraser, 2008, p.19) given that dance as a complete category (as opposed to some competitive dance activities) is thus ineligible for funding from the UK Sports Councils. This would matter less if it was eligible for funding from other government sources, even if viewed as a ‘hobby’ rather than ‘active recreation’. However, public funding for dance participation is minimal, with the vast majority of the Arts Council for England subsidy going to artistic (professional performance) rather than educational budgets (Arts Council England, 2010/11). Therefore, women and girls, despite having fewer financial resources than men, rely mainly on the private sector to access this form of active recreation. Notwithstanding the exclusion of dance, activities which are recognised by the UK Sports Councils as sport and are

therefore eligible for public funding include: angling, arm wrestling, baton twirling, billiards, boules, darts, high wire, hot air ballooning, jet skiing, mine exploration, pilates, pool, powerboat racing, quoits, snooker, snorkelling, super-modified shovel racing, tai chi. Even the broader N18 indicator of participation which includes five '*light intensity sports for those aged 65 and over*', yoga, pilates, indoor and outdoor bowls, archery and croquet does not consider dance to be active recreation (Sport England, 2012b).

Sport England's misframing and gerrymandering problems were also evident when in 2009 it 'commissioned the Futures Company and Mindshare to undertake statistical modelling and qualitative research work to better understand a wider range of factors affecting sports participation' (Sport England, 2012d). The combination of the 'selection model' and 'sport model' used in order 'to identify those who engage in at least some sport' is an excellent example of misframing in relation to sport, PE, and active recreation given that 'the 11 sports modelled were: athletics, badminton, cricket, cycling, football, golf, rugby league, rugby union, squash, swimming, and tennis'. Unsurprisingly, given the sexual division of play, a 'gender gap' was identified with the self fulfilling finding that women are less likely to participate across most of the (primarily androcentric) sports tested (athletics, badminton, cricket, cycling, football, golf, rugby league, rugby union and squash) (Sport England, 2012e).

Problems with framing, gerrymandering and therefore funding may well be contributing to Sport England's problems in relation to increasing participation. The Active People (sic) Survey 5 shows that four 'sports' have seen a statistically significant increase in participation rates: athletics (including running and jogging), boxing, table tennis and mountaineering (excluding ice climbing but including mountain walking). However, 'nineteen sports have seen a statistically significant decrease in weekly participation rates between 2007/8 and the 12 months to October 2011 – swimming, football, golf, badminton, tennis, equestrian, bowls, rugby union, basketball, snowsport, hockey, weightlifting, sailing, rugby league, gymnastics, rowing, volleyball, rounders and judo' (Sport England, 2012f). The 'Active People (sic) Survey' publishes minimal data in relation to sex/gender in summary format but 'Active People Survey 5' which relates to the year from October 2010 to October 2011 reports a statistically significant decrease in women's and a statistically significant increase in men's participation, indicating a deepening sexual division of play. This contrasts with the view that, "the 1980's and 1990's saw significant *increases* in participation by women driven mainly by greater interest in keep fit type activities including swimming rather than outdoor activities and 'traditional team sports'" (Sport England, 2004, p. 7).

## Conclusion: Gender Justice Citizenship and Sport

Gender justice in sport, PE, and active recreation can be interpreted in three distinct ways: either as a citizenship of equality which is nevertheless androcentric; or as a citizenship of difference where the sexual division of play is acknowledged and female and male sport, PE, and active recreation choices are valued equally; or finally as a critical synthesis, transformation, or plural non-gendered movement culture which is appropriately reframed according to the ‘all affected’ principle. This would involve decentring competitive performance sport and valorising other movement activities (e.g. dance, outdoor and adventurous activities, recreational rather than performance & elite sport, ‘sport for all’ rather than ‘grassroots sport’). However, a sporting citizenship of androcentric rhetorical equality is evident in Europe and Britain. Formal sporting citizenship rights are accorded to all individuals and presented as gender neutral, but inequalities of opportunities and power derive from the sexual division of play. Therefore, girls and women are more likely to be second class sporting citizens than boys and men.

The division of the sport, PE, and active recreation political space into the bounded polities of governing bodies of sport works to misframe the ‘what’ of justice as a second order question of distribution, recognition and representation internal to competitive (often team) performance sport. This then naturalises the hegemonic frame of competitive performance (and grassroots) sport, and casts what are actually transborder or first order meta-political injustices as internal matters. The ‘who’ and the ‘what’ of justice are unjustly defined. Thus, the sport, PE and active recreation choices of boys and men are normalised while those of girls and women are problematised. Contracting out sport, PE, and active recreation equality targets *for the population as a whole* to sport Quangos and governing bodies of sport means that ‘affected non-citizens are wrongly excluded from consideration’ (Fraser, 2008, p. 6) and have no ‘voice’ in relation to agenda setting and their active recreation choices of sport for all, physical activity, and dance. The resulting *metapolitical* maldistribution of sport, PE, and active recreation resources in favour of androcentric sport Quangos, governing bodies of sport, grassroots sport and competitive performance sport, is then a likely causal factor in relation to girls and women’s under –representation in sport, PE, and active recreation whilst equality initiatives internal to competitive performance sport purport to aspire to achieve exactly the opposite. This might then explain the increasing sexual inequality reported by Sport England’s Active People 5 Survey and the differences in gender inequalities in EU countries reported in the EU Eurobarometer Survey.

First order meta-political justice requires an interrogation of the mapping of the political sport, PE, and active recreation space and a remapping of the bounds of justice on a broader scale. Whilst equality aspirations within the hegemonic competitive performance sport frame are important and necessary, they are not sufficient. Transborder sport, PE, and active recreation injustices of maldistribution, misrecognition and misrepresentation in relation to, in particular competitive performance sport, sport for all and dance, need to be foregrounded. Thus, the plurality of conflicting & contested frames or ontologies ('sport for sports sake', 'sport for all', dance) needs to be acknowledged. The widely 'adopted' CoE definition of sport<sup>1</sup> needs to move beyond rhetoric to inform the distribution of public funding; recognition of sport, PE, and active recreation preferences; and representation or political 'voice' of all those affected; rather than collapsing into the stakeholders primarily internal to competitive performance sport. There is incommensurability between 'sport' 'physical activity' and 'dance'; and sport, PE, and active recreation policy needs to encompass this plurality rather than attempt to collapse this richness into one hegemonic form. Otherwise, the political communities of sport Quangos and governing bodies of sport are awarded exclusive undivided sovereignty over contracted out equality targets, to a large extent barring external interference in internal affairs as in the conception of the 'special status of sport'. If the reach of sport is framed as universal or compulsory, the democratic 'all affected' principle necessitates first order metapolitical *justice* in relation to distribution, recognition and representation as well as the androcentric *equality* initiatives within the hegemonic competitive sport frame. This requires a critical democratic alternative to decision-making contracted out to experts internal to hegemonic competitive performance sport. As the WSFF reports 'the girls in this research clearly articulated that they felt their voices (and the voices of previous generations of girls) had not been heard with regard to this issue (*—they haven't changed...they don't care...they are not listening to what people actually want to do*)' (Gorely, 2011). It appears therefore that women and girls do not have 'property in the person' in relation to sport, PE, and active recreation, as decision making operates in a modern fraternal patriarchal fashion to gerrymander political space and disproportionately favour androcentric competitive performance sport. The result is that gender mainstreaming and the gender equality agenda is outsourced to this sport form.

In the UK inequality between girls and women, and boys and men, in sport, PE, and active recreation participation has increased in tandem with an increase in income inequality. The UK Sport Councils and the Department for Education have adopted an androcentric gender equality approach to gender justice in sport, PE, and active recreation as outlined in Table 11. Sport England's 'Active People' Survey appears to cast females either as not 'active' (given dance is not

considered as active recreation) or *not people* (that is, citizens, whose voices should be heard, in relation to sport and active recreation). The post second world war settlement resulting in decreasing social and sexual divisions of labour appears to have gone into reverse under both the current conservative/ liberal democrat coalition government in the UK and the previous ‘new labour’ administration. Given the income inequality between women and men, the sexual division of play and the androcentric conception of sporting citizenship with the resultant maldistribution, misrecognition and misrepresentation, in relation to public money, it is perhaps surprising that girls and women are as active as they are. Although androcentric gender equality is a necessary component of gender justice, it is not sufficient. After all, as Sandel argues, justice is not just about the right way to distribute things, but also about the right way to value things (Sandel 2010).

**Table 11:** Gender Justice Citizenship and Sport

	<b>EU: Gender Equality</b>	<b>UK: Gender Equality</b>	<b>Gender Justice</b>
Frame	Hegemonic CPS, SFA rhetoric & underplayed: plural, confused, contested	CPS: naturalises injustices of gender & remove from political contestation	SFA: universal movement citizenship
Citizenship	Androcentric equality	Androcentric equality	Critical synthesis/ transformation/ reframing
Evidence base	Empirical dissembling: legitimisation via appropriation of SFA, sport & PA conflated	Misframing (sport) Anecdotal: no attempt to legitimise (PE)	Reframe Active People & Taking Part, Eurobarometer, Academic research Gender justice (PE)
Gender	Mainstreaming internal to hegemonic CPS	Neutral (androcentric universal sportsman)	1. Reframing 2. Redistribution, recognition, representation
Stakeholders	Internal to CPS	Internal to CPS	‘All affected’ principle
Extending participation	Grassroots CPS and SFA	Hegemonic grassroots sport	SFA
Policy	Sportification of PA, PE &	Sportification of PA, PE &	Broad movement/physical

	movement culture	movement culture	culture
--	------------------	------------------	---------

## Notes

1. ‘ “Sport” means all forms of physical activity which, through casual or organised participation, aim at expressing or improving physical fitness and mental well-being, forming social relationships or obtaining results in competition at all levels’ (Council of Europe, 1992, 2001)

## References

BBC, 2012. *School competitive team sports move unveiled*. Available online: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-19219942> [accessed 10 October 2012].

Debusscher, P., 2011. ‘Mainstreaming gender in European Commission development policy: Conservative Europeanness?’ *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 34 (1), pp. 39-40.

Collins, M., 2010. ‘From ‘sport for good’ to ‘sport for sport’s sake’-not a good move for sports development in England?’ *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 2 (3), pp. 367-379.

Collins, M. and Kay, T., 2003. *Sport and Social Exclusion*. London: Routledge.

Council of Europe, 1992, 2001. *European Sports Charter*. Strasbourg. Council of Europe. Retrieved October 2, 2012, from [https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=Rec\(92\)13&Sector=secCM&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=rev&BackColorInternet=9999CC&BackColorIntranet=FFBB55&BackColorLogged=FFAC75](https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=Rec(92)13&Sector=secCM&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=rev&BackColorInternet=9999CC&BackColorIntranet=FFBB55&BackColorLogged=FFAC75)

DCMS, 2010. *The Taking Part Survey: 2008/9 Proxy Child Questionnaire (5-10 year olds)*. DCMS.

De Beauvoir, S., 1949. *The Second Sex*

Department for Education, 2010. *The Importance of Teaching-The Schools White Paper*. DfE. Available online: <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/CM-7980.pdf> [accessed 24 June 2011].

Devine, C., 2012. ‘London 2012 Olympic legacy: a big sporting society?’. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, pp.1-23 iFirst Article. DOI:10.1080/19406940.2012.656674

Devine, C. and Telfer, H., 2013. Values, Sport and Physical Education. In: Lyle, J., Telfer, H., and Whitehead, J. *Values and Youth Sport*. London, Routledge.

Eichberg, H., 2009. Bodily Democracy: Towards a Philosophy of Sport for All. *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy*, 3 (3), 441-461.

European Commission, 2007. *White Paper on Sport*. Brussels. European Commission. Retrieved January 6, 2011, from [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/white-paper/whitepaper8\\_en.htm#1](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/white-paper/whitepaper8_en.htm#1)

European Commission, 2008. *EU Physical Activity Guidelines: Recommended Policy Actions in Support of Health-Enhancing Physical Activity*. Brussels, European Commission. Available online: [http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/documents/c1/eu-physical-activity-guidelines-2008\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/sport/library/documents/c1/eu-physical-activity-guidelines-2008_en.pdf) [accessed 16 October 2012].

European Commission, 2008b. *Manual for Gender Mainstreaming*. Luxembourg, European Commission.

European Commission, 2010. Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015. Brussels, European Commission. Available online: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52010DC0491:EN:NOT> [accessed 16 October 2012].

European Commission, 2004. *The principle of equal treatment for men and women outside the labour market*. Council Directive 2004/113/EC, European Union.

European Union, 2010. Consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. *Official Journal of the European Union*, 53. Luxembourg, European Union. Available online: [http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en\\_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=FXAC10083](http://bookshop.europa.eu/is-bin/INTERSHOP.enfinity/WFS/EU-Bookshop-Site/en_GB/-/EUR/ViewPublication-Start?PublicationKey=FXAC10083) [accessed 16 October 2012].

Flintoff, A., 2008. Targeting Mr Average: participation, gender equity and school sport partnerships. *Sport Education and Society*, 13(4) 393-411. Retrieved April 11, 2011, from SPORTDiscus database.

Fraser, N., 2008. *Scales of Justice*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Fraser, N., 2009. Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History. *New Left Review*. 56, 97-117. New Left Review.



Gorely, T., Sandford, R., Duncombe, R., Musson, H., Edwardson, C., Kay, T., and Jeanes, R., 2011. *Understanding Psycho-Social Attitudes towards Sport and Activity in Girls: Final Research Report*. Loughborough, Institute of Youth Sport. Available online: <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ssehs/research/sport-science/youth-sport/downloads/research-downloads/physical-activity-dl/wsff-final-report.pdf> [accessed 10 October 2012].

Gove, M., 2010. Gove: “*I want competitive sport to be at the centre of a truly rounded education*”. Department for Education. Available online: <http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0071188/gove-i-want-competitive-sport-to-be-at-the-centre-of-a-truly-rounded-education> [accessed 16 October 2012].

Gove, M., 2011. *A new approach for school sports - decentralising power, incentivising competition, trusting teachers*. Department for Education. Available online: <http://www.education.gov.uk/inthenews/inthenews/a0071098/a-new-approach-for-school-sports-decentralising-power-incentivising-competition-trusting-teachers> [accessed 16 October 2012].

HM Government, 2010. *Equality Act 2010*. London, TSO. Available online: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents> [accessed 16 October 2012].

Hardman, K. and Marshall, J. (2005) ‘Update on the State and Status of Physical Education World-wide’ *International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education*. Available at: [http://www.icsspe.org/documente/Status\\_PE\\_Hardman\\_and\\_Marshall.pdf](http://www.icsspe.org/documente/Status_PE_Hardman_and_Marshall.pdf) (Accessed: 21 June 2012).

Hargreaves, J., 1994. *Sporting Females: Critical Issues in the History and Sociology of Women's Sport*. London: Routledge.

Hargreaves, J., 2000. *Heroines of Sport: The politics of difference and identity*. Oxford, Routledge.

Hunt, J., 2010. *Sports keynote speech*. Department for Culture Media and Sport. 28 June. Available online: [http://www.culture.gov.uk/news/ministers\\_speeches/7207.aspx](http://www.culture.gov.uk/news/ministers_speeches/7207.aspx) [accessed 29 June 2010]

HM Government, 2012. *Marriage Certificate Help Sheet*. Directgov. Retrieved October 2, 2012, from

[http://www.direct.gov.uk/prod\\_consum\\_dg/groups/dg\\_digitalassets/@dg/@en/documents/digitalasset/dg\\_176227.pdf](http://www.direct.gov.uk/prod_consum_dg/groups/dg_digitalassets/@dg/@en/documents/digitalasset/dg_176227.pdf)

Jarvie, G., 2006. *Sport, Culture and Society*. Oxford, Routledge.

Jones, H. , Millwood, P., and Buraimo, B., 2011a. *Adult participation in sport: Analysis of the Taking Part Survey*. DCMS

Jones, H. , Millwood, P., and Buraimo, B., 2011b *Child participation in culture and sport: Analysis of the 2008/09 Taking Part Survey*. DCMS

Lister, R., 2003. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York, New York University Press.

McRobbie, 2009. *The aftermath of feminism*. London, Sage.

Meier, P., and Lombardo, E., 2008. Concepts of citizenship underlying EU gender equality policies. *Citizenship Studies*, 12(5), 481-493. Retrieved April 11, 2011, from Academic Search Complete database.

Millns, S., 2007. Gender Equality, Citizenship, and the EU's Constitutional Future. *European Law Journal*, 13(2), 218-237. Retrieved April 11, 2011, from Academic Search Complete database.

Oxford Dictionaries, 2012. 'Gerrymander'. *Oxford Dictionaries*, Oxford University Press. Available online: ((<http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/gerrymander>) [accessed 22 October 2012].

Pateman, C., 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge, Polity Press

Penney, D., 2002. *Gender and physical education: contemporary issues and future direction*. London, Routledge.

Press Association, 2012. David Cameron: school sports targets result in 'Indian dance' classes. *The Guardian*, 10.8.2012. Available online: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/aug/10/david-ferguson-school-sports-targets> [accessed 10 October 2012].

Prince, R., 2012. David Willets: Feminism has held back working men. *The Telegraph*, 1 April, 2011. Available online: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/8420098/David-Willets-feminism-has-held-back-working-men.html> [accessed 2 October 2012]

Sandel, M., 2010. *Justice: What's the Right Thing to Do?* Penguin

Saner, E., 2012. The female unemployment crisis. The Guardian, 20 February, 2012. Available online: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2012/feb/20/female-unemployment-crisis-women> [accessed 2 October 2012]

Scratton, S., and Flintoff, A., 2002. *Gender and Sport: A Reader*. London, Routledge.

Smith, A., Green, K., and Thurston, M., 2009. 'Activity choice' and physical education in England and Wales. *Sport Education and Society*, 14(2) 203-222. Retrieved April 11, 2011, from SPORTDiscus database.

Sport England, no date. *Sport England funding for 2009-2013*. Sport England.

Sport England, 2004. *Driving up participation: The challenge for sport*. Sport England.

Sport England, 2008. *Sport England Strategy 2008-2011*. London: SE.

Sport England, 2011a. *Active People Survey 5*. Sport England. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/research/active\\_people\\_survey/aps5.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey/aps5.aspx) [accessed 10 October 2012].

Sport England, 2011b. The Active People Survey 5 – Questionnaire Content. Sport England. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/research/active\\_people\\_survey/aps5.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey/aps5.aspx) [accessed 10 October 2012].

Sport England, 2012a. Recognition of sports and NGBs. Sport England. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/about\\_us/how\\_we recognise\\_sports.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/about_us/how_we recognise_sports.aspx) [accessed 10 October 2012].

Sport England, 2012b. *Active People Survey*. Sport England. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/research/active\\_people\\_survey.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey.aspx) [accessed 10 October 2012].

Sport England, 2012c. *Active People Survey 6*. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/research/active\\_people\\_survey/active\\_people\\_survey\\_6.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey/active_people_survey_6.aspx) [accessed 10 October 2012].

Sport England, 2012d. *Understanding Participation*. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/research/understanding\\_participation.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/understanding_participation.aspx) [accessed 22 October 2012].

Sport England, 2012e. *Understanding Participation*. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/research/understanding\\_participation/understanding\\_sport\\_variations.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/understanding_participation/understanding_sport_variations.aspx) [accessed 22 October 2012].

Sport England, 2012f. *Active People Survey 5*. Available online: [http://www.sportengland.org/research/active\\_people\\_survey/active\\_people\\_survey\\_51.aspx](http://www.sportengland.org/research/active_people_survey/active_people_survey_51.aspx) [accessed 22 October 2012].

Sportscotland, 2001. Sports Participation in Scotland 2000. *Research Digest 84*. Edinburgh, Sportscotland.

Sportscotland, 2006. Increasing demand for sport and physical activity for adolescent girls in Scotland. Sportscotland. Available online: <http://www.sportscotland.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/8DD72DC9-E5BD-45C2-85CE-3224EC2910C1/0/Increasingdemandforsportandphysicalactivityforadolescentgirlsinscotland.pdf> [accessed 16 October 2012].

Sportscotland, 2008. Sports Participation in Scotland 2008. *Research Digest 110*. Glasgow, Sportscotland.

Sportscotland, 2012. Scottish Governing Body investment and targets. Sportscotland.

Sports Council Wales, 2009. *Young People's Participation in Sport*. Cardiff, Sports Council Wales.

Sports Council Wales, 2010. *2008-09 Active Adults Survey*. Sports Council Wales.

TNS Opinion and Social, 2010. 'Sport and Physical Activity' Special Eurobarometer 334 Wave 72.3. Brussels: European Commission.

Van Tuyckom, C., Scheerder, J., and Bracke, P., 2010. Gender and age inequalities in regular sports participation: A cross-national study of 25 European countries. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 28(10). Retrieved April 11, 2011, from SPORTDiscus database.

Walby, S., 2005. Measuring women's progress in a global era. *International Social Science Journal*, 57(184), 371-387. Retrieved April 11, 2011, from Academic Search Complete database.

Wellard, I., 2007. *Rethinking Gender and Youth Sport*. Oxford, Routledge.