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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to establish whether there is a policy community for disability sport in England. Whilst structured competitive disability sport may traditionally have been organised and run by charitable bodies, segregated from mainstream non-disabled sport, contemporary policies stress a need for disability sport to be the responsibility of mainstream organisations. However, there is a dearth of literature that considers how disability sport policy has developed, which agencies have been powerful in the organisational network, and the significance of the values of key actors in the policy process and outcome.

This study; a) establishes the key characteristics of disability sport policy in England, and b) establishes the interests, resources, power and relationships between organisations involved in disability sport and determines the ideologies of key actors involved in disability sport policy. Data is generated in three phases using an analysis of policy documents, a survey of 162 sports organisations and 21 interviews with key personnel. In Phase 1 semi-structured interviews with key personnel combined with documentary analysis were used to establish how disability sport emerged and developed. Informed by the data from Phase 1, in Phase 2 a survey of governing bodies of sport and disability sport organisations was conducted to establish which national organisations are involved in the policy network, how disability sport policy is formed, the role organisations play and ideologies of key actors. In Phase 3, informed by the data from Phases 1 and 2 and using interviews and documentary analysis, two case studies were carried out to examine, 1) the formation and role of the English Federation of Disability Sport, and 2) the mainstreaming of disability sport.

The analysis of data is informed by theories of disability, a history of disability policy and sports policy, and three prominent theories of policy analysis: Marsh and Rhodes' policy network model, Sabatier's advocacy coalition framework and Kingdon's policy streams approach.

Findings reveal that organisations concerned with disability sport policy in England do not form a coherent policy community. Typically, these organisations do not reach consensus easily, do not have a binding system of values, do not have a common set
of goals or a coherent and potentially unifying professional body, and are vulnerable to government and ministerial intervention. Similarly to the British Sports Association for the Disabled (BSAD), the EFDS finds it difficult to reconcile the advocacy role it plays for other disability sports organisations (DSOs) with its own development work. Support for EFDS among DSOs seems as equivocal now as it was for BSAD in the late 1980s. The DSOs are dissatisfied with the EFDS prompting DSOs to continue with their own activities and developments. There is little consensus in the way that disability sport should develop and the role that the EFDS and other agencies should play.

Few actors within mainstream or disability sport organisations agree on what mainstreaming is. While there are examples of disability sport and mainstream sport organisations working together successfully, the relationships, roles, and responsibilities across sports is inconsistent. Despite government pressure on mainstream governing bodies to assume responsibility for disability sport, mainstream agencies have been reticent to do so. The reticence of mainstream agencies has been due to: financial constraints, a dissatisfaction with the co-ordination within disability sport, a lack of knowledge of what and how to progress, and a lack of political will. Compounding this, disability sport organisations have been reluctant to relinquish roles to mainstream bodies where they perceive a lack of commitment and capacity.

The case studies reveal that the disability sport policy process involved a large number of agencies with a wide range of interests. The relationships between these organisations fluctuates but conflict is typical. Due to the lack of consensus and poor relationships between organisations in the network, governments have increased their capacity to intervene in disability sport policy yet have also, paradoxically, attempted to keep disability sport at arms length. Typically disabled people and disability organisations have little involvement in the decision making process and disability sport policy is most influenced by mainstream sport policy. While disability sport policy has shifted to reflect a social explanation of disability, ideologies indicate diverse beliefs in the involvement of disabled people and the role of disability sport organisations.

Using the meso levels of policy analysis, the study shows that disability sport policy is ‘messy’ with a range of influences on its policy process (Kingdon, 1984). There have
been no obvious policy entrepreneurs since Guttmann but his involvement in disability sport during its early development is still apparent. This study concludes that disability sport policy in England forms a loose issue network and, without a shift toward the characteristics of a more tightly bound policy community, key organisations in disability sport are unlikely to influence effectively government policy (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992).

Key Words: disability sport, mainstreaming, policy networks, policy-making, power, sport policy.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE STUDY

Disability sport is a relatively recent phenomenon but one which, in England at least, is currently enjoying an increase in political interest. However, there is a dearth of literature that considers how disability sport policy has developed, which agencies have been influential in shaping policy, and how factors, such as the values of key actors, may be significant in the policy process.

Historically, people perceived to have a congenital or an acquired biomedical impairment and identified as being different from the norm, have been marginalised from the rest of society (Oliver, 1990). In England, individuals considered to have an impairment have typically been called disabled but disability is a sharply contested term and a concept with a number of different interpretations and meanings. In this study the term ‘disabled people’ is used as it tends to reflect a socially constructed understanding of disability, emphasising the capacity of society to place an additional burden on impaired people, which isolates them from the rest of society. The author does not use the term ‘people with disabilities’, as it places little emphasis on the individual’s social and physical environment. In this regard, typically the term ‘non-disabled’ is used and not ‘able-bodied’, as the latter implies that disabled people are not ‘able’ and that the barriers to their participation in society is a consequence of their physical impairment. A thorough discussion on the theories of disability and the meanings attached to these terms can be found in chapter two.

‘Disability sport’ as an organised activity has its British origins in the immediate post second World War period where those with an impairment acquired through wartime injury were treated and rehabilitated in hospitals in order that they could return to the predominantly non-disabled society. Whilst it was already well known that physical activity could play a positive role in the physiological and psychological rehabilitation of impaired individuals, it was Ludwig Guttmann, a neuro-surgeon at Stoke Mandeville Hospital in England, who established what is now known as disability sport.
The term ‘disability sport’ is used by the author to describe sports activities that have been created or developed for the specific benefit of disabled people and includes opportunities for disabled people to play with or against other disabled people. The first formally recognised national event in disability sport was held in 1948 at Stoke Mandeville Hospital in England. Since then, a diverse range of ‘disability sport organisations’ have emerged to provide opportunities in disability sport. Competitive disability sport has traditionally been organised and run by the disability sport organisations.

The term ‘disability sport organisations’ (DSOs) refers to those organisations whose primary aim is to co-ordinate, develop and deliver one or more sports for one or more impairment groups. For example, the British Table Tennis Association for the Disabled seeks to develop one sport for all impairment groups and Cerebral Palsy Sport strives to provide opportunities in a range of sports for one impairment group. Reference will also be made to the national disability sport organisations (NDSOs). As will be discussed within chapter six, this refers to seven organisations that became recognised by the Sports Council for having a coordinating role for particular impairment groups.

A government review of disability sport (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989) criticised the lack of co-ordination between the growing number of disability sport organisations. In recognition of the limited resources available, the Review called for a shift of responsibility for disability sport away from the disability sport organisations and to the mainstream sports providers. Thus, contemporary public policy for disability sport stresses a need for integrated organisation and provision and the utilisation of the resources and structures of mainstream sports organisations. Concomitantly, mainstream sports organisations have begun to offer opportunities to disabled people that were hitherto only available to non-disabled people.

The terms ‘national governing bodies of sport’ (NGBs) or ‘mainstream sports organisations’ are used to describe those organisations whose primary aim is to coordinate, develop and deliver one or more sports for a predominantly non-disabled society. While a mainstream national governing body of sport may or may not address issues related to ‘disability sport’, its primary function focuses on the sporting interests of non-disabled people. It is the roles and relationship between, the disability
Chapter four discusses in detail macro and meso level theories of policy analysis, a key theme throughout which is the concept of individual and group ‘interests’. While Lukes’ and Foucault’s perspectives provide a rich discourse on how power is exercised in the expression of interests, the term ‘interests’ will refer to, the political action or inaction, expressed desires and preferences by individuals, groups of individuals and organisations.

The aim of this study is to establish whether there is a policy community for disability sport in England. More specifically, the objectives of the study are to, 1) establish the key characteristics of the disability sport policy process, and 2) establish the interests, power distribution and relationships between organisations involved in disability sport and determine the ideologies of key actors involved in disability sport policy. To achieve the aim this study uses case studies of a recent landmark event and a significant long standing issue in disability sport: namely, a) the formation of the English Federation of Disability Sport and, b) the mainstreaming of disability sport.

1.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Traditionally, disabled people have been marginalised from the mainstream of society and denied the attendant benefits that such a position holds. This marginalisation is also evident in sport and can be demonstrated by the existence of the Paralympic Games. The Paralympic Games represent the pinnacle of disability sport, yet is separated from, and does not enjoy the status of, the Olympic Games, nor do its competitors have access to the same level of support (Doll-Tepper, 1999, Steadward, 1996; Williams, 1994). Furthermore, this structural inequality is evident at a recreational as well as at elite level, as disabled people typically have far fewer opportunities than non-disabled people to participate in organised sport (Stafford, 1989; Sport England, 2000a). The reasons for this disparity include a range of individual, social and environmental factors. That is to say, it has been recognised by government that the inequalities faced by people with impairments are caused, at least in part, by a predominantly mainstream non-disabled society. To this end the Sports
Council and now Sport England have made policy statements accepting that disabled people should be afforded similar opportunities to those enjoyed by their non-disabled peers. This is an indication that responsibility for fulfilling this objective lies with the mainstream sporting organisations, which hitherto, have typically catered only for non-disabled people (Sports Council, 1993a). Thus, organisations traditionally co-ordinating and providing sport for non-disabled people are being asked to play a more significant role in expanding their services to include disabled people.

Case studies and surveys such as those carried out by Elvin (1994), Williams and Newman (1989), Health Education Authority (1999) and Sport England (2000a) have provided some valuable data on disabled people's sporting participation in England, and there is a rich vein of international literature that applies sports sciences to disability sport. However, notwithstanding this important body of relevant material, together with the insightful socio-political observations of authors such as Hahn (1984), there has been no substantial analysis to date of disability sport policy in England.

This is an important study as it will provide information on the development of disability sport organisations, the activities of mainstream governing bodies and the role of the government throughout this process. It will offer an interpretation of how disability sport policy has developed and the perceptions that key actors have of disability sport. Finally, the study will consider the extent to which a discrete disability sport policy community exists.

1.3 HOW THE STUDY WAS CONDUCTED

The theoretical framework for the analysis of the research findings will be informed by theories of disability, theories of policy analysis, and an analysis of contemporary disability policy and sport policy in England. The methods used include an analysis of policy documents, a survey of 162 sports organisations, and interviews with 21 key policy actors.

The research was conducted in three distinct phases. Semi-structured interviews with key policy actors were used in phase 1 which, combined with an analysis of policy documents and archive material, established how disability sport emerged and
subsequently developed in England. In Phase 2 a survey of organisations concerned with mainstream sport and disability sport was undertaken to ascertain which organisations contributed to disability sport, the nature of the contributions and in what context that contribution was made. From this, the relationship between organisations was determined and key organisations in the disability sport policy process were identified. In Phase 3, semi-structured interviews were conducted with administrators in key organisations to explore further, a) the emergence of the English Federation of Disability Sport, and b) the mainstreaming of disability sport (in swimming, table tennis, football, athletics, wheelchair basketball, boccia and tennis). This provided an insight into the roles, relationships and perceptions of key organisations, and assisted in the explanation of how they influenced the policy process and policy outcomes for disability sport.

1.4. A SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTERS

Chapter two provides an account of the theories of disability. First, it provides a brief overview of how contemporary researchers explain the historical treatment of disability and the impact of work and societal culture on the construction and treatment of disabled people. Second, contemporary definitions of disability will be examined and the shift from the predominant medical model to socially constructed explanations of disability will be discussed. Third, the chapter provides a summary of the recent World Health Organisation's attempts to define and categorise disability.

Chapter three is a contextual chapter that examines government involvement in disability and in sport. The development of disability policy and sport policy in England is discussed, providing a prelude to the following chapter that examines various approaches to policy analysis and the necessary background against which this empirical study on disability sport policy is conducted.

The purpose of chapter four is to examine policy-making from macro to meso levels, that is, from the societal to organisational network levels and to establish which theories are most relevant to the analysis of disability sport policy. To achieve this, an introduction to policy studies is provided which gives a summary of different types of policy analysis. This is followed by a description of the main theories of power distribution at the societal or macro level and the relative contribution that these
theories may make to the study of disability sport policy. Following a brief critique of
the traditional stagist theory of policy-making at the meso level, three specific policy
analysis models are presented. The policy community model, the advocacy coalition
framework and the policy streams model are described and their potential application
to policy-making in disability sport is evaluated. Whilst the intention is not to identify
one single theoretical perspective to apply to this study, it is anticipated that elements
within each may provide a useful framework for analysis.

The purpose of chapter five is to present the methodology for the investigation and
includes a discussion of the chosen epistemology, research paradigm, research design
and means of data analysis.

Chapter six employs data generated from the documentary analysis, the interviews
with key actors and the survey of mainstream and disability sport organisations to
examine the emergence, policies and relationships of the English Federation of
Disability Sport (EFDS). More specifically, it draws heavily on the data to provide an
informed and balanced analysis of why the EFDS was established, what its policies
are, how policy decisions are made, who it works with and what perspectives on
disability sport it reflects.

In chapter seven an account is given of policy positions of seven sports on the issue of
mainstreaming disability sport. Phase 1 of the research revealed that the
mainstreaming of disability sport is a central tenet of contemporary government
policy and a key objective of the newly formed EFDS. However, evidence from the
survey in Phase 2 revealed that not all governing bodies of sport have embraced this
policy objective. In this regard, using survey, interview and documentary data, and
focussing on the dominant issue of mainstreaming disability sport, this chapter
provides an analysis of the policies, activities, decision-making processes,
relationships and ideologies of governing bodies in seven sports.

The concluding chapter establishes whether there is a policy community for disability
sport. It identifies the key characteristics of the disability sport policy process,
establishes the interests, power distribution and relationships between organisations
involved in disability sport, and determines the ideologies of key actors involved in
disability sport policy.
2.1 INTRODUCTION

As the purpose of this study is to analyse disability sport policy, it is crucial to understand what is meant by the terms 'disability' and 'disabled people'. In other words it is important to understand the nature of disability. However, while it may be straightforward to establish an organisation's written policy on disability sport, the understanding and meaning that may be attached to the use of the terms 'disability' and 'disabled people' may be less straightforward.

In this regard it is necessary to determine how disability has been explained and conceptualised within policies related to sport for disabled people. It may, for example, provide an insight into why organisations and their individual actors believe in, or strive for, the objectives that they do. As this chapter will illustrate, there have been various conceptualisations of disability, and accordingly, varying treatment of those that are considered disabled.

There is no universally agreed definition or understanding of disability. Indeed in some countries and cultures there is no term that equates to the general notion of disability, which makes any review of literature on disability fraught with epistemological difficulties. Notwithstanding these difficulties, in this chapter the historical treatment of disability is examined and the impact of work practices, culture and values on the definitions of disability will be considered. This is followed by a discussion of the shift from an individualised to a broader socially constructed explanation of disability, which emphasises the environment as the predominant disabling influence. In the latter section of the chapter the current World Health Organisation's definition of impairment, disability and handicap will be discussed. These three definitions are evaluated in the context of the recent arguments that call for a definition of disability that recognises the significance of both the individual impairment and the social environment.

It will be argued in this chapter that the culture and values of a society play a significant part in the social construction of disability. As indicated in the introduction
to the study, because of the socially constructed and contested nature of the concept of
disability, the term impairment will be used in this study to describe the medical
condition of an individual and, disability will refer to the restrictions imposed by
society on the impaired individual. It should be noted however, that while this is the
definition adopted by the author, other interpretations and definitions of these terms
will be examined in this chapter. The conclusion will identify the key themes that
emerge from this review of disability theory and indicate their implications for the
study of disability sport policy.

2.2 HISTORY OF DISABILITY

An overview of historical research reveals a variety of perceptions of disability,
illustrated by the diversity of treatments afforded those considered to be impaired.
There is however, according to Barnes (1997) and Gleeson (1997), a lack of
accessible information and a dearth of interested historians which has militated
against the accumulation of a significant body of literature documenting the treatment
of disability and disabled people from a theoretically informed perspective. Gleeson
(1997) contends that many studies do not consider the historical context of disability
and have tended to 'trivialise the past, to the point where it is little more than a
reification of the present' (Gleeson, 1997:185). Furthermore, he goes on to say that,
partly as a consequence of this lack of theoretical rigour, disability studies suffer from
a failure to engage with major theories of social science.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the treatment of disability in certain periods of
history is well documented and its explication provides a worthwhile contribution to
our understanding of recent policy. It has been found, for example, that the profound
effect of Greek civilisation on the culture and values of western civilisation, also
affected attitudes toward disability (Barnes, 1997). According to Barnes (1997),
whilst Greeks were acclaimed for their development of citizenship; women, non-
Greeks and those considered as physically or intellectually inferior were deemed as
subordinate and unworthy of equal status. Moreover, their apparent obsession with
bodily perfection resulted in the infanticide of children with perceived imperfections.
Barnes also reports that in the Roman Games, dwarfs and blind men were forced to
fight women and animals for the amusement of the locals.
It is alleged by Barnes (1997) and Oliver (1990), two academics who have had significant influence on disability politics in the UK, that the historical treatment of disability has had a direct and observable impact upon contemporary ideology and policy. Barnes claims for example, that the treatment of disabled people in the Bible contributes to current Christian ideologies of disability. Apparently, in ancient Judaism, disabled individuals were seen to be unclean, ungodly, a punishment for the sins of the family and evidence of Satan's power over mortals. In the Old Testament the origins of disability are placed with sin and evil. Barnes believes that the New Testament treats disability with the benevolent and patronising attitudes that are commensurate with contemporary Christian doctrines on charity. Indeed as Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) suggest, in England, by the 16th century, the decrease in the wealth of the church and the increase in the 'vagrant' population due to plagues and immigration, led to an increase in the demand for charity. It was during the 16th and 17th century, a period of significant advances in medical science, that medical practitioners challenged the explanation for impairment as a religious or spiritual phenomenon and argued that impairment was the consequence of a biological condition.

According to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999), advances in medical science have been influential in contemporary definitions of disability as it was the medical professionals who were perceived to be the definers of, and providers of solutions to, disability. Definitions of disability had increased in importance during the period of industrialisation as medical professionals identified who was and who was not disabled, and in so doing, decided who could and could not work. Therefore, industrialisation radically affected the treatment of disabled people, their families and community relationships. According to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999), the speed of factory work, the regimented discipline, the complex manual tasks, as well as the high production demands, combined to afford the impaired person a less favourable working environment compared to the more flexible pattern of local domestic or agricultural production. Oliver (1990), in an examination of how production and culture impacts on disability divides this history into three eras. Firstly, he claims that in the feudal era disabled people devised their own ways of farming that were different to the norm. In the second era during the period of industrialisation, impaired people were segregated because those that could not work were considered useless. In the third, modern era, there has, according to Oliver
been a shift away from medical to environmental and social explanations of disability in which the responsibility for disability lies more with the community. Concurring with Oliver’s views on the influence of production on disability, Findlay (1994) suggested that the advent of industrialisation encouraged a social division between those who were and those who were not deemed to be of use in the workplace. British society then began the process of categorising those who were acceptable or normal, and those who were not. Oliver (1990) argues that those not up to the physical and mental standards required for the workplace were considered below normal and were often relegated to a life on welfare benefit. During this era, individual usefulness was defined substantially in terms of economic productiveness.

By the nineteenth century the changes in the demands of work resulted in an increase in those who could not contribute to the economy and added to the potential drain on social welfare. In 1834, the terms of the Poor Law Reform Act required that to receive social benefit as a result of being impaired and thus unable to work, individuals would have to be institutionalised. This promoted the legitimacy of the medical profession in their identification and therapeutic treatment of disabled people. As Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999:19) claim, this encouraged polarised concepts of ‘normal and abnormal, sane and insane, healthy and sick’. These concepts, together with Darwin’s emerging theory of ‘the survival of the fittest’, resulted in a sharp increase in the number of disabled people who were institutionalised. First, asylums for the mentally ill were built, followed by educational establishments for the intellectually impaired, and then for the blind and the deaf. The physical relocation of disabled people away from their families and communities to these institutions, together with a range of professional interventions were aimed, according to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999:19), to help patients cope with normal life and be independent enough not to burden the rest of society. Therefore, the capitalist economy, in which individuals sell their labour in the free market, identifies those that are more likely to produce than others and has, according to Oliver (1990), created or at least contributed to the definition of disability and to the disabling consequences of impairment. The evolution of work culture in Britain has, therefore been, and remains, significant in defining disability.
The Influence of work and culture

Whilst the culture of work and production contributes to the definition of who is and who is not disabled, so does the non-work related culture of a society and its attendant values of impairment. To illustrate this, Oliver (1990) cites the example of a deaf community in which the only disability is the inability to use sign language. In such a community, Oliver claims that those that are deaf are not disabled and segregated from their hearing peers due to their impairment, because they are able to use the accepted means of communication - sign language. Thus, it is argued that disability is also culturally determined, because whilst impairment is static, disability is dependent upon the culture in which the impaired person lives. To continue with the example of deafness, whilst it is the same biomedical condition in one country as it is in another, the consequence of that deafness is culturally determined by, for example, the importance of the ability to work, the medical science available and the values that a community attaches to deafness. As Oliver (1990) contends, societies attach different values to impairment so that, whilst the ability to work may be significant in some countries’ definition of disability, in others, disablement may be caused more by non-work related culture. In Africa for example, the Masai believe that the most disabling condition is the failure to have children (Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999) and in China, before the revolution, the ideal foot size for a woman was just three inches, but the crippling effects of foot-binding was not considered to be as disabling as the social consequences of larger feet (Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999).

It is crucial, according to Biklen (1987), to examine the cultural meaning of disability if disability policies are to be understood. Indeed as Biklen asserts, social policies can often exacerbate the oppressive stereotypical perceptions of disability, because policy makers may be a part of the culture that created them. Moreover, Biklen (1987) suggests that to make substantive changes to policies and services that purport to serve disabled people necessitates a redefinition of disability. Therefore, whilst the ability to be economically productive is significant in determining disability, Oliver (1990) stresses that production alone does not determine disability. It is, he suggests, only significant within the context of a particular culture or society. However, as Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) assert, as the ability to carry out manual tasks has been given increased importance in many cultures, biomedical impairment has become the dominant definition of disability. Thus as Oliver claims, disability can be
said to be 'culturally produced through the relationship between the mode of production and the central values of the society concerned' (Oliver, 1990:23).

2.3 TWENTIETH CENTURY EXPLANATIONS OF DISABILITY

The consolidation of the medical explanation of disability

As the previous section has illustrated, definitions are important, as the words that we use to define an object attach meanings and values which can affect our behaviour toward it. The following section will consider the key theories and definitions of disability in the twentieth century.

Subsequent to the explanations of disability as a religious or spiritual phenomenon, attempts to define disability have used a variety of sociological, psychological and socio-psychological theories, such as functionalism, deviance, Marxism, feminism and postmodernism (Bickenbach, Chatterji, Badley and Ustun, 1999). However, Bickenbach et al (1999) suggest that a suitable theory must be able to provide a universal and workable model that can be used by welfare services, medical officers and disabled people themselves. For example, the variety of definitions, criteria and boundaries that have been drawn around disability thus far have resulted in a wide variety of estimates in the number of disabled people in Britain (Marks, 1997) which has consequently affected the type of services offered.

Although there is a wealth of literature that discusses definitions and theories of disability, contemporary authors of disability studies consistently claim that definitions of disability fall into one of the following two categories - medical or social. The medical model or personal tragedy theory embraces those definitions or perceptions that suggest disability is an impairment owned by an individual, which results in a loss or limitation of function. Arguably, the most important post Second World War definition of disability was introduced in 1980 by the World Health Organisation (WHO) which combined their classification of disease with one that considered disability, impairment and handicap. Within WHO's International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps (ICIDH), the following key definitions were detailed:
Impairment: Any loss or abnormality of, psychological, physiological or anatomical structure or function (WHO, 1980:27).

Disability: Any restriction or lack of ability (resulting from impairment) to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being (WHO, 1980:28).

Handicap: A disadvantage for a given individual, resulting from an impairment or disability that limits or prevents the fulfilment of a role (depending on age sex, social and cultural factors) for that individual (WHO, 1980:29).

The World Health Organisation's definitions are regarded as key in the recent history of disability (Oliver, 1986; Abberley, 1987; Oliver, 1990; Stalker, Baron, Riddell & Wilkinson, 1999) as, according to Oliver (1990), it became securely entrenched in social policy and manifested itself in professional practice. For example, the Office for Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS) used this definition in its surveys of disabled people in Britain during the late 1980s, the purpose of which was to establish the prevalence of impairment and to gauge the type of welfare support needed. As Marks (1997) suggests, the ICIDH has been widely used by policy makers to assess the need for treatment, services and benefits. Moreover, according to Bickenbach et al (1999) whilst the original publication of the ICIDH incorporated a social understanding of disability, by the time it was translated into thirteen languages and used within a variety of health, vocational, and research based contexts, the version operationalised at grass roots level often focused on the medical condition of the individual and paid little attention to the individual's social context.

The ICIDH definitions consider impairment to be a deviation from a bio-medical norm and disability to be the social consequence of impairment which, as Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) contend, focuses attention on the parts of the body that do not function properly and what those individuals can and cannot do as a result of the impairment. The problem with this definition according to key academics and disabled activists such as Abberley (1987), Oliver (1990), Barnes (1998), Shakespeare and Watson (1997) and Borsay (1997), is that the focus on 'having something wrong' implies the need for professionals to impose their own priorities on the lifestyles of
disabled people, and often relegates other personal or social needs to second place. Essentially, Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) suggest that the ICIDH definitions identify impairment as the cause of both disability and handicap and this assumes that the only way that disability can be overcome is through medical intervention and rehabilitative therapy. Oliver (1990), Stone (1995) and Abberley (1987) agree and criticise the ICIDH for its presumption that the diagnosis of, and solution to, disability lay mainly in medical knowledge and practice. They claim that the WHO definition and the medicalised model to which it subscribes, renders the impaired person as passive, and disability as the defining characteristic. As Bickenbach et al (1999) suggest, this encourages the view that people are disadvantaged because of their impairment alone. In defence of the ICIDH, Marks (1997) points out that it attempts to acknowledge a social approach to disability but still gives priority to biomedical factors (Marks, 1997).

This medical view of disability reflects a perspective which places responsibility for disability with the individual and is laden with able bodied values of ‘ablebodiedness’. This assumes that those considered to be impaired should strive to be as able bodied as possible. As Oliver contends, this view fails to appreciate the cultural relativism of normality and thus the culturally specific nature of disability. Nor, he suggests, does it recognise the impact that the environment and, in particular significant others, can play in the lives of those deemed to be impaired. For example, the ICIDH would not be able to identify whether any changes in the ability of an individual to perform a task were the result of an improvement in the medical condition or the social environment in which the impaired individual lives. Nor does it recognise that impairment is not randomly distributed. There are, for example, more people who are impaired as a result of a road traffic accident in Europe than in the third world. Thus, the ICIDH-based perception of disability, Oliver (1990) argues, provides little opportunity to consider the role of society in the construction of disability. Concurring with this criticism Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) claim that according to these definitions, the social context in which the impairment exists plays no part in the disabling process. Instead, they suggest it is a static or neutral factor that cannot be changed in a way that affects disability. Oliver (1990:5) claims that in attempting to offer a ‘concrete’ definition of disability, the ICIDH has reduced disability to a ‘static state’, which violates ‘its situational and experiential component’.
According to Borsay (1997) and Abberley (1987) the treatment of disabled people has typically been informed by medical ideologies of disability, in which practitioners have sought solutions to problems within the individual without considering the wider societal context in which the individual lives. Indeed, a consistent criticism of the medical definition and the services it leads to, is that it assumes that disabled people wish to be ‘physically whole’ or ‘normal’ so that they fit into the predominantly non-disabled mainstream society (Begum, 1996 and Swain and French, 2000). This assumption is illustrated by the medical profession’s encouragement for mobility impaired patients to walk no matter how painful or slow, rather than use a quicker and more comfortable medium of travel such as a wheelchair, or a speech therapist’s inclination to solve the problems of a stutterer by focussing exclusively on the stutterer’s mouth patterns without considering the possibility of a parent’s influence or the stress imposed by peers.

According to Barnes (1990) this obsession with normality and the assumption that able-bodiedness is the embodiment of normality, is embedded in western culture and in the medical profession’s constant attempts to assert control over disabled people. In an analysis of non-disabled people’s response to disability, Hahn (1988) claims that non-disabled people are nervous of disabled people because the disabled person’s appearance or behaviour deviates markedly from the predominant human form that they are used to. He suggests that it is typical for us to shun those individuals who have what we perceive to be unattractive bodily attributes. Hahn goes on to say that our aesthetic anxiety is compounded by an existential anxiety which encourages us to feel relieved that we do not have a particular medical condition and fear the deterioration in our own bodies. Moreover, as Stone (1995) suggests, the increasing interest with bodily perfection and visual appearance is not just oppressive to those who are considered as disabled, but is also oppressive towards the non-disabled as it alienates us all ‘from our bodies’. It seems therefore that western culture treats disability as a condition to be avoided, encouraging us to deny visible differences and aspire to a particular type of human body.

According to Barnes (1997) this aspiration to ablebodiedness has been promulgated by the medical profession, which has been instrumental in the oppression and social control of the impaired as it was the role of medical doctors and psychologists to define who could and who could not work. Indeed there seems to be a general
consensus amongst contemporary academics that the dominant perception of
disability is incorporated in the medical model and that disabled people have been
oppressed by the medical professions (Barton, 1986; 1996; Abberley, 1991; Oliver,
1996; Marks, 1997).

In summary, a review of the literature indicates that, at least until the 1980s, the
typical definition of disability was as a medical and individualised problem. Such a
definition and conceptualisation of disability was based on notions of normality or
function with little or no recognition of other social, cultural, environmental or
personal factors such as gender (Morris, 1991; Begum, 1992; 1996; Lloyd, 1992;
Oliver, 1990; Abberley, 1991). These perceptions of disability are, according to
Barton (1996) and Branson and Miller (1989), endemic in contemporary social policy
and systematically oppress those who do not meet models and standards of
ablebodiedness and physical beauty expressed in the dominant ideology in the western
world. According to Stone (1995) and Marks (1997), when definitions fail to take into
account the wider aspects of disability they are often de-personalised and insulting,
treating disabled people as unfortunate, dependant, helpless and pitiable.

From a medical to a social explanation of disability

Discontent with the domination of an individualised, medical definition of disability,
led disabled people to form organisations which challenged what many perceived to
be the oppressive consequences of these definitions. Disabled people became critical
of those professionals whose aim was to use corrective surgery and therapy to make
them 'normal' and began to develop alternative theories of disability (Marks, 1997).

According to Soder (1989), there have been at least three social rather than medical
approaches to disability. The first, he suggests, is an 'epidemiological' approach
which sees disability as an abnormality of the individual, the causes of which could
include social factors. The second approach considers disability to be the outcome of
the interaction between the impaired individual and the environment. Different to the
epidemiological view, this 'adaptability approach' does not see disability as an
intrinsic personal characteristic. Notwithstanding that both of these perspectives
attempt to incorporate the environment into a view of disability, they still subscribe to
a predominantly medical perspective with the individual as the owner of disablement.
The third perspective, however, is based on Goffman’s normalisation theory and views disability as being socially constructed by our values and beliefs (Goffman, 1963). Whilst earlier versions attempted to redefine the hitherto medicalised definition of disability, it was not until Goffman’s seminal work on stigmatization and normalization in 1963, that disability was considered at least by some, as a creation of the environment rather than an individual problem (Chappell, 1997; Borsay, 1997; Soder, 1989). Goffman’s normalisation theory promotes the notion that, instead of focusing on organising our environment in a way that suits everyone, we typically try to change those we have labelled as ‘special’ (Goffman, 1963), and who do not fit the predominant mainstream or normal society. He proposed that stigmas were inflicted on those who transgressed the cultural norm. This labelling of those who do not fit the culturally determined norm, Goffman claimed, leads to an institutionalised process of segregation and stigmatisation. Of the three approaches that Soder (1989) reviews, the social constructionist approach to disability became the dominant paradigm employed by disability theorists and activists to criticise the traditionally oppressive treatment that they believed medical definitions lead to.

The American campaign organisation, the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) offered an alternative to the individual medical theory of disability which had become so prevalent in the social policies of the western world. Making a clear distinction between impairment and disability, UPIAS suggested that to be impaired is to lack ‘part or all of a limb, or have a defective limb, organ or mechanism of the body’. Disability, however, is the ‘disadvantage or restriction of activity caused by contemporary social organisation which takes little or no account of people who have physical impairments and excludes them from participation in the mainstream of activities’ (UPIAS, 1976 cited in Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999:28). This alternative definition acknowledges that, based upon a biomedical norm, some individuals could be deemed to have an impairment but claim that the cause of disability is entirely the responsibility of society. Whilst the early social definitions were dissimilar because they drew upon a range of sociological, psychological and social psychological explanations of disability, they typically agreed on a rejection of the medical model of disability (Bickenbach, Chatterji, Badley and Ustun 1999). Bickenbach et al (1999) hold that at this stage there was agreement amongst academics and disabled activists that while impairment was important to disability, it was no more salient than the characteristics and culture of
the society that imposed disadvantages and restrictions on impaired people. As well as
language and culture, Marks (1997) contends that the built environment, the social
hierarchy, technology, legislation, attitudes, images, and aesthetics are all factors
which shape disability. For example, Cooke, Daone and Morris (2000) argue that
contemporary media portrays disabled people in films and cartoons as evil, bitter and
threatening and in documentaries and "soaps" as victims, heroes or medical freaks.
Disabled people, they argue, are rarely newsreaders or television presenters.
Therefore, according to the UPIAS definition, the media provides an example of how
people with impairments are prevented from full participation in society.

The issue at the heart of the debate on definitions of disability is that of causation and
responsibility. Where the WHO's 1980 definition places responsibility for disability
on the individual, the UPIAS definition suggests that disability is the imposition of
social and environmental restrictions and limitations on the individual. However, as
Hahn (1988) asserts, ultimately, it is not possible to examine impairment outside of
social relationships, representations and built environments. For example, the access
to buildings and the availability of education and communication technology are
fundamentally determined by policy and have a significant impact on the functional
demands of a human being. Marks (1997) goes on to say that we should see
impairment not as fundamental but as just one factor in the social construction of
disability. Authors such as Marks (1997) have consistently pointed out that this social
model of disability does not negate the importance of medicine and medical
intervention where appropriate and desirable, but it does reject the notion of disability
as a purely medical condition necessitating medical treatment.

This re-definition is based on the notion that society disables people by limiting their
worth in society placing, what Findlay (1994) describes as, an additional burden on
impairment, which unnecessarily isolates the impaired from the rest of society. Barnes
(1997) considers that additional burdens, such as negative public attitudes, are the
most significant barrier to disabled people's meaningful inclusion into mainstream
community life, and believes that it is the environmental and social restrictions that
exclude people with perceived impairments from mainstream society. According to
Marks (1997), it was disabled activists in Britain who championed the view that these
restrictions were additional, and not natural, consequences of impairment.
Oliver (1990) illustrates the significance of definitions for policy and practice, by reference to the difference between the questions posed by the Office of Population Censuses and Survey (OPCS). Oliver suggests that the (OPCS) questions were underpinned by a medical model of disability, and alternative questions underpinned by a socially constructed definition of disability would be more appropriate. Oliver suggests that rather than asking 'can you tell me what is wrong with you?' and 'what complaint causes you difficulty in holding, gripping or turning things?', which embrace an individualised theory of disability in which the individual's impairment is the cause of the disability, an alternative approach is suggested that takes account of the potential of the environment to act as a disabling influence on the impaired individual's life (Oliver, 1992:104). He goes on to propose that suitable alternative questions would include: 'can you tell me what is wrong with society?' and 'what defects in the design of everyday equipment like jars, bottles and tins cause you difficulty in holding, gripping or turning them?' These questions acknowledge the role that the environment plays in disabling people.

**Disabled People as a Minority Group**

The social model of disability is not dissimilar to the minority group approach previously employed by other groups to challenge what they perceive to be a dominant culture that excludes them (Bocock, 1987). The social model encourages the view that, similar to blacks or homosexuals, disabled people are a minority population oppressed by the predominant male, ablebodied, heterosexual hegemony and its concomitant perceptions of normality and abnormality (Oliver, 1990; Deegan, 1985; Morris, 1993). While the implication of impairment may change according to culture, explanations of disability have shifted from individual, personal problems to environmental, public issues. The shift recognises the socio-political construction of disability and the capacity of the social environment to oppress people with impairments in a similar way to women, gays and black people.

Social oppression, as an explanation of disability, implies that disabled people are oppressed and wider capitalist society benefits, thus it has been contended that disabled people have been subjected to the same processes of social labelling, stereotyping, stigmatising, prejudice, discrimination and segregation that have plagued racial and ethnic minorities (Hahn, 1988). However, the experience of
discrimination is not the same for all disabled people. For example, whilst women and racial minorities may be similarly oppressed to disabled people, disabled women, have been largely ignored in policy and research and suffer from a double discrimination (Lloyd, 1992; Morris, 1993; Fine and Asch, 1985). While disabled men can aspire to fill a socially useful role, disabled women are perceived as inadequate for an economically productive role, and also incapable of assuming the sexual or maternal roles that non-disabled women can adopt.

Perhaps the most significant similarity between the social theories of disability and social theories concerning for example, gender or race, is that they empower those who consider themselves as oppressed, to group together and ‘fight against’ the oppression that unites them (Hahn, 1988). Thus, disabled people, similar to other minority groups have grouped together to challenge what they perceive to be the dominant hegemony. However, according to Humphrey (1999) campaigners for equal rights that work on behalf of disability groups and ethnic minority groups, typically adopt an isolationist approach and do not necessarily accept the commonality in the oppression that they face. They do not work collectively to challenge the dominant male, ablebodied hegemony that disempowers them. Moreover, according to Lukes (1974), governments prefer to divide society into groups that compete for better status.

**Empowerment**

Whilst Lukes (1997) may take a neo-Marxist view, in which groups such as disabled people will always be considered as lower on the social stratum, Oliver (1996) contends that the shift in understanding of disability has illustrated the relationship between the individual and society, and has argued for the importance of citizenship and the role that empowerment can play in challenging dominant hegemony. However, Oliver claims that the contemporary practice of empowerment tends to assume that individuals with power can somehow devolve this power to those who were hitherto powerless. Oliver (1996), Morris (1997) and Corbett (1997) believe, however, that empowerment cannot be given or taken away but may be obtained by those who seek it. For example, disabled people were collectively empowered when they grouped together to challenge the definitions, policies and practices that oppressed them. Morris (1997) goes on to say that the most efficient way to empower
disabled people is to dismiss the ideology of caring, because the practice of caring in the twentieth century has disempowered disabled people. Whilst recognising that some disabled people may need the physical support of others, they are only independent and empowered, rather than cared for, if they have control over the help that is provided. Ultimately, Morris (1997) suggests, disabled people are trying to break down the stereotypes of being dependent, grateful, demanding and undeserving, so that they can establish their status as citizens.

2.4 A BIO-PSYCHOSOCIAL EXPLANATION OF DISABILITY

Whilst there may be growing support for the social theory of disability among both academics and rights campaigners, academics such as Hughes and Paterson (1997) and Shakespeare and Watson (1997) have debated the need to reconsider the social model of disability.

Shakespeare and Watson (1997) argue that without a clear distinction between disability and impairment, researchers, organisations and practitioners will continue to individualise disability. Whilst they acknowledge the significant shift towards a social theory of disability, they suggest that it is easy to overestimate its impact. Shakespeare and Watson (1997) allude to contemporary media coverage to exemplify the individualised medical explanation of disability that is still prevalent. In a justification for continuing to use the social model of disability Shakespeare and Watson (1997: 289) state:

'the social model originally under-played the importance of impairment in disabled peoples lives, in order to develop a strong argument about social structures and processes'

Whilst accepting the benefits of intellectual discourse, Shakespeare and Watson (1997) stress that the significance of the differences in preferred theory within the disability movement are negligible compared to the ignorance and hostility with which the social model is greeted in the wider community. Notwithstanding the need to debate further the nuances within the definition of social oppression, they argue that the disability movement needs to concentrate its efforts on the acceptance of the
social model and the changes to policies and practices that its implementation necessitates.

Social theories of disability explain disability in terms of stigma, that is a marking or branding of certain individuals who have transgressed the norms and values of a part of society. However, such theories are criticised for denying the significance of impairment. Therefore, it has been argued that disability needs to be perceived as a relationship between impairment, social restrictions and meaning. Barnes (1997) for example, while sympathetic towards the view of disability as a social phenomenon, argues for the need to establish a new disability theory that is not grounded in able bodied presumptions, and includes both environmental factors as well as personal experience.

Hughes and Paterson (1997) however, whilst applauding the shift from medical and individual theory to social and environmental explanations of disability, disagree with Shakespeare and Watson (1997), believing that Oliver’s (1990) application of the oppression theory is rife with ambiguity. They call for a new theoretical perspective that serves the interests of disabled people. In agreement with Abberley (1987), Hughes and Paterson (1997) accept the success in shifting the debate about disability from biomedical dominated agendas to discourses about politics and citizenship but suggest that, contrary to the beliefs of Shakespeare and Watson (1997), there is a need to reposition the distinction between disability and impairment. Controversy surrounds this suggestion as the simple distinction between medical and social theories of disability has been at the heart of the disability movement. Hughes and Paterson (1997) consider this a necessary endeavour, however, because they believe that the current separation of body and culture is untenable. They claim that impairment is as central to the lives of disabled people as the oppression which may result from society’s treatment of their impairment. The social model has, they claim, reduced impairment of the body to a discursive space, inappropriate to intellectual discourse within the social model.

Hughes and Paterson (1997) suggest that both the medical and the social models consider bodily impairment in similar ways. That is, as discrete, physical and inert, ‘pulled apart’ from the social consequences of the impairment. They argue therefore, that impairment is more than a medical issue unrelated to the social world in which
the individual lives, and must be repositioned within the social theory of disability. Contradicting Oliver's (1990) analysis of impairment as merely a description of the body, Hughes and Paterson (1997) believe that if disabled people are to challenge effectively and deconstruct the political and economic structures which oppress and exclude them, they need to embrace body politics and accept the significance of the individual within the wider sociopolitical environment (Abberley, 1987; Stone, 1995; Branson and Miller, 1989). Crow (1992; 1996) stresses that a review of the social model is required, as it should include rather than exclude the experience of 'impairment'. The current over-emphasis on social and environmental explanations of disability is, according to Shakespeare (1996), out of fear that an admission of impairment as a biological construct will confirm society’s assumption that disability is a medical 'condition' or 'personal tragedy'. It could be suggested that the social model fails to acknowledge that the experience of a perceived impairment is central to disabled people’s lives and, according to Crow (1992:9), the 'best route to creating a world which includes us [disabled people] all, can only be achieved if impairment is integrated into the social model'. However, it cannot be denied that the social model (which never attempted to incorporate the individual experience of disability) has enabled disabled people to assume a collective identity that facilitates a challenge to their subordination in society (Oliver, 1990; 1992).

Whilst disabled people’s experiences may need to be considered in future theories of disability, the physicality of 'body politics’ may indicate the exclusion of certain disabled groups. According to Chappell (1997) while it is important to acknowledge the significant intellectual and political contribution made by the social model of disability, it has systematically excluded people with learning disabilities from the analysis. An illustration of Chappell’s (1997) argument is provided by Oliver’s (1996) definition of disability, which alludes to a society that takes 'little or no account of people who have physical impairment’, and makes no reference to other impairments. Research has been informed (almost exclusively) by the experiences of physically and sensorally disabled people (Chappell, 1997). Chappell (1997) believes such exclusivity is divisive and calls for a social model that acknowledges and embraces the experiences of all disabled people.

In recognition of the concerns surrounding the need for a redefinition of the 1980 version, WHO introduced a revised International Classification of Impairment,
Disability and Handicap, (ICIDH-2) in 2000 (World Health Organisation, 2001). The ICIDH-2 took account of the criticisms made of the earlier definition, particularly by disabled people, activists and academics, and attempted to incorporate both the individual and the social models of disability by distinguishing between those limitations to activity which are best dealt with by medical intervention and those that are the cause and subject of social and environmental barriers. In 1993 WHO began the process of revising the ICIDH, and after collaboration with Holland, France, North America and the Nordic countries, draft proposals were produced in 1996 and again in 1997. It is notable that the United Kingdom was not included in the process despite Bickenbach et al's (1999) acknowledgement of authors such as Barnes and Oliver as instrumental in linking the theorising of disability with political action.

Following consultation with professionals, policy makers and disabled people, the ICIDH-2 was launched as a trial in 2000. The ICIDH-2 purports to embody a new biopsychosocial model which synthesises both the medical and the social models of disability. That is to say, this new model recognises that each aspect of disablement is an 'interaction between intrinsic features of the individual and that person's social and physical environment' (Bickenbach et al, 1999:1183). This model allows a disability to be determined under the classifications of the body, the person in context, and the person’s social and physical environment. The ICIDH-2 calls these three dimensions; 'impairments', 'activity limitations' and 'participation restrictions'. Bickenbach et al (1999) claim that this model disabuses people of the notion that impairment is necessarily the prime disabler. Moreover they contend that the three dimensions have equal status. That is to say, just as a medical intervention such as rehabilitative therapy may be the best solution to some impairments, some restrictions to participation may be ameliorated by modification of the physical and social environment. Whilst it is likely that an impairment may lead to an activity limitation and a restriction to participation, the model does not assume that this is the case. It is, therefore, inaccurate, according to Bickenbach et al (1999), to consider disablement in isolation from human functioning, and as much as possible seems to use positive or at least neutral language. Furthermore, to generate a universal approach to disability, the ICIDH-2 uses the 'full participation' in society that is normally enjoyed by those without impairment or disabilities as a guiding principle, and as such can also include those who may not have an impairment but are prevented from full participation due to others who may be perceived as 'at risk'. Bickenbach et al (1999) recognise,
however, that the ICIDH-2 may have a negative effect on the ability of the social model to act as tool for political action, as it may undermine the unifying experience of oppression that the social model assumes.

In May 2001 at the World Health Assembly, a further development of the ICIDH-2 was published. Following a series of the field trials, the ICIDH-2 was amended and the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) was launched (WHO, 2001). The overall purpose of the ICF was to 'provide a unified and standard language and framework for the description of health and health related states' (WHO, 2001:3). More specifically it aimed to provide a scientific basis for studying health and establish a common language. It also sought to permit comparisons of data across countries and contexts, and provide a coding scheme for health information systems. It differs from the previous systems in that the terms 'impairment', 'disability' and 'handicap' have now been replaced by just two domains: 1) Body Functions and Structures and 2) Activities and Participation. As stated in the text:

'Functioning is an umbrella term encompassing all body functions, activities and participation; similarly disability serves as an umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations or participation restrictions.' (WHO, 2001:3).

Figure 1 provides a useful overview of the ICF and how policy makers, for example, may use it to establish the extent of functioning or disability as well as the extent to which the environment is acting as a facilitator or a barrier to the individual. In this sense the ICF has confirmed a move away from the WHO's original 1980s 'consequences of disease' perspective, to 'components of health' as the criteria for classification. The ICF has two parts and each has two components:

Part 1. Functioning and Disability
  a) Body Function and Structures
  b) Activities and Participation

Part 2. Contextual Factors
  c) Environmental Factors
  d) Personal Factors
The ICF and supporters of its principles, such as Bickenbach et al (1999), claim that the ICF is not just about disabled people, ‘it is about all people’ (WHO, 2001:7). However, the main criticism of the ICIDH-2 and the ICF that followed, is that they continue to label those considered different to the social norm, and, therefore perpetuate the stigmatising effects of labelling (Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999). Indeed whilst Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) acknowledge the improvement, they still criticised the early drafts of the ICIDH-2 for perpetuating disability as a natural consequence of impairment.

The discussion that surrounds definitions of disability becomes particularly salient in the context of the contemporary debates on genetics, eugenics and the potential role that science can play in the screening and amelioration of impairment. A brief overview of the history of eugenics and disability reveals a range of medical interventions employed to prevent the birth of abnormal embryos. For example,
although 'class and race biased' and founded on poor science, the sterilization of women with 'feeble minds' became commonplace in the USA (Biklen, 1987). There was an inevitable decline in the study and support of eugenics following Nazi Germany's attempted annihilation of the Jews and people with disabilities during the Second World War (Biklen, 1987). Since then, the study of eugenics, genetics and disability has been the subject of ongoing political debate. Indeed the advances in medical science have continued to fuel moral and ethical controversies relating to the pregnancy, birth and termination of biomedically impaired people. Recent cases in which parents have had the opportunity to choose which embryo will be born has brought into sharp reality these hitherto hypothetical controversies and highlighted the potential to 'genetically cleanse' the human population.

It has been argued that it is desirable to eliminate impairment and encourage abortion in cases of foetal abnormality. However, organisations of disabled people are concerned that this may lead to practices akin to the Nazi eugenicist's selective culling of the impaired. There are four main concerns. First, using Goffman's normalisation theory, it can be argued, that whilst some congenital impairments may be eradicated (as some already have such as rubella), society will continue to disable people who are perceived to transgress the cultural norm. Second, the disability movement, according to Shakespeare (1998), would contest the notion that a genetic variation can necessarily be considered as an impairment. Third, Shakespeare also argues that those born deaf or with Downs Syndrome or with cleft palette, for example, whilst impaired according to the biomedical norm, may have no other medical condition, and are in no way diseased. Fourthly, that the medicalised approach to genetics does not distinguish between impairment as a biological condition and disability as a social construction preferring to blame all the consequences of impairment on the individual. As a result, the medical model and the scientific community that subscribes to it fails to recognise that the social consequences of impairment can be ameliorated through social policy.

Whilst Shakespeare suggests that focusing on the disabling barriers imposed upon impairment may provide a powerful argument for the selective screening out of impairment, this position seems compromised, if impairment is discounted as insignificant in disabled people's lives. He argues that 'disabled people experience the problems of both impairment and disability' (Shakespeare, 1998:671). Impairment is
not, however, the disabled person’s defining characteristic because everyone experiences impairment to some degree at some time in their lives. That is to say, it is not easy to clearly distinguish between those who are and who are not impaired. Moreover, genetic disorders that cause impairment are produced through the interaction of several genes, which are affected by environmental conditions. Thus, according to the arguments of Shakespeare and those that concur with this particular view of disability, a more adequate model of genetics needs to be developed to account for both the genotype and ‘multi-factorial’ understanding of living with impairment and disability. Consistent criticisms of academics and activists indicate that the appropriate decision about individual and societal screening can only be made if those people directly affected by genetic conditions are listened to. It seems to be the case, however, that whether it be on matters relating to special education (Barton, 1993b), welfare rights (Oliver, 1990) or genetic engineering (Shakespeare, 1998), there is a systematic exclusion of disabled people from the policy-making process.

2.5 CONCLUSION

There are five key points that emerge from this review of literature on disability. First the review reveals that disability is an intensely contested term. Disability has been and continues to be used to describe different phenomena and thus can include and exclude different groups of people. For example, the term disability can be used by one organisation or individual to mean something very different to another organisation or individual. Moreover, not only may two organisations use the term disability to mean different things, they may also attach different values to that same term and hold different ideological views of disabled people’s place and role in society.

A second point highlighted by this review is the culturally specific nature of the concept of disability. In other words definitions of disability are determined by a society’s culture and thus disability can have a different meaning in one country or one era to another. Thus the culture of a country or community plays a significant role in determining what disability is and who is and who is not disabled.

Third, although there is no universally accepted definition of disability, there has been a gradual broadening of the concept of disability over the last 30 years. The western
world has shifted toward a greater acknowledgement of the social context in which
disability is created and maintained. This has blurred the boundaries between who is
and who is not disabled and consequently it is less clear who is included and who is
excluded from mainstream society and, academics and activists in Britain continue to
disagree on which definition of disability provides the most political leverage and best
serves the interests of disabled people.

The fourth point that has emerged from this review focuses on the exclusion of
disabled people from decision making processes, and has particular relevance to this
study. The broadening of the definition of disability led to a shift of emphasis in
Britain during the 1980s, toward an appreciation that people were disabled from
participation in society by the environmental and social restrictions more than by their
own individual impairment. This shift of emphasis was the result of a political
movement of disabled people that emerged to lobby for improved rights and services.
In the last twenty years the campaigning activities of disabled people has led to
significant impact on social policy in the UK. However, policies by central
government, local authorities and charities are largely made on behalf of rather than
by or with the direct involvement of disabled people. A fuller discussion of disabled
peoples' involvement in disability policy-making is contained within the next chapter
and the extent to which this is mirrored in disability sport policy is examined in the
case studies.

Fifth, these key points have significant implications for disability sport. Indeed, it
would be surprising, to say the least, if the tension, debates and disputes over the
conceptualisation of disability, the relationship between disability and impairment and
the relative merits of the medicalised and various social constructionist models of
disability were not replicated or reflected within organisations concerned with
disability sport. For example, organisations may hold different beliefs on what
disability is and how disabled people may be best served. It is plausible, for example,
for an officer in a mainstream national governing body to have the belief that those
who are significantly different from the biomedical norm cannot expect to be catered
for by the ordinary or normal providers and are best served by discrete and separate
organisations. Alternatively, an officer could consider disability to be a biomedical
deficiency and themselves as the benevolent helpers of disabled people, providing few
opportunities for participation wherever and whenever feasible. In yet another
mainstream sports organisation, officers may believe disability to be a socially constructed phenomenon and accept that their policies are typically discriminatory and that it is their responsibility to make whatever changes are necessary to ensure that disabled people can access all of those services hitherto only enjoyed by non-disabled people.

This review of literature provides a sharp insight into contemporary understandings of disability and offers a useful theoretical framework to assist in the explanation of the extent to which sport organisations in England serve disabled people. Moreover, this appreciation of disability theory will help to explain the policies and ideologies of, and relationships between, those sports organisations that purport to be developing opportunities for disabled people.
CHAPTER THREE

DISABILITY POLICY AND SPORTS POLICY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The review of disability theory contained in the previous chapter provided an important element of the context for this study. However, in order to understand fully the development of disability sport policy it is also important to have an awareness and an appreciation of the two most closely related policy areas: disability policy and sport policy. This chapter examines the evolution of disability policy and sport policy in England and identifies the key characteristics of these policy areas. The concluding section of this chapter indicates the extent to which disability policy and sport policy respectively, affected the development of disability sport policy. This provides a prelude to the following chapter that examines various approaches to policy analysis.

3.2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF DISABILITY POLICY

In conjunction with the earlier examination of Disability Theory in Chapter 2 this discussion provides a critical analysis of the evolution of disability policy in England. Although the study of social policy has a long history, emerging as a distinct field of study following the significant interventions of the state in the perceived social problems of the early twentieth century (Williams, 1989), it is only recently that social policy analysts acknowledged the significance of class, race, gender and disability for social policy. However, far from being simply a marginal issue relevant to a small minority, Oliver (1990) argues that disability is a key social and policy issue affecting the whole of Western society. According to Oliver (1990), similar to both the feminist movement and black struggles for equality, disability emerged as a social issue following the reinterpretation of disability ‘from a personal to a political experience’ (Oliver, 1990:166). What follows is an historical account of the emergence of disability as a social and political issue.
According to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) and Barton and Oliver (1997) the English Poor Law Act passed in 1601 signalled 'the first official recognition of the need for state intervention in the lives of people with perceived impairments' (Barton and Oliver, 1997: 17). Disabled people were considered to be among the 'deserving poor' and thus entitled to public assistance. However, in the early 19th century the government became concerned that defining poverty as the 'inadequacy or unwillingness to work' (Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999: 125) encouraged a dependency on public resources. This concern prompted the passage of the Poor Law Amendment Act in 1834 which was introduced to alleviate the financial burden resulting from the 1601 Act. The 1834 Act stressed how public welfare assistance led to dependence on the hard working taxpayer and emphasised the need for families to take more responsibility for the care of disabled people. As a consequence of the 1834 Act, support from the government was restricted to those who would otherwise have fallen into abject poverty. Those disabled people that could not or would not be cared for by the family were located in dedicated institutions.

While it is arguable that the most significant developments in the history of disability policy and, in particular, the political movement of disabled people may have taken place during the 1980s, the origins of these shifts lay in the activities of organisations for the deaf and for the blind in the late 1800s and early 1900s. In 1920 the National League of the Blind and Disabled organised marches of blind workers in Britain and campaigned against charities for blind people which according to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999: 159), were perceived as being staffed by 'inefficient, self serving bureaucrats rather than blind people themselves'. The campaigns by the National League of the Blind and Disabled, in close co-operation with the Trades Union Congress, led to the Blind Workers Act in 1920 which gave financial assistance to, and provided better working conditions for, the many blind people who worked in poorly paid industrial environments. For Campbell and Oliver (1996) the Blind Workers Act was the forerunner of future welfare policies such as the Disabled Persons Act of 1944. A chronology of key developments in disability policy prior to the 1940s is shown in Table 1 and provides a summary of the key landmarks in the early history of disability policy.
Table 1 Landmarks in Disability Policy: Pre 1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>English Poor Law Act</td>
<td>First intervention of government in the lives of disabled people. Disabled people seen as part of the 'deserving poor' and provided with assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Poor Law Amendment Act</td>
<td>Disabled people seen as a drain on public resources. The Act encouraged families to take more responsibility for their welfare. Only when necessary were disabled people cared for in segregated institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Blind Workers Act</td>
<td>Provided financial assistance for unemployed blind people and blind people in low paid employment. The Act followed a march by blind workers in London protesting against low wages and poor working conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1944 The Disabled Persons Act

Prompted by the lobbying activities of the National League of the Blind and Disabled, policies in the 1940s encouraged the access of disabled people to employment and education. The Disabled Persons Act was passed in 1944 to provide reasonable access to employment for disabled people. The Act encouraged the employment of disabled people by setting up a "disabled persons' employment register, a nationwide disablement resettlement scheme, a specialised employment placement service and a duty on employers of twenty or more workers to employ a 3% quota of registered disabled people" (Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999: 113). The Disabled Persons Act reflected a medical ideology of disability which placed responsibility for disability on the individual and which characterised disabled people as 'useless' workers who should be grateful recipients of government intervention. Not surprisingly, according to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999: 159) "déspite all this activity, through the post 1945 period, wages in workshops for the blind and other disabled workers remained disproportionately low".

The intervention of the government in employment opportunities for disabled people was mirrored in education by the 1944 Education Act which encouraged local authorities to place disabled children in ordinary or mainstream schools. However, it was not until the 1978 Warnock Report on Special Educational Needs that this became more than a political aspiration and not until 2001 that a law was passed to protect disabled people against discrimination in education (Warnock, 1978).
1944 Education Act and the mainstreaming policies that it promoted are of particular interest to this study of disability sport as the shift of responsibility for the welfare of disabled people from segregated institutions to mainstream providers is reflected in the evolution of disability sport policy and will be discussed in more detail in Chapter six.

Subsequent to the Second World War, an interdepartmental committee established by William Beveridge, to investigate a policy that insured against illness and impairment, produced a report which laid the foundations for the development of welfare policy for the rest of the century (Beveridge, 1942). The post war welfare state was developed to co-ordinate and provide education and health care for both the employed and non-employed, family and childcare support, and subsidised housing accommodation. (The National Health Services Act and the National Assistance Act, both passed in 1948, established a range of care based hospitals, which through providing suitable medical treatment for disabled people, placed them in institutions that were isolated from ordinary hospitals and thus mainstream society.) The National Health Services Act and the National Assistance Act enshrined the ideology of caring and furthered disabled people’s enforced dependency.

By the 1960s, disabled people were either confined to segregated hospitals where their needs were decided and provided for by medical staff or they lived in mainstream communities and had to cope with the limited support that was available. Encouraging disabled people to become dependant on the services of others is an illustration of the medical model of disability and provides the background against which contemporary political movements of disabled people are set. Table 2 provides a summary of policies, from 1944 to 1969.

Table 2 Landmarks in Disability Policy: 1944 –1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Disabled Persons (Employment) Act</td>
<td>Introduced a series of measures to encourage (but not enforce) mainstream organisations to employ disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Education Act</td>
<td>Signalled a policy shift toward the education of disabled people in mainstream schools. The Act had limited impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Health Services Act and National Assistance Act</td>
<td>Established hospitals and institutions for disabled people that were segregated from mainstream society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Campbell and Oliver (1996), the origins of the political movement of disabled people lay in their rejection of the institutional care arrangements within the welfare service infrastructure established following the Second World War. The Disability Alliance and the Disability Income Group (DIG) were established in the 1960s and whilst they were not organisations run by disabled people, disabled members such as Vic Finkelstein and Paul Hunt were key actors who later became founders of the disability movement in Britain. The Disability Income Group in particular, whilst an organisation focused on the employment rights of disabled people, 'raised crucial questions about the direction of the disability movement' (Campbell and Oliver, 1996: 53) and began to develop a socially constructed explanation of disability. The bifurcation between a concern for better income and a broader concern for a better standard of living, divided the Disability Income Group and the failure to grasp fully the importance of the latter, according to Swain, Finkelstein, French and Oliver (1993), led to the DIG's downfall.

1970 The Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act: A backwards step?

According to Barnes and Mercer (1995) the Conservative government elected in 1970 introduced policies which increased disabled people's dependence on the welfare state. Similar to the Acts of 1948, the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act (1970) was intended to support those who could not work due to their impairment. However, those that were deemed to be unfit for work were provided with state benefits and, as a consequence, became even more reliant on welfare services. According to Swain, Finkelstein, French and Oliver (1993) it amounted to a backward step for disabled people. They suggest that similar to the National Assistance Act of 1948 it perpetuated disabled people's status as dependent recipients of public services.

However, at the same time as the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act was passed, disabled people were beginning to challenge more effectively and forcefully the professional able-bodied assumptions about disability and the definitions of citizenship that led to their enforced dependency (Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999). In 1972 disabled people who were discontent with their treatment formed the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) which soon after its publication 'Fundamentals of Disability' in 1976, established itself as an extremely
influential body. The UPIAS believed that disabled people were better placed than professionals to solve the problems that disabled people faced.

Whilst the initial political campaigns led by disabled people focused on the improvement of welfare services and provisions, the work of organisations such as UPIAS encouraged a shift in emphasis toward a more broadly based struggle for independence, and a change in the attitudes of society (Swain, Finkelstein, French and Oliver 1993; Campbell and Oliver, 1996; Barton and Oliver 1997). To a significant extent UPIAS was learning from the more radical advocacy groups operating in the United States. For example, in the 1960s the Independent Living Movement in the United States fought for greater independence for disabled people, which they measured by the opportunities available for disabled people to make economic and personal decisions rather than the number or range of functional tasks that they could perform. Central to this view of independence was the power and empowerment of disabled people in the control and running of organisations meant to serve them (Oliver, 1990). As Oliver (1990) points out, and in keeping with neo-Marxist perspectives that we will discuss more fully in Chapter four, power not limited just to those with the privileges of class and wealth. The discontent of disabled people, he asserts, is also a source of power if individuals can mobilise and use that discontent. According to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999), discontent with their enforced dependency has led to the worldwide 'political mobilisation of disabled people' (1999:4).

This fight for 'rights not care' took place against an increasing concern for international human rights (Brandon, 1995) and was furthered by the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Disabled Persons (1975). The Declaration encouraged the involvement of disabled people in the development of policies that were meant to serve them (Campbell and Oliver, 1996). Whilst prior to the 1975 Declaration there were few organisations that represented disabled people, by the end of the 1980s there had been a significant growth in organisations and policies aimed at increasing disabled people's independence. This growth of organisations according to Campbell and Oliver (1996) was in spite of politicians and policy maker's lack of faith in a new movement which they perceived as being built by people who had, so far, seemed so dependent on the welfare state (Campbell and Oliver, 1996:20).
This concern with achieving greater independence and increasing the number and prominence of disabled people in positions of power in lobbying organisations meant to serve them, was given added momentum by the formation of Disabled People's International (DPI). DPI was formed in 1981 after delegates at the 1980 World Congress of Rehabilitation International refused to accept a motion to have at least 50% of its executive board represented by disabled people (Barnes and Mercer, 1995). DPI believed that disabled people should be central to the policy-making process within organisations that were supposed to represent and serve disabled people. Over four hundred delegates, representing 53 countries, attended the first World Congress of Disabled People's International. According to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) Disabled People's International has helped society to recognise the significant contribution that disabled people can make to the political process. Whilst Disabled People's International assumed a leadership role in the disabled people's movement and was granted consultative status with international organisations such as the United Nations, its success in influencing government policy has been limited, primarily due to the complexities of an international organisation lobbying governments in a range of countries.

One consequence of the impact of the DPI was the formation of the British Council of Disabled People (BCODP) in 1981: a move that coincided with the International Year of Disabled People. However, the official activities within the International Year of Disabled People were a source of further irritation to the disability activists. According to Swain et al (1993) the official activities in the International Year of the Disabled were led by non-representative ineffective organisations, and thus provided a group of disabled activists with a further prompt to set up a national body of organisations run for and by disabled people. By the end of 1981, the British Council of Disabled People had become the established and recognised umbrella organisation. The BCODP represented the diverse and increasing number of local self-help and lobbying organisations of disabled people, all of which expected the BCODP to lobby on behalf of their, often tightly defined, interests. For example, 'The Association of Blind Asians' and 'People First' (an organisation of learning disabled people) both became influential in representing specific populations within the emerging disability movement.
During the 1980s the British Council of Disabled People began a series of campaigns lobbying parliament for better transport, benefits and rights and protested against what they believed to be the patronising approach to disability perpetuated by high profile charities such as Children in Need. Table 3 highlights some of the key landmarks in disability policy between 1970 and 1990.

According to Drake (1994; 1996), Duckett (1998) and Northway (1997), disabled people's lives have been dominated by non-disabled people, disabled people have been underrepresented in positions of authority and have had little control over the organisations meant to serve them. In recognition of the greater independence demanded by disabled people, the Disabled Persons Act of 1986 stressed the rights of disabled people to be involved in their own destinies. A central tenet of the Act was greater user input to service delivery, requiring local authorities to include representatives of user led organisations in the planning and formation of locally run services for disabled people. However, as far as Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999:144) are concerned there was 'little consultation with user groups' and Swain et al (1993) argue that in reality, non-disabled professionals continued to exert their power and influence over disabled peoples lives. Nevertheless, according to Oliver (1990:80), the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act of 1970 and the Disabled Persons Act of 1986, along with the appointment in the 1975 of a Minister for the Disabled 'heralded a move toward the treatment of disability as a discrete policy issue rather than as a mere adjunct to other policy issues'.

In the United States, the Americans with Disabilities Act (1990) demanded better access to public services and was regarded as a landmark for the international disability community, providing a model for British disability campaign organisations. Notwithstanding the divisions on social and health policy issues that emerged in America, disabled people, acting within pressure groups, began to use the Americans with Disabilities Act to demand changes in state policy (Fox, 1994). In 1991, the British Council of Disabled People sponsored Barnes to write a report entitled 'Disabled People in Britain and Discrimination', which became considered as a comprehensive account of the discrimination faced by disabled people in Britain. Following its publication, Nick Scott, the then Minister for Disabled People, acknowledged for the first time, the widespread discrimination against disabled people (Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999). By the mid 1990s according to
Barnes et al (1999), the Conservative government had, at least in part, accepted the claim that disabled people were being discriminated against in many aspects of their lives and acknowledged the campaigning objectives of disabled people within organisations such as the British Council of Disabled People.

Table 3 Landmarks in Disability Policy: 1970 –1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act.</td>
<td>Encouraged those responsible for public buildings to make reasonable adjustments to enable access by disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation formed.</td>
<td>Signalled disabled people’s discontent with the medical definition of disability and the resulting treatment of disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation publish ‘Fundamental Principles of Disability’</td>
<td>Provided the first conceptual distinction between impairment and disability which became a central tenet of the social model of disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Disabled People’s International formed.</td>
<td>An international umbrella organisation established and controlled by disabled people to support a network of national organisations for, and controlled by, disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>United Nations’ International Year of Disabled People</td>
<td>Focused attention on highlighting awareness of disabled people’s basic human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>The British Council of Disabled People formed.</td>
<td>A lobbying organisation established to provide a coordinated campaign for the rights of disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Disabled Persons (Services, Representation and Consultation) Act.</td>
<td>Emphasised the need to involve disabled people in decisions that affect their lives. It was criticised for being tokenistic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1995 The Disability Discrimination Act

In 1994 the government produced a draft Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) that was passed in 1995 and came into force in July 1996, to tackle the discrimination faced by disabled people. The DDA defines discrimination as:

‘treating someone less favourably than someone else, for a reason related to
the disabled person’s disability – than it treats (or would treat) others to whom that reason does not (or would not) apply; and can not show that the treatment is justified’ (HMSO, 1995: s, 20(1), 2.5)

The DDA focused on employment, provision of goods, facilities and services and the management of land and property. It sets out to protect anyone with ‘a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect upon their ability to carry out normal day to day duties’ (DDA, 1995). For example, and of particular relevance to this study, it is unlawful for a service provider to discriminate against a disabled person:

‘by refusing to provide (or deliberately not providing) any service which it provides (or is prepared to provide) to its members of the public’.
(HMSO, 1995: s, 19(1), (a)5)

Thus, a disabled person who wishes to join the local hockey club could not (legally) be refused on the grounds that they are disabled. The Act stipulates that this includes those with sensory, physical and learning impairments but not mental illness. Those already identified as being disabled under the earlier Disabled Persons Act of 1944 were treated as disabled until 1998 when further assessment took place.

However, the DDA received significant criticism from organisations representing disabled people for its failure to acknowledge a socially constructed approach to disability and the lack of responsibility placed upon employers to address current inequities within the work place. For example, the Act allows employers to ask about a person’s impairment throughout the recruitment process. Moreover, there were many areas of public service such as the police and universities that were exempt from the Act. A particular criticism is the vague and ambiguous requirements placed on providers. Providers are required to make ‘reasonable adjustments’ for disabled people but what constitutes ‘reasonable’ is unclear and as Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999: 115) highlight, ‘unlike the sex and race anti-discrimination legislation, discrimination [against disabled people] is only illegal if it is unreasonable’. While recognising the weaknesses of the DDA and accepting that it is ‘flawed and limited’, Barton and Oliver (1997:64) contend that the DDA represents an
'acknowledgement that disability is on the mainstream political agenda, and a public recognition that disability may be socially created, and not just a personal tragedy'.


Under the Conservative government, the National Disability Council was established to oversee the implementation of the DDA, but after the election in 1997, the new Labour government created the Disability Rights Task Force (DRTF) to assess the Act. The DRTF was renamed the National Disability Task Force and made up of Radar, the Royal National Institute for the Blind, the Royal National Institute for the Deaf, Mencap, MIND and SCOPE, all of whom, according to Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999), are organisations 'for disabled people' in that they are not run by an executive in which disabled people are in the majority. Whilst Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare (1999) acknowledge the small increase in disabled Members of Parliament (MPs) since the 1997 election, they argue that those MPs, comply with non-disabled values of disability and are not representative of the disabled people's movement. As a consequence of this apparent lack of representation at the highest level, the number of pressure groups and community groups of disabled people has continued to grow. However, with the establishment of the Disability Rights Commission in 1999, the government demonstrated its sympathy towards the aims of the disability activists and radical self help-organisations such as the British Council of Disabled People.

The Disability Rights Commission was established as a part of the Disability Rights Commission Act (1999) and is an independent body with the statutory power to enforce the DDA. The Disability Rights Commission has 15 Commissioners, two thirds of whom are disabled (as of May, 2002) and a Secretary of State appointed Chairman (currently Bert Massie who served on both the National Disability Commission and the National Disability Rights Task Force). The Disability Rights Commission is an advisory body, but it is different from previous quangos working on disability policy, in so far as it has, for example, power to conduct formal investigations, serve non-discrimination notices, act over persistent discrimination, and provide assistance to individuals who have been discriminated against.
Due, in part at least, to the pressure from the Disability Rights Commission and disability lobbying groups, two changes to the initial DDA were made. First, the Disability Rights Commission issued a new Code of Practice which covers Part III of the DDA: Rights to Access – Good Facilities, Services and Premises – providing further detail on how providers can meet the requirements of the Act. Second, although the education sector was originally omitted from the requirements of the DDA, from 2002, the education authorities and their establishments will have to ensure that disabled people are not discriminated against. The education sector was brought further into the mainstream of disability policy through the enactment of the Special Education Needs and Disability Act (SENDA) passed in 2001, which requires the education sector to comply with the demands of the DDA. The Act extends the earlier 1978 and 1981 Education Acts and the 1995 Code of Practice which simply encouraged schools and colleges to provide for disabled people in 'ordinary' rather than segregated settings. For the first time, disabled people in further and higher education are protected, at least in law, from discrimination. Table 4 summarises the key policy developments in Britain since the passing of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

Table 4 Landmarks in Disability Policy: 1990–2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) passed.</td>
<td>Aimed to integrate disabled people into mainstream society. Outlawed discrimination in employment, access, transport and local government. Notable success in improving access to the buildings. This Act became a benchmark for British disability campaign groups such as BCODP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Disability Discrimination Act passed.</td>
<td>DDA was passed after 15 previous attempts over 13 years to pass a private members bill. Aims for similar basic rights as the ADA but, unlike the ADA, there are no minimum standards and it is criticised by disability activists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Disability Rights Task Force formed.</td>
<td>Conservative government formed the DRTF made up of existing organisations working on behalf of disabled people such as SCOPE and the RNID.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Disability Rights Commission Act passed.</td>
<td>The DRC was established under the Labour government to enforce the DDA. The DRC has a much closer relationship with the disability activists through organisations such as the BCODP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the passage of SENDA into law, Barbara Roche (Cabinet Office Minister) has indicated that a single body may replace the Disability Rights Commission and the other five similar equality related commissions that currently exist. She suggests that it is not possible to address equality when 'dealing with six separate strands of discrimination including race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, age and disability' (Roche, 2002). While Bert Massie claimed that a single commission 'might work to the advantage of all and be a tremendous opportunity to tackle multi-discrimination', disabled rights campaigners such as the BCODP have been concerned that the loss of the Disability Rights Commission would impact negatively on their struggle for equality.

This review reveals that disability policy and the disability policy process has at least four distinctive characteristics. First there has been a shift from medical individualised definitions and ideologies of disability to more socially constructed explanations of disability, which place more responsibility for disability on mainstream society. Second, and as a consequence of this shift in understanding, policies have changed from segregating disabled people, to taking responsibility for their care and welfare within mainstream society. Third, disability policy has seen since 1970 an increased politicisation through greater involvement of lobbying activists. Fourth, due to the increased interest in government legislation, disability policy is now more centralised and opportunities to exercise local discretion have diminished.

Whilst disability sport policy may be influenced by disability policy, sport policy may also assist in the explanation of disability sport's emergence and development. It is to an examination of government interest and policy developments in sport that I now turn.

3.3 THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPORTS POLICY

As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, in order to study disability sport policy, it is necessary to have an understanding of the two most closely related policy areas. The purpose of the next section, therefore, is first, to provide a summary of the various motives for government interest in sport as a context within which to analyse governments' recent interest in disability sport, and second, to provide an historical account of sport policy developments in England.
THE MOTIVES FOR GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN SPORT

Maintaining Social order

Governments have taken an interest in competitive, physical, game based contests since the pre-industrial period. Initially, the involvement stemmed from the potential of sport to threaten social order, encouraging the government to introduce rules and regulations that prevented or controlled participation. For example, a law was introduced in 1671 to penalise poaching, a crime normally perpetrated by the lower working classes. Indeed, the laws typically protected the ruling class's own sporting interests in hunting, fishing and shooting (Brailsford, 1991). According to Hargreaves (1985), the early interventions in sport by the government allowed the ruling upper classes to dominate the development of sport in the United Kingdom and exacerbated class divisions. Houlihan (1997) suggests that the maintenance of the ruling class privileges, and the need to maintain control of the undisciplined recreational practices of the working classes has been central to government policy on sport. Moreover contemporary policies and programmes have continued to use sport as a tool for addressing social problems such as crime and delinquency. In the 1980s a variety of community based sports leadership schemes were introduced as a means of encouraging the unemployed and black and ethnic minorities into sport and thus it was argued, steer them away from involvement in the inner city riots. The belief that sport can act as a positive agent in tackling social problems is explicit in the government's recent policy statement. In 'A Sporting Future for All' (2000) Hoey (then Minister for Sport) claimed that 'there is growing evidence that involvement in sport helps to prevent young people from getting mixed up in crime and drugs' (Department of Culture Media and Sport, 2000:3). However, in the 'Government's Plan for Sport', the DCMS recognised the need to support such claims with firmer evidence (DCMS, 2001:6). Indeed, according to Nichols (1997) there is little evidence to suggest that such programmes are effective in reducing crime.

Improving Health

Despite occasional government interventions to control sporting activities there was only a scant interest in sport and recreation as a policy area before World War One. However, in the mid 19th Century, there developed increasing concern for the health
of the working classes and a recognition that public baths and large open spaces offered an opportunity to improve the physical and mental health of a significant population who worked in dangerous and demoralising conditions. Thus swimming pools and recreational parks became an increasingly common feature of many Victorian industrial towns and cities. More recently, sport and physical activity has been used as a means of improving health and in particular for reducing the risks of coronary heart disease and reducing obesity. The Allied Dunbar Fitness Survey in 1992 and the government policy statement – The Health of the Nation (Department of Health, 1992) recognised the benefits of participation in sport but highlighted the need for greater co-operation between agencies in tackling inactivity and ill health. Indeed the Department of National Heritage (1995) and its successor, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, both emphasised the health benefits derived from participation in sport. Over the last fifteen years or so there has been a rapid growth in the number of national and local programmes and initiatives that attempt to improve health through participation in sport. The Borough of Crewe and Nantwich, for example, conducted a ‘Football on Prescription’ programme which aimed to encourage adult males who had dropped out of regular participation to become active once more. Football was chosen as it was believed to be the most accessible and most popular activity.

Despite evidence which questions the relationship between sport (as opposed to physical activity) and improved health (Waddington, Malcolm and Green, 1997) successive governments in recent years have continued to emphasise a positive link between sport and health. For example, the Department for Culture Media and Sport (2000) stress in ‘A Sporting Future for All’ how sport can make a significant contribution to health and, in particular, to tackling obesity and associated diseases such as diabetes, cancer and heart disease. Rt. Hon.Tony Blair MP in his forward to ‘Game Plan: a Strategy for Delivering Government’s Sport and Physical Activity Objectives’ estimated that physical inactivity costs the nation at least £2bn a year. Blair goes on to emphasise the ‘importance of improving grass roots participation for health benefits’ which prefaces a report full of targets and actions to ‘raise participation levels for the whole population’ (Strategy Unit, 2002: 5). A key aim within the report is to ‘develop a sport and physical activity culture to produce a fitter, more active population and realise the significant health benefits and savings available’ (Strategy Unit, 2002:90).
Moral educator

Key youth organisations such as the Boys Brigade and the YMCA have a long established record of using sport as a tool for moral development, especially of young urban working class males. For at least the last 100 years the Youth Service, the Boys' Brigade, the Girl Guides, the National Association of Boys' Clubs, as well as church oriented youth clubs, have sought to use sport as a tool to develop 'citizenship' as well as 'bodily fitness'. The capacity of sport to act as a moral educator is still a key justification for government intervention in contemporary policy. The Department for Media Culture and Sport (DCMS) recognised the opportunity that sport presented for moral leadership stating that 'sports champions of today have a responsibility to ... set an example of integrity and fair play' (DCMS 2000: 2). In 'A Sporting Future for All: the Government’s Plan for Sport', DCMS claimed that 'as well as making people healthier, taking part in sport teaches self-discipline, teamwork and leadership skills' (DCMS, 2001:11).

Equity of opportunity and social inclusion

In the late 1970s and 1980s governments began to target particular under-participating groups, such as teenage girls, women, members of ethnic minorities and the middle-aged. Although a number of groups were identified because they were considered to be a source of specific social problems, e.g. young urban males in the early 1980s, there gradually emerged a greater concern with equitable participation as a motivation for government intervention in its own right. Prompted partly by the promotion of 'Sport for All' by the Council of Europe, from the mid 1970s there developed a steady accumulation of data indicating significant variation in participation by age, social class, ethnicity and gender. The National Demonstration Projects of the early-mid 1980s, were the first systematic attempt to address issues of equity of sports participation. The National Demonstration Projects (Sport Council Research Unit, 1991) provided clear evidence of a commitment to address inequality and improve opportunities for mass participation. The National Demonstration Projects signalled the beginning of a long-term interest in addressing equity issues in sport. The Sports Council began to encourage local authorities, in particular, to tackle the physical, economic and cultural barriers that prevented equal opportunities in sport. Using the tag line 'Sport for All', the Sports Council focused on improving access to sport for
low participating groups including disabled people (Sports Council, 1982). In 1993 the Sports Council launched a ‘Current and Planned Action’ series of policies which focused on young people, women, people with disabilities and black and ethnic minorities, the purpose of which was to improve the equity of sports provision. These initial projects and programmes designed to increase participation among particular target groups were later incorporated into the Labour governments’ wider political agenda on tackling social exclusion (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2000). The DCMS stated in a Sporting Future For All that their objective was to have ‘more people of all ages and social groups taking part in sport and to reduce, over the next ten years, the unfairness in access to sport’ (DCMS, 2000:11). To help them to achieve this objective the DCMS called on governing bodies to ‘commit themselves to putting social inclusion and fairness at the heart of everything they do, (DCMS, 2000: 22).

In the Government’s Plan for Sport, the DCMS stated that ‘equity principles will be central to every level of the Government’s plan for the sporting future of the country’ and go on to claim that ‘gender, race disability, ethnicity economic status and age should not result in any individual being excluded from the fun, sense of achievement and companionship that participation in sport brings’ (DCMS, 2001:27).

National Success and Identity

The policy document ‘Sport: Raising the Game’, published by the Department of National Heritage (DNH, 1995), offers perhaps the best illustration of a government’s commitment to the development of elite sport and in particular national team games and international events. ‘Sport: Raising the Game’ (1995) made explicit the government’s concern to ‘bring about a sea-change in the prospects for British sport’ (DNH 1995: 1). Using revenue from the National Lottery the government proposed to establish an elite training centre, as ‘the key to top level performance’ (DNH 1995: 36). While previous governments had indicated interest in elite sporting success the Conservative government under John Major and its Sport: Raising the Game policy legitimised the explicit and planned commitment to high performance success.

The need for a coordinated professional approach to elite sport was endorsed by the Labour government policies, ‘A Sporting Future for All’ and ‘A Government’s Plan
for Sport'. In A Sporting Future for All the government claimed that 'we need to learn the lessons of our competitor nations and have the most professional system for talent development and support of excellence' (DCMS 2000: 15). In the Government's Plan for Sport, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport through UK Sport and Sport England further demonstrated its commitment to the improvement of UK international achievement. Programmes such as the World Class Performance Plans illustrate the significant investment attached to this commitment. In the Government's Plan for Sport, Kate Hoey (then Minister for Sport) encouraged Governing Bodies to 'put in place the coaches, resources and structures necessary for competitors to produce more world-beating performances in more sports (DCMS, 2001:3). The effectiveness of these activities is now monitored by the number of medals won at international events, and the individual and team positions in the world rankings. In Game Plan the government identified three key changes that it believed would improve the UK's success in high-performance sport. The plan identified that first, there needed to be a clearer prioritisation of funding for high performance sport, second, help needed to be given to talented athletes and third, funding and service delivery needed to be more customer focused (Strategy Unit, 2002).

The justification for such interest is based on the belief that 'elite achievement acts as a vital source of inspiration' to others (Sport England, 2001:32) and creates a culture of 'pride and a sense of national identify (Strategy Unit, 2002: 9). In the Government's 'Plan for Sport' the Rt. Hon. Tony Blair MP stated that 'Sydney reminded a nation starved of sporting success just how important it is to do well on the world stage' (DCMS, 2001:37). Blair goes on to claim that the 'achievement of our athletes lifted people’s spirits and made us feel proud to be British' (DCMS, 2001:37). Moreover, according to Hylton, Bramham, Jackson and Nesti (2001) and reflecting government's interests, failure in elite sport could be perceived as an indicator of a decline in culture and competitiveness in the UK.

Urban Regeneration

As well as a tool to demonstrate national success and to assert political identity, sport is also used increasingly as a tool for urban generation. For example, following the 1981 riots in Liverpool and Brixton, the government invested in sports facilities and projects with the intention of ameliorating public discontent and reducing the risk of
further rioting. Unsurprisingly, the Sports Council was delighted with the opportunity to realise government interest in using sport as a tool to rejuvenate local communities. While urban regeneration is a vague concept that encompasses a range of motives, Cashmore (2000: 232) argues that it is essentially, a ‘solution to urban unrest and youth delinquency’. However, in Polley’s (1998) view the purpose of government interest in, for example, building new sporting facilities and hosting major events, is to stimulate tourism and thus improve the local economy.

In the Government’s ‘Plan for Sport’, the DCMS recognises ‘the need to support Local Authorities in building up sports and leisure services which serve the needs of local people’ and recommends that ‘local authorities and Local Education Authorities work together’ so that the potential to regenerate local communities is realised (DCMS, 2001: 21). The Department for Culture, Media and Sport claims that ‘both regional and national sporting events have the potential to bring a range of economic and social benefits to their localities’ (DCMS, 2001: 21). In the government’s view, investment in events such as the Commonwealth Games can act as a catalyst for local regeneration. However, governments expect such significant investment to reap substantive long-term rewards. For example, Roger Draper (Chief Executive of Sport England in 2002) said of the Olympic bid, ‘the legacy of a London Olympics must be felt for many years’, Draper goes on to claim that ‘the 2012 Olympics can leave an amazing legacy... Sport England supports a London Olympics provided a robust business plan delivers increased investment and involvement in sport at every level from grass roots to world class’ (Sport England, 2003).

In a series of case studies, Collins (2003) demonstrates how Governments have been particularly interested in the capacity of major sporting events such as the Olympics to regenerate urban areas through the reclamation of brown field sites. He highlights however, that such events are often more costly than predicted and that the local community does not always enjoy the anticipated economic benefits. Moreover, Collins goes on to suggest that as well as sometimes failing to provide sustained economic benefits, investment in sport facilities can cause damage to the environment and has the capacity to cause significant urban deprivation.

In any case, plans to regenerate communities through the development of sporting opportunities and facilities often fail due to the expectations of key stake holders. For
example, in Houlihan’s view, some major projects such as the building of a new national stadium to replace Wembley have proved problematic, in part at least, due to the government’s ambition both to build excellent facilities for elite athletes and also to regenerate the local community and achieve lasting benefits for the local area (Houlihan, 2003: 33). The problems associated with the new national stadium are undoubtedly compounded by, and perhaps a reflection of, the Sports Council’s dual responsibility for the development of sport and the development of community through sport.

Summary

Whether the intervention is as a regulator, provider or exploiter, according to Houlihan and White (2002), governments are now more conspicuous in their intervention in the development, organisation and provision of sport than ever before. While the negative consequences of sport, such as hooliganism and drug abuse are recognised, recent British governments have been particularly interested in the way that sport can be used as a tool to achieve wider political aims. More specifically, recent British governments seem particularly interested in the capacity of sport to be used as a means of developing international prestige, tackling urban regeneration and addressing social exclusion. The DCMS’ ‘A Sporting Future for All’ and Sport England’s Annual Report 2001-2 provide ample evidence of government’s various interests and interventions in sport (DCMS, 2000; Sport England, 2001). As Houlihan and White contend (2002), government sports policy embraces a commitment to the development of sport but also to achieve a wider variety of other social and political objectives.

The broader concerns with moral order and urban regeneration have been key motives for government involvement in sport but they provide little scope to lobby government for more investment in disability sport. However, other government motives have provided disability sport organisations with a window of opportunity to campaign for more commitment and better resources. The concern for equality and social inclusion is one motive for government involvement in sport, which has created an increased interest in sport for disabled people. Also, since the increased profile of the Paralympic games and the success of British athletes, the government is now more aware of the international status that disability sport and in particular, paralympic
sport, can bring. Government concern for success in elite disability sport and for addressing social exclusion is now complimented by its interests in using physical activity and sport as a tool to improve health. This next section examines when and how government motives in sport have been translated into policy.

THE RECENT HISTORY OF SPORT POLICY IN ENGLAND

1960s: The establishment of the Advisory Sports Council

To further the governmental co-ordination and promotion of sport and as a result of the Wolfendon Report commissioned by the Central Council of Physical Recreation, an Advisory Sports Council (ASC) was established in 1965 by the Labour Government. The Advisory Sports Council was set up to advise the government on matters relating to the development of amateur sport and physical recreation (Advisory Sports Council, 1965). Houlihan and White (2002) argue, however, that the willingness of the Wilson government to establish the Advisory Sports Council was more a reflection of an interest in expanding the scope of Labour's welfare services than a particular interest in the intrinsic benefits of sport.

Despite the existence of the Advisory Sports Council, the government turned to the Central Council of Physical Recreation (CCPR) for advice on matters relating to sport and physical education, as the CCPR had established itself as the primary advocate on behalf of sport. The Central Council of Physical Recreation was established in 1935, as an independent voluntary body, by a physical educationalist called Phyllis Colson, and represented a wide range of governing bodies in the promotion, improvement and development of sport (Central Council of Physical Recreation, 2003:1). Perhaps most notably, the CCPR commissioned the Wolfendon Committee's investigation into policy on youth sport. The Wolfenden Committee's report in 1960 indicated there was a gap between school sport and local clubs, and prompted local authorities to engage in what became a decade of facility building which proved to have a profound effect on the public provision of sport and recreation. Based on the Wolfenden Committee report, the CCPR then formulated a policy on youth sport, which the Sports Council later adopted (CCPR, 2003).
1970: A decade of facility development

In 1972 the Conservative government agreed to replace the Advisory Sports Council with a Sports Council, which, according to Houlihan and White (2002), was an indication of the success of the Advisory Sports Council rather than a shift in government interest in sport. The Sports Council was set up as a quango, that is, a semi-independent public body operating at arms length from the government but with a remit to implement its policies. As Elvin (1993) indicates, the Sports Council was given the remit to address issues of concern to government such as the safety of facilities, hooliganism, drugs and the improvement of national performances.

Though the recognised governmental agency for sport, the Sports Council's impact on sport during the 1970s was limited. The provision of opportunities was predominantly delivered by local authorities as well as sports clubs who, co-ordinated by their governing bodies, were members of the Central Council of Physical Recreation. Whilst the governing bodies of sport received funds from the Sports Council, the governing bodies were unwilling to relinquish their relationship with the Central Council of Physical Recreation. The government saw sport as a peripheral area of concern preferring sport to be run substantially by volunteer agencies (Houlihan and White 2002), thus the Central Council of Physical Recreation was crucial to the early development of sports policy. Landmarks in the development of government sports policy from 1965 – 1975 are shown in Table 5.

Table 5 Landmarks in government policy on sport: 1965-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Advisory Sports Council formed</td>
<td>The Advisory Sports Council was established to advise government on sport and recreation issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Sports Council established</td>
<td>The Sports Council was established to address problems such as football hooliganism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sports Council grant aided local authorities who rapidly became the significant providers of sporting opportunity. Between 1971 and 1981 local authorities focussed their new interest in sport on the expansion of swimming pools (500) and indoor
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sports centres (450) (Houlihan, 1997). Roberts and Brodie (1992) argued that this increase in facilities brought about an increase in participation that was unlikely to be replicated in future campaigns. The new venues provided opportunities for a significant sector of the community to engage in a range of locally provided recreational as well as competitive activities. That is to say, the sports centres offered opportunities for the proficient club player, as well as the beginner and the casual user to participate at a time of their own choice.

The momentum generated by the commitment of local authorities to the building of sports facilities, led in part, to the publication in 1975 of the White Paper, on 'Sport and Recreation' by the Department of the Environment (House of Lord's Select Committee, 1975). The White Paper acknowledged the ability of the local authorities and of the voluntary sector to deliver opportunities but was concerned to maintain a balance between the need for better strategic co-ordination by national agencies such as the Sports Council and an underlying concern to avoid a paternalistic and directive approach to people's use of their leisure time.

By the end of the 1970s, as a policy area, sport continued to hold little political sway. The Sports Council itself continued to be shadowed by the Central Council of Physical Recreation and, in addition, national governing bodies still regarded the government's interest and intervention in sport with caution.

The 1980s to the early 1990s: Sport for All and Sports Development

Notwithstanding the initial impact of the new facilities on levels of sports participation, the Sports Council and the voluntary sector recognised that the growth in participation had been uneven. Consequently, the focus of policy began to shift away from facilities and onto under-participating groups. However, the concern for under-participating groups was often replaced or disguised by the Sports Council's obligation to use sport as a vehicle to tackle social problems of delinquency or vandalism even though such interventions had not been proven successful (Nichols, 1997). In 1982 the Sports Council published the policy statement Sport in the Community, which identified as its target groups 13-24 year olds and 45-59 year olds thus addressing the apparent drop off in participation in those moving from youth to
adulthood and employment, and those moving from full time employment to retirement (Sports Council, 1982).

The slogan ‘Sport for All’ was used to promote participation by the Sports Council and a conceptual continuum from foundation to excellence was formulated originally by Derek Casey of the Scottish Sports Council in 1988, to provide a context within which policy discussions could be located and given greater coherence (Houlihan and White, 2002). The continuum also provided a template on which discussions on people’s sporting careers and gaps in provision could be framed (see figure 2). The first level of the sports development continuum concerned acquisition of basic skills (foundation), and progressed through a voluntary and regular involvement with sport (participation), to acquiring specific specialist skills to play or compete at a higher level (performance), and for some, culminates in a publicly recognised peak at the highest level (excellence). Whilst there were various adaptations of the original pyramidal continuum it provided, in the 1980s, a conceptual model as well as a pragmatic framework within which to locate sports policy.

Figure 2 The Sports Council’s Sports Development Continuum

(Source: Sports Council North West, 1991)
The Sports Council operationalised its commitment to Sport for All and its policy on mass participation with two major initiatives. First, through the Manpower Services Commission, and by pump-priming the local authorities with £1 million a year for each year from 1982 to 1985, the Sports Council developed an infrastructure of Sport Development Officers (SDOs) to implement the Action Sport programme. Second, in 1984 it launched fifteen National Demonstration Projects which sought to identify strategies to ameliorate the barriers to participation for a range of under-represented groups.

Between 1982 and 1985 the Sports Council funded 15 local authority run Action Sports programmes in Birmingham and London. The objectives of the Action Sports programmes were to develop, in partnership with other interested agencies, sustainable, consumer driven opportunities for low participant groups. The significant diversity in the populations of each authority was reflected in the range and type of programmes. Many local authorities, recognising the contribution that sports development could make to their local communities, provided further funding to the programmes which they then tailored to the needs of its own population. For example, by 1988, Hammersmith and Fulham Local Authority was employing ten sports development officers (SDOs) with a remit to work with a wide range of specific groups deemed to be disadvantaged or under-represented in sport, such as disabled people, women, older people, ethnic minorities and the unemployed, all of which were involved in the decisions relating to the provision of sport in their locality. Houlihan and White (2002) estimate that by 1987 there were 300 SDOs and by the beginning of the 1990s there were as many as 2,000 SDOs, though many by this time were focused more on sports development for young people than on other target groups.

The 'sports development officers' sought 'the advancement, expansion and improvement of sporting opportunities' (Eady, 1993). The Northwest Sports Council, which played a significant role in early sports development projects, stated that:

'Sports development is a process by which interest and desire to take part in sport may be created in those who are currently indifferent to the message of sport; or by which those not now taking part, but well disposed, may be provided with appropriate opportunities to do so; or by
which those currently taking part may be enabled to do so with meaningful frequency and greater satisfaction, thus enabling participants at all levels to realise their full potential’ (Sports Council, North West, 1991:3)

SDOs may be employed full-time, part-time or voluntarily, for governing bodies, local authorities, education authorities or charities. They may have a specific remit for one sport, a range of sports, a low participation or ‘target group’ or a stage of the continuum, thus, the role of one sports development officer can be substantively different to another (Houlihan and White, 2002). Indeed as Hylton et al (2001) suggest, sports development is a contested term as it seems to be concerned with both the development of sport at recreational and elite levels as well as an area of social policy in which sport is used as a vehicle for the improvement or development of the community. The Action Sport era enabled the Sports Council to firmly establish its central position in sports development policy, yet according to Houlihan and White (2002), the Sports Council failed to use the opportunity to define the role of sport in social policy.

The National Demonstration Projects (NDPs) were initiated shortly after the Action Sports programmes began. Not only did the NDPs confirm the Sports Council’s role in the development of sports policy but further demonstrated its commitment to the objectives of Sport for All. The purpose of the NDPs was to improve a), participation through outreach development in the community b), opportunities for particular target groups such as women and disabled people and, c) school sport, in partnership with the education authorities. Not only did the fifteen NDPs generate valuable lessons that contributed to the Actions Sport programmes but also the lessons learnt and recommendations published subsequently, also provided significant direction to the future of sports development. Indeed, many of the recommendations relating to the needs of specific target groups were as salient in 2002 as they were in 1991, when the NDP final report was published. For example, the recommendations of the NDPs for the development of sport for disabled people (Sports Council Research Unit, 1991), were echoed in the objectives contained within ‘Building a Fairer Society’; published by the English Federation of Disability Sport sixteen years after the NDPs began (EFDS, 2000).
However, sports development and sport policy generally changed direction in the late 1980s following the introduction of Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT). CCT was originally introduced in the Local Government Planning and Land Act in 1980 and was extended in the Local Government Act of 1988 to include a wider variety of service provision, including the management of sport and leisure facilities such as pools, leisure centres, golf courses and tennis courts (Henry, 2001). The Act provided increased potential for privatised leisure facilities and, with it, the decrease in flexible programming. Despite many contracts being won in-house by local authorities, programmes that were aimed at target groups whose participation rates were low and needed additional support or promotion but which generated a poor return on investment, were difficult to provide for in the newly privatised leisure industry (Elvin, 1993). Concerned about the impact that CCT would have on disabled peoples' opportunities and access to sport, in 1990 the British Sports Association for the Disabled published ‘Compulsory Competitive Tendering: Policy Guidelines for Leisure Management: To Safeguard Provision for People with Disabilities’. The document sets out to provide local authorities with ‘guidelines for the provision of sport and leisure for people with disabilities’ (BSAD, 1990: 1) and calls on authorities to include BSAD’s suggestions in their strategy documents and specifications in order that disabled people do not suffer from the changes to sporting provision brought about by CCT.

Table 6 Landmarks in government policy on sport 1980-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Landmarks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>National Coaching Foundation formed by Sports Council</td>
<td>NCF was established as a partner of the Sport Council to coordinate coaching and coach education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Sports Council ‘Sport in the Community’ published</td>
<td>This targeted youth groups, the unemployed and retired people as non-participants in sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Sports Council established 15 local authority run Action Sport programmes</td>
<td>These projects which focussed on addressing low participation for specific target groups, had significant impact on the emergence of sports development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Sports Council launched the National Demonstration projects</td>
<td>The NDPs focussed on outreach projects, target groups and the development of local partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Compulsory Competitive Tendering was introduced</td>
<td>CCT encouraged the privatisation of sports facilities and threatened local authority provision for target groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, despite the constraints of CCT, the 1980s saw Action Sport and the NDPs make a significant contribution to the development of sports policy. Indeed as a result of both programmes, the 1980s witnessed a significant growth in the contribution of local authorities to sport. However, sport remained a peripheral concern to the government and very dependant on the commitment and interest of a few politicians. For example, one of the few Ministers who had a genuine interest and knowledge of sport, Colin Moynihan (Minister for Sport in 1989), instigated and chaired a review group on sport for disabled people, heralded by many as seminal in the history of disability sport in Britain. While Moynihan involved disabled people in his review, at this stage, sport policies typically placed little importance on user or client involvement, preferring to rely on the emerging professions within the field (Houlihan and White, 2002).

Although the Sports Council had, through using the Manpower Service Commission’s funding for local authority run Action Sports programmes, clearly established itself as influential in local sports policy – governing bodies of sport were still reluctant to co-operate with the Sports Council on matters relating to the strategic development of sport. Indeed, despite a pledge by the Sports Council in 1982 to spend 35% of its resources on elite sport (Sports Council, 1982:34), according to Coghlan (1990:153) ‘virtually no’ governing body responded to the plea for better co-operation. In order to promote a clearer relationship between the Sports Council and the NGBs, the Sports Council established in 1980 the National Coaching Foundation (later to become Sports Coach UK), as the co-ordinators of elite level coaching and development. The National Coaching Foundation was established at a time when the role of many NGBs began to change from the basic administration of rules and competitions and the selections of national teams to more substantive roles. Not only did many begin to manage facilities and international competitions, most began to play a significant role in the development of opportunities at all levels of the sport development continuum. While there was government funding available for NGBs to fulfil these functions, according to Houlihan and White (2002:164), the increased funding came with ‘strings attached’. For example, the NGBs had to submit development plans which identified what the money would be spent on and what it would achieve. This combined with a requirement to conform to the wider political demands, such as equal opportunities employment, resulted in what Houlihan and White (2002:165) refer to as the ‘ambivalent relationship between some NGBs and the Sports Council’. 
Having prioritised facility development in the 1970s the priority shifted in the 1980s to addressing sports opportunities for disadvantaged groups. By the mid 1990s government attention had turned to performance and success at the elite level and ultimately returned to the development of better facilities. However, although the 1990s witnessed a growth in facilities they were not those funded by public sources. The increases in participation in the 1980s, due to the new publicly funded leisure and sport facilities, plateaued by the 1990s. However, individual exercise based activities such as aerobics, swimming, running and weight training enjoyed significant growth in popularity, particularly amongst women (Roberts, Brodie and Lamb, 1991). By the early 1990s the number of privately funded health and fitness clubs had increased to meet this demand, challenging the local authorities' hitherto dominance in many areas of the mass participation market.

While the increased interest in individual exercise based activities was catered for by privately funded health and fitness clubs, government interest in the 1990s was firmly rooted in elite performance and school sport. Government interest in the development of school sport prompted John Major to shift responsibility for sport to a different government department. From 1974-91, as a policy area, sport was a part of the Department for the Environment but this was considered problematic, as the intended developments within school sport outlined by John Major, was the responsibility of the Department for Education and Science (DES). In 1991 John Major transferred responsibility for sport to the DES (later Department for Education and Employment) who supported the Sports Council in their publication of 'New Horizons' (Sports Council, 1993b). New Horizons provided further clarification of the Council's commitment to the development of pathways from foundation to excellence in each sport and emphasised the need to develop equity within sport. According to the Sports Council:

Sports equity is about fairness in sport, equality of access, recognising inequalities and taking steps to address them. It is about changing the structure and culture of sport to ensure that it becomes equally accessible to everyone in society, whatever their age, race, gender or level of ability (Sports Council, 1993b:4).
The 1990s saw an increase in government interest in sport. In 1993, building on the work of the Action Sport Programmes, the NDPs and the sports equity principle, the Sports Council published a series of policy ‘Frameworks for Action’ for women, black and ethnic minorities, people with a disability and young people. Each set out the individual and social constraints to participation and identified the role that various agencies could play in improving current opportunities. Houlihan and White (2002) assert that these policies enshrined the Sports Council’s commitment to equity and for the first time placed responsibility for addressing inequity on governing bodies, local authorities and other traditional providers of sport. The publication ‘Women: Frameworks for Action’ led to the Brighton Declaration (Sports Council, 1994). This was supported by 82 countries and agreed a set of clear principles for developing the full involvement of women in sport. However, despite endorsement for the Declaration by 200 governments, major national organisations, and the international movement on sport for women that it inspired, it was not until 1998 that the Declaration was given the support of the British Government. The policy on ‘People with Disabilities: Frameworks for Action’ (Sports Council, 1993a) did not enjoy such influence, perhaps because of the lack of commitment by the Sports Council and a lack of coherence within the disability sport policy community.

Table 7 Landmarks in government policy on sport 1990-1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Responsibility for sport policy transferred from the Department of the Environment to the Department of Education and Science</td>
<td>John Major’s government moved sport policy to the DES to improve the relationship between sport and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Responsibility for sport policy transferred to the Department of National Heritage</td>
<td>The creation of the DNH heralded an increased interest in sport by the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Sports Council publishes a series of Frameworks for Action</td>
<td>The series summarises the constraints to participation for particular target groups and identifies action to address them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1992 sport came under the remit of the newly formed Department for National Heritage (DNH). As the title suggests, the DNH was responsible for the arts, tourism and heritage as well as sport, although other departments such as the Department of
Environment, the Department for Education and Science have continued to have an involvement in sporting issues. The Department of Environment had responsibility for planning, the Department for Education and Science had the remit for Physical Education and school sport and the Home Office for the implementation of policies relating to law and safety in sport (Elvin, 1993). Thus sport remained a diffuse policy area largely determined by, and vulnerable to, a range of other government interests. However, the shift of responsibility for sport to a newly created department marked an increased political status for sport in England.

1995: Department of National Heritage and Sport: Raising the Game

The Government policy statement ‘Sport: Raising the Game’ published in 1995, outlined a more streamlined structure for the organisation of sport in the United Kingdom. Sport: Raising the Game (DNH, 1995) also provided clear priorities in favour of elite level performers, the development of national teams and sport for school aged children. John Major wanted to put sport back at the heart of school life, to reverse a perceived decline in the provision for, and youth participation in, sport. The Government statement placed particular emphasis on the teaching of competitive team games in the physical education curriculum and stressed that it was ‘sport rather than physical education’ that was the focus of its policy (DNH, 1995: 7). Significant investment in local and regional infrastructures were developed in partnership with governing bodies of sport, youth sport agencies and the physical education profession in order to implement the government driven youth initiatives. The Sports Council, physical educationalists and governing bodies of sport co-operated in the government’s drive to reverse the decline in competitive school sport, despite the view held by Roberts (1995) and Houlihan (1996), for example, who suggested that the decline has been exaggerated. Indeed Roberts (1996) claimed that in promoting the traditional teams games that were seen as so important to John Major, and ignoring the changing needs and culture of British youths, ‘Sport: Raising the Game’ could lead to flight from sport for British young people. Moreover, the concentration on team games in after school sport could, according to Penney and Harris (1997), perpetuate the divide between those who do and those who do not play sport. They believed that children who were good at team games were already engaged in voluntary sport, but those that were not, were likely to be further disenfranchised by
the reification of what is already a predominant team-sport culture within the PE curriculum.

Whilst many agencies welcomed the heightened profile for sport and physical education that this policy offered, there was considerable concern surrounding its focus on team games and the minor role given to local authorities. More fundamentally perhaps ‘Sport: Raising the Game’, whilst reaffirming the Sports Council’s dual role of promoting both mass participation as well as elite performance, made clear the distinction between the providers of sport at each level of the continuum. In doing so, ‘Sport: Raising the Game’ encouraged improvement in school and local community sport opportunity, but placed most emphasis on the development of elite performance. Concurrent with their emphasis on young people, and confirming the government’s interest in the performance and excellence end of the continuum, was the creation of a new United Kingdom Sports Institute.

The Conservative Government were able to implement the recommendations in ‘Sport: Raising the Game’, at least in part because of the increase in funding available from the Foundation for Sport and the Arts, the Football Trust and the National Lottery. Whilst not significant funders of sport directly, the Sports Council’s policies in the 1990s provided the framework for which programmes and initiatives, by other agencies such as the local authorities, were financed. However, whilst the Lottery funds may have benefited a myriad of community projects as well as local facilities, events and activities, the £300 million pounds distributed by the Lottery each year was not allowed to support coaching, training or sports development. Furthermore the requirement for match funding by the bidding agent, together with the lack of capacity to target or direct funding on the part of the Lottery, militated against the strategic distribution of grants.

Whilst the NGBs became more active in strategically planning the growth and development of their sport, as a policy area, sport remained a peripheral concern for the many government ministers. Nevertheless, during the mid 1990s another agency emerged as a leader in the development of youth sport policy. In 1994, funded initially by Sir John Beckwith, the Youth Sport Trust was launched. The Trust soon became regarded as an important facilitator (Shenton, 1996) between sport and physical education, overcoming long standing ethical and political differences in the
interests of providing a coherent pathway from 'cradle to grave' (Campbell, 1995). The Youth Sport Trust’s TOP Programmes, under the corporate banner of Sport England’s National Junior Sports Programmes, were developed and implemented in close co-operation with a variety of national and regional agencies, including the Physical Education Association UK, the National Governing Bodies, and the Local Authorities. Houlihan and White (2002) contend that the Trust’s rapid increase in responsibility and political influence was due to the success of its teacher friendly TOP programmes, the Trust’s capacity to address the school sport demands identified in ‘Sport: Raising the Game’ and, they suggest, Sue Campbell’s (Chief Executive of the Youth Sport Trust) abilities as a policy advocate and policy entrepreneur.

1996 – 2002: Department for Culture, Media and Sport and ‘A Sporting Future for All’

In order to address the confusion caused by having a Sports Council for Britain as well as Sports Councils for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, in 1996 the Sports Council was restructured. The UK Sports Council (UKSC) was established to take responsibility for developing excellence at elite level and in January 1997, Sport England was created to develop sport in England from foundation to excellence. Although the Sports Council was dissolved, the Sports Councils for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland remained unchanged. Responsibility for disability sport was split between Sport England and UK Sports Council with the latter having a particular responsibility for elite level disability sport.

One of the first major decisions of Sport England was to select twenty-two priority sports. Sports were selected based upon their governing body’s proven commitment to the development of excellence and young people, as well as a stringent set of ten further criteria against which they were measured. The criteria included, for example, the level of public support that the sport enjoyed, the international success of England in that sport and the infrastructure of its governing body. Governing bodies with a commitment to both excellence as well as young people were placed as Category A sports, and those with a commitment to excellence or young people, were placed under category B. Following this prioritisation, national governing bodies grant aid became contingent upon their ability to meet performance criteria, which also included improvement in their own organisational infrastructure.
Subsequent to the change in Government in May 1997, Sport England became accountable to Parliament through the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). In particular, the creation of the DCMS improved the collaboration between the DfEE which is responsible for schools and the DETR which is responsible for local government (Houlihan and White, 2002).

In Labour’s first year of office Sport England published ‘England: A Sporting Nation’ and ‘Labour’s Sporting Nation’. In 2000 the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) published Labour’s first comprehensive sports policy document since Major’s ‘Sport: Raising the Game’ (1995). The DCMS’s policy ‘A Sporting Future for All’ (2000) reiterated the importance given to school and elite level sport in ‘Sport: Raising the Game’ and replaced (Houlihan and White, 2002) the focus on simple targets and outcomes with a comprehensive strategy. Furthermore, distinct from ‘Sport: Raising the Game’, ‘A Sporting Future for All’ clearly identified the role that each agency should play in the delivery of policy objectives and brought these agencies together in working groups to oversee the implementation of the strategy’s action plan.

The five elements of the strategy were: 1) to rebuild school sport facilities, 2) to create 110 specialist sport colleges, 3) to support after school sport, 4) to introduce 600 school sport co-ordinators, and 5), to support the identification and coaching provision for talented young people. On the release of the new strategy, Kate Hoey (then Minister for Sport) stated that the strategy was due to the ‘joined up thinking’ between government agencies responsible for sport and education (Hoey, 2000). Thus as Houlihan and White (2002) highlight, ‘A Sporting Future for All’ continued to place schools at the heart of sport, yet at the same time perpetuated the now long standing dual responsibility for, and bifurcation between, elite and mass participation. For example, it is anticipated that whilst specialist sport colleges would develop and share examples of good practice in the delivery of physical education and sport for all pupils, they would also act as training grounds for talented youngsters and feeders to the developing UK Sports Institute.

The focus of the Conservative government on elite performance was consolidated by the DCMS in its request for NGBs to create national development plans to demonstrate how they identified and provided for talented individuals. The DCMS'
strategy proposed that talented individuals identified by the NGBs would be linked to the new UK Sports Institute and their training and performing costs met through the Lottery’s World Class Performance programme. According to Houlihan and White (2002), the strategy provided an acknowledgement by government that the enjoyment of international success necessitated the direct and indirect funding of elite (able bodied and disabled) athletes. To focus funding on those sports most likely to achieve international success Sport England, in 1999 revised its 1996 list of 22 priority sports and selected 33 sports for inclusion in the World Class Performance programme. To complement the support given to current medal winning athletes under the World Class Performance programme, the launch of World Class Potential and World Class Start in 2001 provided NGBs with financial assistance in the identification and nurturing of talented athletes.

In 1999 Sport England launched the ‘Active Schools’, ‘Active Sport’ and ‘Active Communities’ programmes. Many of these programmes incorporated initiatives that were part of the National Junior Sports programmes such as the Youth Sport Trust’s TOP Play and BT TOP Sport Programme and Sports Coach UK’s Coaching for Teachers initiative, again illustrating the continuing dual interest in both elite as well as mass participation. The TOP programmes enjoyed notable success by providing activity cards, training and equipment to local authorities and schools. The programme was deemed particularly important by the Sports Council following the concerns surrounding the lack of time allocated to physical education in a national survey of Young People in Sport (Mason, 1995).

The launch of the Active Programmes was an opportunity for the Sports Council to formally launch Sport England and corporately brand a series of already successful initiatives, which met the needs of the DCMS. The implementation of the Active programmes was greatly enhanced by the changes to the distribution of Lottery funds introduced in the National Lotteries Act in 1998, which required a more strategic distribution of funds than was previously allowed under the Conservative administration.

However, one of the policies that was central to the New Labour government’s manifesto and which distinguished its policy from that of the previous Conservative government, was the shift toward social inclusion. The emphasis on social inclusion is
in the creation of opportunities for those previously excluded from society to enter the mainstream and to reduce the dependence on the benefits system. More specifically the government made a pledge to address social problems such as crime, drug abuse, truancy and community health and encouraged sport and, in particular Sport England to play its part in meeting this objective. The DCMS in ‘A Sporting Future for All’ called on a variety of agencies to support Sport England in tackling social exclusion.

Table 8 Landmarks in government policy on sport 1995-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Landmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Department of National Heritage publishes Sport: Raising the Game</td>
<td>John Major’s policy confirmed government interest in elite sport, school sport and national teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The (GB) Sports Council abolished and replaced by UK Sport and a ‘sports council’ in each of the home countries (Sport England in England)</td>
<td>UK Sport became responsible for elite sport and Sport England for national policy and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Responsibility for sport policy transferred to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) from the DNH which was abolished.</td>
<td>The creation of the DCMS signalled the Labour government’s increased interest in sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Labour Party publishes Labour’s Sporting Nation</td>
<td>This provided an interim policy for Labour, with simple outcomes and targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>National Lotteries Act</td>
<td>The Act resulted in a more coordinated approach to the funding of sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Sports Council launch the Active programmes</td>
<td>The Active programmes were a comprehensive series of national initiatives designed to improve sport in local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>DCMS publishes ‘A Sporting Future for All’</td>
<td>‘A Sporting Future for All’ provides a comprehensive policy which reinforced the previous government’s interest in school and elite level sport. It also emphasised the need to improve equity in sport and identified roles for key agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UK Institute for Sport established</td>
<td>The UK Institute for Sport provided a more coherent infrastructure and facilities for the identification and training of elite athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>World Class Start and World Class Potential programme launched.</td>
<td>These Lottery funded programmes focussed on the identification and training opportunities for talented young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>DCMS publish the Government’s Plan for Sport’</td>
<td>The plan provides a clear directive for NGBs to achieve better business practice, coaching infrastructures and to improve inclusion in their sport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Active Communities element of the government strategy was charged with implementing the sporting equity principles that social inclusion embraced. In 2000,
thirty Sport Action Zones (SAZs) were created with Lottery funding to improve the availability of sports opportunities in communities where sporting provision was inadequate (Hylton et al, 2001). Of the £200 million available from the Lottery, £150 million was used for community programmes, of which £25 million was devoted specifically to projects which sought to address the social exclusion faced by disabled people, ethnic communities, women and those on low incomes. It is interesting to note however, that as Houlihan and White (2002) claim, the Lottery continued to demonstrate the deeply entrenched bias toward the middle class sports that were promoted within the Major government. Houlihan and White go on to suggest that sports which had a more middle-class profile of users such as cricket, tennis, golf, hockey and rugby have continued to receive over a third of all Lottery funding.

The first set of 12 SAZs have been based in areas of deprivation such as South Liverpool and by linking organisations together, strive to improve the community’s access to sport. The SAZs provide an example, however, of the complex and possibly conflicting, dual responsibility with which the original Sports Council and now Sport England have been charged. As Houlihan and White (2002) contend, because of the variable and often conflicting interest of the agencies that are involved, Sport England has found itself in the almost untenable position of having to develop sport as well as develop the community through sport.

In March 2001 the DCMS published an action plan to implement its Sporting Future for All policy. The ‘Government’s Plan for Sport’ (DCMS (2001) prescribes a series of targets for key agencies such as local authorities and governing bodies. In the ‘Plan’, the government emphasises the need for NGBs to improve inclusion, business practice and coaching infrastructures within their sport. With regard to inclusion, the plan makes specific reference to the requirement on governing bodies to address equity and improve inclusion within its sport. The Plan states:

‘from 2001 Sport England will make the development and promotion of equity and inclusion action plans a prerequisite for the delegation of powers and funding to NGBs [and]...a requirement to monitor and evaluate impact on inclusion and equity must be built into all funded projects’ (DCMS, 2001:27)
As Houlihan and White (2002:166) suggest, while improving the coaching available to elite athletes as well as providing a more inclusive club structure is not incompatible ‘there is a tension between the two objectives’.

3.4 CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided the opportunity to review and make observations on the influence of both disability policy and sport policy on the development of disability sport. The review reveals that there are interesting similarities between the development of sport policy and disability policy and that disability sport shares some similar aims with disability policy. However, the policy-making process in disability sport more closely resembles that in sport policy than it does disability policy. This chapter concludes with a summary of three observations that are key to this study.

First, it is clear that both disability policy and sport policy have moved up the government agenda in the last 30–40 years. Prior to the campaigning activities of organisations such as the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation, Disabled People’s International and the British Council of Disabled People – government interest in disability was primarily subsumed within the caring welfare policies of various Health Acts. Following the international campaigning of various lobbying agencies, disability policy emerged as a discrete area of government interest illustrated by the passing of the Disability Discrimination Act and the formation of the Disability Rights Commission.

Similar to disability policy, sport policy is a relatively recent area of government interest which in the last 30 years has been given increased importance. Since the establishment of the Advisory Sports Council in 1965, the organisation and provision of sporting opportunities has become more central to government policy. The establishment of the Department of National Heritage in 1995, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in 2000 and the creation of the UK and English Sports Councils in 1997 all signify an increase in government interest in sport.

It is clear, therefore, that sport policy and disability policy have both been the subject of increased government interest and intervention. In other words, there has been a tendency in both sport policy and in disability policy for the government to be more
directive. For example, tackling the discrimination facing disabled people in employment and improving elite performances in sport are clearly articulated policies with recognised government supported organisations to implement them.

Second, an interesting characteristic that is common to both disability policy and what we know about sport policy for disabled people is the similarity in their primary aims and the conceptual language used to articulate them. In particular, improving the opportunities for disabled people and more recently achieving equity is a central rationale, which underlies both policy areas. The similarity in the aims of disability sport and some key aims in disability policy may be no coincidence. While disability policy is a discrete area of government policy, it also influences other policy areas such as sport. So, the Sports Council's shift from simply supporting the activities of BSAD, to recognising the wider responsibility on itself and others to improve equity in the opportunities available for disabled people, may be in part, at least, due to the shift in the understanding of disability brought about by the disability activists and the social policies they contributed to.

However, while there is commonality in their primary aims, sport policy and disability policy have been developed by different stakeholders and there is little evidence to suggest a strong connection between disability policy, sport policy and the emergence and development of disability sport. The government’s increased interest and activity in disability sport policy is more likely to be a consequence of government shifts toward addressing other social inequalities manifest in sport. The 'sport for all' policies of the 1980s identified the inequalities faced by for example, women, black and ethnic minorities, elderly people and disabled people and were developed without any direct involvement with disability policy or disability policy activists.

It is clear then, that the shift in understanding of disability from a medial pathology to a socially constructed phenomena provided the impetus for polices such as the DDA and may have led to an increased interest in services to disabled people on the part of mainstream organisations. However, despite the growth of government interest in disability policy there is little evidence that disability policy or its key stake holders have had much influence or indeed interest in sport policy.
Third, while disability policy has emerged because of, and continues to be influenced by, the radical campaigning activities of lobbying agencies, in contrast actors within sport policy have been more conservative, negotiating with, rather than challenging government policy. The government’s wide-ranging interest in sport has encouraged the involvement of a diverse range of sports organisations with what are often conflicting or competing ambitions. While Government policies on sport have been influenced by these sports organisations, as well as other departments with broader political goals, because of the lack of consensus in the policy network, government has found it relatively easy to direct sport policy. Thus, the impetus for disability sport policy has been shaped more by broad shifts in sport policy than disability policy and thus the key stakeholders in disability sport vie for access to the sport policy process and, similar to actors in mainstream sport policy, are less effective in influencing government policy.

However, it would be remiss to imply that the policy process in disability sport is clear. Government involvement in disability sport policy is complex and there is a dearth of research to provide an informed perspective. For this reason, a more detailed review and interpretation of the emergence and development of disability sport in England is provided in Chapter six.

While this chapter has provided an important overview of the key policies in disability and in sport, it has not attempted to explain how those policies have developed, which organisations have been involved in the decision making processes or how ideologies may have been a significant influence on policy formation. The following chapter describes various theories and models of how policy is formed and provides an interpretation of how they could be useful to an explanation of why policy and more specifically, disability sport policy has been shaped the way that it has.
CHAPTER FOUR

POLICY ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

While the previous two chapters provided a review of disability theory, disability policy and sport policy, in order to analyse disability sport policy it is necessary to identify which tools or frameworks may be of most use in that analysis. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to provide an overview of policy analysis at the macro and meso levels and to establish which theories are likely to be of greatest utility in the analysis of disability sport policy. To achieve this, an introduction to the types of policy analysis is provided followed by a description of the main theories of power distribution at the macro level and the relative contribution that these theories may make to the study of disability sport policy. It is not the intention, at this stage, to identify one single theoretical perspective to apply to this study as it is anticipated that elements within each may provide useful insights. Following a brief critique of the traditional stagist theory of policy-making at the meso level, three specific policy analysis models are presented. The policy network model, the advocacy coalition framework and the policy streams model are described and their potential application to policy-making is evaluated. This chapter, therefore, provides a theoretical foundation for the study involving a review of a range of policy analysis approaches. The extent to which these approaches might adequately contribute to an explanation of disability sport policy will be considered in the conclusion.

Introduction to policy analysis

Analysing policy, according to Dye (1976), is finding out what organisations do, why they do it and what difference it makes. Dye (1976) goes on to say that while there are other definitions of policy analysis they amount to much the same thing, that is, a description and explanation of the causes and consequences of an organisation’s actions. As well as being a descriptive activity, Dye (1976) argues that policy analysis can be prescriptive, helping policy makers to shape future policy. There appears to be some debate, however, concerning the role of the policy analyst and whether the concentration should be on the theoretical examination of policy or on the political fray of advocacy, that is, seeking to improve policy processes and outcomes. Fox
(1974) for example, criticises those who claim to know what is wrong with policy and how to improve it, as the research, he claims, becomes dominated by the researcher's own beliefs and values.

In an attempt to provide clarity on the various types of analysis of, and analysis for, policy Hogwood and Gunn (1981) offer seven conceptualisations of policy analysis. These are firstly, studies of policy content, which examine where a policy has come from and what it has achieved. Secondly, studies of the policy process, which are more concerned with the factors that contribute to the policy formulation. Thirdly, studies of policy output which seek to explain the different levels of finance or provision. Fourthly, evaluation studies which provide a link between analysis of and analysis for policy, and which establish what impact a policy has had on a given population. The final three categories include information for policy-making, process advocacy and policy advocacy, all of which are undertaken primarily to improve or promote policy by finding information or advocating and promoting a particular process or political concern. It has been claimed that policy analysts seem most concerned with the analysis of policy and particularly what governments do. Jenkins (1993), Marsh and Rhodes (1992) and Kingdon (1984) offer various models that attempt to provide systematic frameworks for analysing policy. Whilst Jenkins (1993) concludes that each model has its own advantages and disadvantages, he suggests that none should be regarded as suitable for all forms of analysis. Furthermore, it is important, he argues, to focus upon the explanation of the political process and the policy outcomes, rather than the validation of theoretical approaches. That is to say, the focus should be on what organisations do, and policy analysts should not be constrained by disciplinary boundaries but should utilise whatever framework is suitable for the time and situation. Informed opinion suggests that policy analysis can use a range of disciplines and frameworks to explain and interpret the influences on, and consequences of, policy.

To understand fully the policy process, therefore, it seems necessary to make sense of the relationship between the policy and the players that it has been influenced by, and it is in this context that this next section is written. What follows is a summary of the theories designed to explain how power is distributed and how decisions are made at the macro level.
4.2 MACRO LEVEL THEORIES OF THE STATE

Ball and Millard (1986) in an explanation of how different theories of power have developed, liken political science to the ‘wearing of glasses’, suggesting that each of us views the world around us through a different lens. Thus although we may observe similar things, we come to different conclusions as to what it is we have seen. These different views or theories provide a particular perspective of the world both in terms of how the world works, and how the world needs to change. The reason why these theories are significant in politics generally and for this study in particular is because they permeate the policy-making process and key actors’ roles within it. A review of the literature on power distribution consistently identifies Marxist, elitist, pluralist and corporatist theories of power distribution as the most frequently employed and it is those theories that will now be discussed.

Marxist

In the mid 1900s Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels combined their understanding of British economics, German philosophy and French revolutionary experience to develop what is regarded by Dunleavy and O’Leary (1987) as the first example of scientific socialism. Since then, according to Held (1986), social and political science has been preoccupied with the Marxist theory of class, power and state organisation.

Marxists and particularly structuralist Marxists such as Miliband, hold a polarised view of power distribution, believing that there is a minority population who because of their economic wealth and ownership of the means of production have power and use it to control the majority. According to Marxists, the state maintains the status quo, acting on behalf of the ruling classes. Marxists believe that the state is extremely powerful and that the state is controlled by the bourgeoisie who oppress and subordinate the proletariat classes. Thus class domination and subordination are the central tenets of Marxist theory, with the bourgeoisie using the state as a tool to dominate the working class proletariat (Miliband, 1969).

The traditional Marxist approach to power is based upon the control and ownership of financial capital, and power is considered to be in the hands of those who can use their wealth and its attendant class privileges to maintain dominant positions in society.
The concentration of political power and political domination in class based societies lead to what Bilton et al (1981:180) claim is 'economic exploitation, whereby the dominant economic class extracts maximum surplus value from the labour force'. The inextricable link between political power and class-based economic power is problematic, as there is a common perception that organisations and individuals as well as classes possess interests which they would hope to pursue within the public policy-making process. Structuralist Marxist views of the state reject this perception, claiming that power in society is unequally distributed and that the state is neither neutral nor a significant independent actor in the policy process. It is argued that the state is a reflection of the class system, providing the illusion of serving the general interests of society but in reality serving only those of the dominant class. Moreover, political domination brings with it ideological domination, with the morals and ideals of the ruling class being taken for granted as the common sense perspective held by wider society.

Three reasons are offered by Miliband (1969) to justify the Marxist position that political power is in the hands of the ruling class who typically use their wealth and the positions they occupy to perpetuate their economic dominance. First, it is contended that the officers in government are of a similar social background to the bourgeoisie. Second, the bourgeoisie can influence government by their personal contact and positions of responsibility. Third, government officers are limited in their freedom of actions by their personal need for continued employment and self promotion.

The main criticism of the structural Marxist explanation of power distribution according to Dunleavy and O'Leary (1987), is that the ruling classes do not just rule for their own self interest. It could be argued, for example, that the welfare state is ample evidence of the ruling classes' commitment to serving the best interests of the whole community and particularly those that are less privileged than themselves. Furthermore, whilst the Marxist theory may reflect reality in some countries, post war western democracies demonstrate that the working class who, while not possessing the same benefits of financial or cultural capital enjoyed by the upper classes, have nevertheless, gained access to positions of power within finance and banking, manufacturing industries, public services and government offices through successful social mobility.
The recognition of such criticisms and the failure of early analyses of the state to explain, for example, the development of the welfare state between the 1950s and the 1970s, contributed to the emergence of what became known as neo-Marxism (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987). When communism in the Soviet Union changed during the 1950s from a totalitarian to a more conventional authoritarian regime, western Marxists, inspired by Antonio Gramsci, developed a new theory which reflected the ongoing conflicts between dominant and subordinate cultures (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987; Bocock, 1987). Neo-Marxists contend that the state reflects the dominant culture or hegemony within any society, and whilst always retaining the power to make final decisions, coerces others to subscribe to a particular view which serves the state and legitimises its authority. Different to the structural Marxist perspective, the more contemporary neo-Marxist views recognise the need to obtain consent from the masses (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987). Thus, in the neo-Marxist view of the state, whilst always controlled by the bourgeoisie, the dominated or oppressed majority can challenge and influence policy.

According to Dunleavy and O'Leary (1987) Gramsci encouraged challenges to the state on all matters, not just those relating to finance and the economy. He claimed that neo-Marxists were engaged in a 'counter-hegemonic project' (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987: 233), in which the state's values and practices would be continually challenged and replaced by those influenced by more socialist principles. Thus a neo-Marxist views society as based on coercion and consensus, and relationships within society as essentially dominated by power struggles. Within these struggles the oppressed may be subject to a level of ideological domination which leads them to accept state policy as the inevitable or common sense solution. Thus, neo-Marxists argue that while the state may not act in the interest of the capitalist class on every occasion it will always, in the last instance, defend and promote this group, at the expense of working class interests. Consequently, while the working class may on occasion win concessions from the state they will tend to be short lived and ultimately hollow victories.

Held (1989) contends that the increasingly powerful role that the state plays in western politics has fuelled a new interest in the neo-Marxist perspective. Miliband (1969) and Poulantzas (1973) offer two different neo-Marxist perspectives on the state and the use of power. Central to the debate is a discussion on whether the individual
within the state holds the power or whether power is only exercised during the
decision making process. Poulantzas perceived that the state bureaucracy did not have
power in itself but that power was exercised during the decision making process. The
difference between the two theories is that Poulantzas sees the capitalist state as a
result of societies determined by class power, whereas Miliband views power as being
held by individuals and groups and institutions infiltrated by the bourgeoisie and those
with class privileges.

Of particular interest to this study of disability sport is the contribution that neo-
Marxism can make to our understanding of the definition of disability and the
dominant non-disabled culture within sport and the extent to which this status quo has
been reinforced by the state and challenged by lobbying organisation within disability
sport.

Elitist

Elitist explanations of power distribution are distinct from Marxist theories
as elitists argue that the uneven distribution of power is not only inevitable but also
appropriate. Elitists agree with the Marxist premise that power is concentrated in the
hands of the few but reject the notion of a true democracy and the Marxist explanation
of how the elite obtains its power. This elitist view of power distribution is associated
with Pareto and Mosca, who refuted the reductionist explanation adopted by the
Marxists (Parry, 1969).

Pareto and Mosca and the elite theory which they inspired, contend that the
concentration of power is inevitable. Indeed a ruling elite they claim is a necessary
facet of contemporary politics as there is a need for some individuals who 'fit the role'
and are predisposed to leadership to assume the positions of influence and power that
all societies require. In contrast to Marxist theory however, the elitists claim that an
elite individual or group's superiority may be due to leadership or entrepreneurial
ability and not necessarily as a consequence of economic power. Moreover, whilst the
existence of a superior class is considered to be constant, the composition of that elite
group can change. That is to say, elitists suggest that the constitution of elite groups
will vary between policy areas and over time.
The elite theory perspective on the distribution of power has been criticised however, for its failure to reflect reality as it infers that access to political office is limited to just a few small cohesive groups with shared views and the will to maintain their superiority. Coxall and Robins (1998) for example, found evidence of people in positions of power from a variety of backgrounds and a genuine interest in serving the interest of those from different classes to themselves.

**Pluralist**

Pluralists criticise both Marxist and elitist theories of power distribution for not adequately reflecting reality. Pluralists such as Dahl believe that power is far more widely distributed than Marxist and elitist theories acknowledge (Dahl, 1961). Pluralist approaches see power as dispersed between a wide range of groups, all of which contribute to the decision making process. Dahl (1961) suggests that while groups are not necessarily equally influenced on policy, no political party or policy actor is dominant in the policy process. As an early exponent of pluralism, Dahl contends that all true democracies must embrace pluralist perspectives 'otherwise we will be unable to ensure that public decisions will generally achieve the good of all' (Dahl, 1989: 299). According to Dahl a pluralist polity may be highly competitive but should be fundamentally balanced and equitable.

Pluralism was defined by Schmitter and Lembruch (1979:15) as having 'a system of interest group representation in which the constituent units have an unspecified number, are voluntary, competitive, non-hierarchical and self determined'. The pluralist perspective on power assumes a multiplicity of actors competing in a wide range of policy arenas 'whether that be for financial, political' or other gains (Self, 1985:80). According to Self (1985), competition between diverse interest groups is as central to the early concepts of pluralism, as the 'elite ruling class' is to the Marxists. Indeed, pluralists believe that there is no one central source of power and that the key contributors to policy are continually in flux, so decisions are the outcome of complex relationships and negotiations between all groups (Held, 1989; Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987; Ball and Millard, 1986; Ball, 1988; Coxall and Robins, 1998).

Pluralists encourage groups to form, lobby for government action and enter into competition with opposing groups. While accepting that society is not entirely
egalitarian, the pluralist belief is that the emergence of numerous interest groups has led to a much wider distribution of power for which all groups have to compete, thus avoiding the potential domination of a few groups with a similar interest or background. There is continual competition between these interest groups, and a regular emergence of new groups. Moreover, because pluralist theory assumes power to be situational and non-cumulative, no group holds disproportionate power for a long period across a number of policy areas (Held, 1989). The variety of groups provokes conflicts which are resolved by consensus or at least by compromise rather than violence. This early version of pluralism indicated that any active and legitimate group can make itself heard at some stage during the decision making process. As a result, typically, a political drive in one direction would provoke a response from a group pushing in the opposite direction, encouraging groups to be more politically active.

According to Ball and Millard (1986) the central concepts of pluralism have diversified since David Truman’s ‘The Governmental Process’ and Arthur Bentley’s 1908 book on the ‘Process of Government’. However, as most subsequent versions embrace the premise that power is widely dispersed between competing interest groups, pluralism seems to provide a generic term to describe theories which assume that interest and pressure groups play a significant role in the policy-making process.

There are three forms of political action that pressure groups may be engaged in, namely changing policy, gaining participation in the policy process and, changing social values. Rochon and Mazmanian (1993) assert that gaining participation in the political process is most likely to be effective in achieving the desired changes. However, gaining participation and thus power in the process, is reliant on the degree to which government agencies are dependant upon the pressure group’s relationship and resources (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992). Furthermore, whilst it is the extent and nature of community and pressure group involvement in the policy process that determines the success of the policy implementation, it is government agencies that decide which groups are ‘inside’ and which are ‘outside’ the policy network (Smith, 1993). Furthermore, a community or pressure group will only be allowed to contribute to the policy process if it plays by the rules laid down by the state, which has the autonomy to develop its own policy networks and interest groups (Grant, 1989; Rhodes, 1986; Smith, 1993). Indeed the state can act independently of all or any
pressure groups if it wishes and in what is often a static community, can exclude the involvement of radical 'outside' groups to prevent the possibilities of radical change. Thus, it can be argued that any changes which do occur may be as much to do with the socio-political context as any influence from pressure groups (Grant, 1989).

However, if the state wishes to make changes to policies, it is easier to do so with pressure group support (Smith, 1993). Whilst acknowledging that empirical evidence is not unequivocal, the few case studies available support the desirability of user or client involvement. However, involvement of client groups is not sufficient; they must be empowered, heard and listened to (Knox and McAlisstair, 1995). Whilst an increasingly popular form of political action, it seems that community or pressure groups fail to achieve the changes in policy they strive for (Rochon and Mazmanian, 1993). According to Richardson (2000), during Margaret Thatcher's period in office, the government undermined the role that interest groups play and, became more willing to attack and destabilise policy communities and coalitions. However, Richardson (2000) claims that rather than thwart interest group activity, the instability in policy communities encouraged organisations to compete for closer relationships with, and influence on, central government policy.

According to Richardson (2000), in a political climate in which many policy networks include a large number of agencies, interest groups have become more active in order either to reduce their uncertainty or to exploit the opportunities afforded by multi-agency policy-making processes. Richardson goes on to suggest that as other agencies have gained access to the increasingly wide networks, the community has become 'crowded' and relationships less clear as the areas of interest diversify.

Indeed, as illustrated in this discussion, recognition of the skewed distribution of power amongst interest groups has encouraged much criticism of the pluralist approach. According to Bachrach and Baratz (1962), pluralism ignores non-decisions and the impact of social class on the ruling elite. In other words, pluralism ignores the predominant and significant influences of the ruling classes in the decision making processes. Moreover, it disregards the significance of class and wealth in determining who has and who has not got access to political power. Indeed the huge increases in salaries amongst the directors of large companies is an example of the perpetuation of the unaccountable power and self interest exercised by the ruling classes. Whilst
recognising its contribution to policy analysis, Bachrach and Baratz (1962) also go on to criticise pluralism for over-estimating the ease with which groups can be formed and the extent to which they have access to the decision-making processes.

Whilst neo-pluralists still hold with the basic pluralist principle that liberal democracies, though not always successful, strive to satisfy the needs and wishes of ordinary people, they accept the criticism of elitists that pluralism does not reflect the significant political influence of large corporations (Lindblom, 1977). Neo-pluralists recognise that business interests are often disproportionately powerful and that they are often the winners in political battles (Held, 1989). Rather than ignore the notion of elite groups and what Marxists believe to be an uneven distribution of wealth and power, neo-pluralists such as Lindblom and Woodhouse (1993) regard elite group formation as unavoidable in political life. Lindblom, for example, accepts the notion of elite groups, but claims that the dominant group changes across time, albeit very slowly and that the competitive and democratic election processes militate against the potential for one class or group to subordinate others over the long term.

Consequently, neo-pluralists acknowledge, much in the same way as neo-Marxists, the potential for influential organisations, in particular large businesses, to manipulate the beliefs of the general population to create an ideological predisposition toward their interests (Lindblom 1977). However, they contend that this is balanced to an extent, by the increased authority of professionals such as teachers, doctors and social workers within the public sector to identify and resolve social problems. Whilst interest groups play an important role in forming challenges to policy, neo-pluralists see power and influence dispersed more selectively to the professions in the public sector, together with businesses and large industries. Accordingly, as Held (1989:61) states, 'public policy can be skewed towards certain interest groups which have the best organisation and most resources; it can be skewed towards certain politically powerful state agencies; and it can be skewed by intense rivalries between different sectors of government itself'.

Neo-pluralists, in contrast to Marxists and pluralists, contend that western democracy, with its power distributed between economic and political systems, is optimal as it provides financial stability yet has the attendant flexibility to address a wide variety of social, economic and political crises. Whilst accepting the significant impact of finance, wealth and class on policy, neo-pluralists do not assume that all economic
changes result in political and social consequences. Indeed following Weber, neo-pluralists claim that policy change has multi-causal explanations, as developments and divergences in technology, economic organisation, and social values, mean that the political world is very complex. A change in educational policy, for example, cannot be reduced to one single influence, more likely, the policy is the result of a multitude of converging variables. Indeed the changes in the social and economic situation and in particular the changes to the mode of production and the increase in non-manual jobs, has led to a blurring of the class system and consequently a shift away from class based explanations of policy. Thus neo-pluralism could be seen as a more adequate explanation of power distribution, and more useful to this study as it acknowledges the potentially powerful role played by particular groups, especially business, and accounts for the fundamentally asymmetric distribution of power. The potential contribution that the neo-pluralist perspective may offer this study of disability sport policy is discussed more fully later in this section.

**Corporatist**

Corporatism has roots that link it to a range of other macro theories, although Schmitter and Lembruch (1979) believe its emergence is most adequately explained as a development of pluralism. Schmitter and Lembruch (1979: 16) suggest that both pluralism and corporatism 'recognise, accept and attempt to cope with the growing structural differentiation and interest diversity of modern polity, but then offer opposing political remedies and divergent images of the institutional form that such as modern system of interest representation will take'. They expand on this assertion by claiming that corporatism addresses the criticisms of pluralism by recognising that it is to the benefit of interest groups and the government to co-operate closely.

Whilst neo-pluralists recognise the power of business, it was not until the 1970s, when the government required the co-operation of major businesses and industries in the development of economic policy, that corporatist approaches to power distribution emerged. Corporatists such as Winkler (1977) argue that certain groups or sectors of society, and in particular the major industries as represented by their peak organisations, have a significant role to play in the decision making processes. According to Winkler (1977) the state is influential in the organisation of business and labour, and ultimately sanction the decisions made on the conflicts between these
organisations. Held (1989) suggests that the concepts of a pluralist society, with multiple groups competing in a non-hierarchical system, does not resemble the reality of post-war Britain, as it does not account for the close relationship between the government and a few key, mainly economic, organisations.

Influenced by the writings of Schmitter and Lembruch (1979), contemporary corporatists claim that whilst there are a number of interest groups involved in policy-making these interests have a specific function sanctioned by the state and are organised hierarchically. More specifically, it is the large industries and other economic interests such as trade unions that have the main stake in policy-making. This analysis gained support in post Second World War Western European democracies, particularly in Sweden and Germany, but less so in Britain where, according to John (1998), a wider range of interest groups than simply businesses and economic organisations were considered to play a significant role in policy formation. Although as Self (1985) indicates, in some policy areas such as agriculture, there are single interest groups which have a significant if not dominant influence on policy development.

John (1998) criticises the corporatist approach for failing to account for the continual change in organisational arrangements within many policy-making arenas. Similar to other theories of power distribution, he suggests that corporatism as a model for analysis fails to cope with the complexity of policy-making processes at the macro level.

Neo-corporatism as a recent development of corporatism, recognises that there are numerous groups which have a role that is sanctioned but not controlled by the state. Thus, the development of corporatism recognises the vast number and type of agencies that are close to government decision-making. Schmitter and Lembruch (1979: 16) defined neo-corporatism or as he called it, liberal corporatism, as 'the special type of participation of large economic groups... in public and especially economic policy'. In essence then, corporatists argue that macro level decision-making is characterised by the integration of diverse interests, achieving consensus and acting collectively, as opposed to the pluralist belief in equitable power distribution and the goal of a devolved self-governing political system.
4.3 CONTRIBUTION OF THE ‘THEORIES’ TO THIS STUDY

The previous section discussed the contribution and criticisms of Marxist, elitist, pluralist and corporatist approaches to the analysis of power distribution. It is important to note that some policy areas may be better explained by one of these macro theories rather than others and also that some theories might have greater explanatory power at some times and less at others. The purpose of what follows it to establish which, if any, of the four main theories of power are useful to the analysis of disability sport policy.

As indicated earlier, elitist and corporatist theories of power distribution are not particularly instructive and have little to offer to this analysis as disability sport policy does not attract corporate business attention, and has not been influenced by peak economic interests. Corporatist theory is distinguished by first, a close relationship between government ‘peak organisations’ especially businesses and trade unions and second, the expectation that ‘peak organisations’ have the capacity to deliver policies that have the agreement of their members as well as the government. This theory may not make a particularly valuable contribution to this study of disability sport policy, as disability sport does not appear to have significant interest from businesses. Elitist theory is mainly concerned with the dominance of elite groups, and while disability sport policy may be of marginal interest to government and may be subordinate in its relationship with able-bodied sport, the concept of an elite ruling body has little to offer this analysis.

As has already been discussed, Marxist theory contends that there is an economic elite who form the ruling class and have significant power in society. Marxism reduces the analysis of power to class and economics and ignores the significance of other biological or social differences. Marxists consider the proletariats’ participation in sport as an ‘opiate’, ameliorating the drudgery of working class life, and partially accounts for the subordinate place and role of disabled people in society and in sport. However, as the Marxist perspective focuses almost exclusively on class and wealth and ignores other inequalities other than those based on class and wealth, it has a limited contribution to make to the marginal place of disability sport and the relationships within the disability sport policy area. That is not say that the Marxist perspective does not provide an explanation for the role and place of disability sport
in society, rather it is suggested that the analysis offers a limited insight into the complex nature of policy-making process within and between the wide variety of interest groups.

However, as indicated in the earlier part of this conclusion, neo pluralism and neo Marxism have much to offer to the analysis of disability sport policy as both theories recognise the subordinate status of 'minority groups' (such as disabled people) and account for the dominant non-disabled hegemony of sport policy. Consistent with neo Marxist ideology and Gramsci's theories of hegemony (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987), the dominant culture in wider society is evident in disability sport. In other words, just as the affairs of disabled people are considered to be secondary to those of non-disabled people in wider society, this inferior status of disabled people is manifest in sport.

Neo-Marxist theory has more to offer to the analysis of disability sport than Marxism as it recognises that explanations of power distribution cannot always be reduced to arguments about economics and class. This perspective on power distribution is evident in sport as participation is influenced by social constructs other than class. Social differences such as race, gender and disability also impact upon the dominant cultures in society and thus sport (Coakley, 1998). As discussed in chapter three, for example, disabled people have been typically excluded from decision-making roles (Ducket, 1998) and are discriminated against in the work place (Abberley, 1987). Accordingly, and reflecting their subordinate status in wider society, disabled people participate in sport less than non-disabled people (Sport England, 2000a). However, and in keeping with the cultural studies perspective, there is evidence of subordinate groups challenging and attempting to redefine the dominant hegemony in sport. Moreover, the significant increase in the popularity and commercial sponsorship of sport has led to sport being used as an arena to demonstrate and draw attention to non-sporting issues as well. There is a wealth of literature that considers how the predominant white male culture in sport and society has been challenged or maintained in or through sport (Hargreaves, 1986, Coakley, 1998; Cashmore, 2000; Rojek, 2000). As Rojek (2000) and Hargreaves (1986) contend, sport is a potential arena for consciousness raising and collective mobilisation. It is a way that individuals and groups can resist and struggle against the dominant hegemony and bring about change.
While it can be contended that recent policies on mainstreaming seek to challenge the discriminatory or exclusive practices of the dominant sporting organisations, there is little evidence from the case studies that disabled people have challenged the dominant able bodied hegemony of sport. Nor have disabled people used sport as a vehicle to challenge the able bodied hegemony in wider society. Although the policies and practices of a few mainstream governing bodies may indicate a shift from the previous non-disabled dominant sports culture, it would be inappropriate to suggest that disability sport policy is anything other than subordinate to mainstream sports policy. Typically, mainstream organisations embody and reflect the non-disabled dominant society, and give priority in resources and commitment to sport for the non-disabled.

In keeping with neo Marxist theories on power distribution, the earlier review of literature suggests that Sport England has retained power in the decision making process and has coerced other organisations to subscribe to its views on disability sport policy. To illustrate this, the creation of the English Federation of Disability Sport and the pressure on NGBs to mainstream, demonstrate the state’s intention to convey what it perceives to be inevitable and common sense solutions, through a power struggle of coercion and consensus. In other words, Sport England has sought the views and involvement of others but ultimately sanctioned those developments that suits its own purpose. While this discussion will be developed further within the case study chapters, Sport England has continued to devolve responsibility for disability sport, yet has retained its role as the most influential actor in the decision making process.

The development of disability policy demonstrates how in the UK at least, disabled people and the interest groups that they have formed, have challenged the dominant non-disabled hegemony. The disability movement and its influence on the anti-discrimination legislation that followed – namely the Disability Discrimination Act (1995), illustrates how interest groups can influence government policy and thus culture. While there is a paucity of literature that considers the power struggles in disability sport, the neo-Marxist perspective may provide an interesting analysis of disability sport policy and the state, and interest group roles in challenging or perpetuating the dominant non-disabled hegemony of sport.
Pluralists and neo pluralists believe that power is spread across a diverse range of groups, all of whom have the opportunity to involve themselves in some part of the decision making process. This perspective on power distribution may be useful to the analysis of disability sport policy as there appears to have been a proliferation of organisations involved in disability sport (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989), all vying for better services for their particular interest. Pluralists may consider this growth of disability sport organisations as essential in the articulation of the interests of such a diverse population that state policy is meant to serve. Indeed the distribution of power and relationships between those organisations involved in disability sport may reflect the pluralist theory that there is no one group or organisation that dominates policy-making. The neo-pluralist perspective on power distribution may be of particular value to this study. First, it acknowledges the variety of influences on policy formation, and in particular the spill-over from one policy area to another. For example, and as discussed more fully in the previous chapter, we can see how policies on health impact upon sport policy. Second, neo-pluralism recognises the significant role that can be played by a large number of disparate interest groups and third, it acknowledges the rivalries that can exist between different sections of the government.

As stated at the outset of this section, these theories are as much an interpretation of how the world is, as they are a reflection of ideological beliefs of how the world ought to be, and in that sense, studies conducted from any of these perspectives bring with them the attendant values that each of these theories is inspired by. Notwithstanding the significance of ideologically influenced interpretation, of the four theories of power distribution, neo pluralist and neo-Marxist theories may be of most use in the analysis of disability sport policy. Neo-Marxists and neo pluralists recognise the existence of inequalities other than those based simply on class and wealth and that not all groups have the same access to decision making as others. These perspectives accommodate the wide range of organisations with diverse interests and resources that are involved in the disability sport policy network. Moreover, the neo-Marxist and neo pluralist perspectives on power distribution may help to explain the struggles and conflicts between organisations within the policy-making process.

These macro theories inspired various alternative perspectives on policy-making at the meso organisational level, some of which offer more useful insights into disability
sport policy than others. What follows is an examination of some key meso level models of policy analysis and an evaluation of the contribution that these may make to this study. More specifically, after a brief discussion of the rational and stages approach to policy-making, the Advocacy Coalition Framework, the Policy Streams approach and the Policy Network model will be discussed in the context of their application to disability sport policy.

4.4 POWER IN THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

Whether policy-making power is held by central government, by agencies sanctioned by the state, or whether it is more widely distributed, is contested. It is clear, however, that the study of public policy is essentially a study of power and that recent theorising on policy-making indicates a shift away from the ‘rational model of decision making’ introduced by Simon in 1945.

Rational Model of Decision Making

Simon (1945) claimed that decision making involves three steps, namely; (1) listing alternatives, 2) identifying the consequences of each alternative, and 3) comparing the consequences. The decision making process is complex and extends over a long period. It is rarely, declares Simon (1945), one decision but more likely a series of decisions influenced by a wide range of internal and external factors. Furthermore, he contends that policies are formed as much by non-decisions as decisions. For example, some possible solutions to problems may not be considered because of the ideological biases implicit in the policy-making process. Therefore, a policy can be as much about what is not being done, as about what is being done. In this context it must be recognised that policy analysis in any of its forms is rarely, if ever, a value-neutral, objective activity free of assumptions and prejudices. As Simon (1945) concedes, a decision may reflect an individual’s rather than an organisation’s values.

It needs to be recognised, however, that policy cannot be examined by the scrutiny of decisions alone, as there is also a need to examine practice and actions carried out consistently over a period of time as these can also be deemed to be a manifestation of policy. It would seem, therefore, that actions as well as policy decisions provide a balanced focus for policy analysis. However, whilst some actions may be clearly
identifiable as the implementation of a policy, not all actions performed on behalf of an organisation will be obviously attributable to policy. The analysis of actions and practice may, however, provide, an important insight into an organisation’s beliefs and values.

Hogwood and Gunn (1981) claim that academics are too concerned with the formulation rather than the implementation of policy, arguing that there is often a significant gulf between an organisation’s intentions (policy) and its actions. Gunn provides a list of prerequisites for the successful implementation of policy and, as an example of the top-down approach, it provides a useful insight into the factors which may not be under the control of policy makers and senior administrators. Barrett and Fudge (1981), in recognition of this concern, stress the need to consider implementation as a negotiated process between those seeking to put policy into practice and those upon whom this action depends.

It seems, therefore, that policymaking is often seen as a technical and controlled process. Reality shows, however, that this is not always the case, primarily due to the necessary involvement of the ‘individual’ throughout the whole policy process. Furthermore, it is argued by Jenkins (1993), that rather than being seen as a complication, the study of human interaction is as central to policy analysis as the examination of policy documents (Jenkins, 1993). Moreover, Minogue (1993) stresses how policies must be considered not only in the context of the overall policy process, which involves the ‘interaction of decisions, policy networks, organisations, actors and events’ (Minogue, 1993:11), but also in the context of the wider socio-economic context. Minogue (1993) goes on to suggest that policy analysts often ignore or fail to cope with the organisational and individual politics which are an implicit influence on the policy process. In its simplest linear stagist formulation, the policy process involves the following: policy demand, policy decision, policy output and policy outcome, thus providing a context within which to discuss the definable aspects of policymaking process.

However, although the rational decision making model provides a potentially useful point of entry for policy analysis, it is generally considered to be an inadequate tool for analysing policy-making. First, it oversimplifies complex policy issues and encourages the analyst to ignore the possibility of deep structural biases in the policy
formation. Second, it suggests a linear development of policy, which generally fails to
capture the raggedness of the policy process, and third, it creates the impression that
the exercise of power is moderated by the quality of rational analysis and argument. In
other words it ignores or significantly downplays the role of ideology in the policy
process. It is to a consideration of ideology in policy-making that I now turn.

**Ideology and power in the decision making process**

It is argued by Benson (1977) that within individual policy-making processes, power
can be exerted at the level of deep structural beliefs or ideologies. This closely reflects
a neo Marxist perspective on the use of power at an individual level, in that neo-
Marxists (as discussed earlier) recognise the dominance of particular groups and their
ideological influences on the dominant culture. Schnattschneider (1960) agrees that
ideology shapes policy as it is individuals who both shape and challenge policy. Thus,
similar to the neo-pluralist view of power distribution, he claims that the proliferation
of organisations or interest groups within a policy area simply reflects a collective
mobilisation of individual bias. Gramsci’s cultural studies theory, derived from the
neo-Marxist theory, indicates that policies are the result of ‘struggles’ between
dominant state-sanctioned agencies and challenges made by others including
individuals, groups, the media or public opinion. In Hay’s view, ‘power is to political
analysis what the economy is to economics’ (Hay, 2002:168). All these perspectives
identify power as a central element of the policy-making process but emphasise that
power is not always an observable ‘surface’ phenomenon and may be embedded in
the social structure and pattern of social relations. Consequently, in order to
understand fully the policy process it is necessary to examine how power is exerted
and in whose interests.

While macro-level theorising is valuable in suggesting where power is located and on
what it is based at the societal level, it is important to examine how power is
operationalised by individuals and organisations in the policy-making process. Lukes
and Foucault offer two of the most important theories of power and it is these theories
that we now discuss.
Lukes' view of power

In his seminal text ‘Power. A Radical View’, Lukes (1974) provides a conceptual analysis of power which sheds light on this crucial element within policy analysis. Essentially, he proposes that power can be viewed from one of three dimensions. One dimensional views of power, such as Dahl's (1961), Lukes (1974) claims, are based upon the notion that A gets, or attempts to get, something from B. Lukes considers Dahl's (1961) view of power, in which ‘A has the power over B to the extent that A can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do’, to be over-simplistic and inaccurate as the use of power may produce observable behaviour but even if it does, it may be impossible to detect or measure it in any useful way. Furthermore, as Lukes argues this first dimension or ‘face’ of power assumes that all decisions are the outcome of observable conflicts thus ignoring the possibility of implicit or taken for granted views or values (Lukes, 1974; Hay, 2002). Consequently, in the one-dimensional view power is an attribute of individuals, and is associated with the domination or power over others. It is an unproductive zero-sum relationship in which ‘some gain only to the extent that others lose out’ (Hay, 2002:173).

Lukes agrees, therefore, with Bachrach and Baratz (1962) who consider the one dimensional view to be an inadequate explanation of power as it fails to consider the unobservable power exercised by the more powerful. That is to say, power also involves the conscious or unconscious prevention or suppression of views or potential conflicts. This mobilisation of bias, evident in all individuals, groups and organisations, determines which issues are organised into or out of the observable political discussions and conflicts (Lukes, 1974).

Bachrach and Baratz's two dimensional view accounts for the predominant values and beliefs that benefit one group at the expense of another and involves both observable and unobservable decision making and non-decision making processes. According to this view, a decision is a choice among alternative modes of action and a non-decision is a decision that results in the suppression or thwarting of a latent challenge to the values or interests of the decision maker (Lukes, 1974). Demands for change within an organisation, for example, can be thwarted or suppressed without any discussion or observable conflict taking place, either before or during the policy process (Lukes, 1974). This provides an explanation for the way in which issues may be kept on or off
the political agenda and helps to explain how those in positions of power can perpetuate the *status quo* (Leanard, 1975; Hay; 2002).

Notwithstanding the contribution of the two-dimensional view of the decision-making process, Lukes (1974) insists that it ignores the wider influences on the individual and thus the group decision. Moreover, he suggests it still uses the one dimensional preoccupation with observable conflict as the dominant indicator of power. As Swingle (1976) surmises, individuals, groups and organisations all use the term power even though there is little agreement on its meaning. Whilst he concedes that many explanations are based on this initial premise, Swingle (1976) believes it is a mistake to limit discussions of power to cause and effect as it assumes that power can only be used if a response, such as an employee’s grievance or trade union strike, is evident. In response to these limitations, Lukes (1974) offers a third dimension of power, which emphasises the social nature of power and recognises that power can be exerted over, as well as, on behalf of others. It recognises that power is decision-making, agenda setting and preference shaping (Hay, 2002: 180). This face of power recognises that power is exercised when A gets B to do something she otherwise would not do – but is also exercised when A influences or shapes B’s preferences, so that B believes the options offered by A are ‘a good deal’ (Hay, 2002: 178).

According to Lukes (1974: 24) power is ‘shaping their perceptions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural or unchangeable’ (Lukes, 1974: 24)

Swingle (1976:48) defines power as ‘the ability of a person or group, for what ever reason, to affect another person’s or group’s ability to achieve its own goals (personal or collective)’ but Lukes (1974) believes that power does not have to be observable behaviour. Even if not deployed or exercised, the mere capacity to affect others constitutes power, thus according to Lukes (1974), power can be either realised or unrealised potential or capacity. Lukes’ third face of power draws on Marxist theory to suggest that society is bound by systematic inequalities that are the consequence of ‘largely invisible...highly effective and insidious mechanisms of institutionalised persuasion’ (Hay, 2002: 179).
However, not all outcomes are a result of an intended use of power but that outcomes of power must serve, and be intended to serve, the interests of the powerful. This however, may not account for the altruist who may use power to serve the interests of others to his own personal or economic detriment. Lukes' view implies that power can be possessed, obtained and given. An alternative view is expressed by Foucault (Foucault, 1974, 1978; Simon, 1995; Ransom, 1997; Philip, 1998), who asserted that power was not a commodity that could be owned. Foucault claimed that power is an interaction embedded in the decision making process and it is to this view of power that we now turn.

Foucault's view of Power

Foucault rejected, in part at least, the one dimensional view of power that Lukes described, claiming that individuals do not possess power nor do they have different levels of power. Particularly influenced by Nietzsche, Foucault believed that people did not 'have' power implicitly but that power is an action which individuals can engage in (Foucault, 1974; Simon, 1995; Ransom, 1997). He contended that power cannot be possessed, but it can be exercised and when exercised, typically, its impact will provoke a resistance. He believed that people do not have a 'real' identity that they possess, rather their identity is communicated in their interactions with others. Nor is their identity fixed, rather it changes according to the interaction with those persons that they are surrounded by and is a shifting, temporary construction. Thus Foucault's explanations of power reject the Marxist and even neo-Marxist views of powerful elites. According to Philip, (1998), Ransom (1997) and Danaher, Schirato and Webb (2000) Foucault's view of power works against the view that there are dominant subjugating cultures that subordinate and oppress certain groups. Therefore, Foucauldian theory sits uncomfortably with, for example, the feminist claim that women are disempowered by men. For Foucault, these theories assume that certain groups and individuals possess power because of what or who they are. He contends that life is not so clear-cut and that some males for example, may have less in common with their male peers than with the women they are supposedly oppressing. Foucault claimed therefore, that the elitist theories of power rely on the notion of stable identities, with no recognition of the confusion that may surround the identity of, for example, the ruling class or workers, male or female, straight or gay and we might add, able-bodied and disabled. He suggested that it is illogical to assume that
power will somehow be possessed by certain people and not held, in any way, by others. Instead, he contends that power is something which can be deployed by particular people in specific situations, which itself will produce other reactions and resistances and is not tied to specific groups or identities (Simons, 1995; Philip, 1998; and Danaher, Schirato and Webb; 2000). According to Foucault power is derived from people’s empowerment or disempowerment by the groups to which they belong. Foucault believes that modern societies has ‘experts’ who are empowered by scientific and technical forms of discourse and, who convince and persuade non-experts to accept the claims they make. The control that is exercised over people is not just imposed, it is ‘instilled’ (Scott, 2001: 95). It appears, therefore, at least according to Foucault, that power is embedded in the decision making processes within and between organisations. It is not possessed or owned by an individual and it is not always observable, rather it is immanent in the interaction between individuals within organisations. Power is also exercised in the interaction between organisations and thus plays an important part in the policy-making process.

While power may be exercised within all policy-making processes, the concepts of power and disempowerment may be of particular relevance to this study. As discussed in Chapters two and three, disabled people have typically been excluded from decision making positions (Ducket, 1998). For example, it appears from the history of disability policy that doctors and medical staff in hospitals exercised considerable power over disabled people until, in the 1970s, disabled people collectively challenged their enforced subordination. Foucault’s perspective on the role of the professional expert is useful here in explaining the dominant influence on the emergence of teaching hospitals, institutions for the mentally ill and disabled peoples lives generally. Indeed, the medicalisation of impairment and the role of the (typically non-disabled) dominant medic inspired Foucault’s theory of the ‘professional expert’.

Moreover, the medical expert led to the institutionalised segregation of disabled people from ordinary life and encouraged the consolidation of a sporting culture around notions of able-bodiedness with the attendant marginalisation, oppression and disempowerment of those with disabilities. Consequently, policy debates around issues such as the mainstreaming of disability sport need to be understood not only in
terms of struggles between groups adopting differing ideological positions, but also in terms of the way power is articulated within decision-making processes.

However, while society and sport in society may be the product of embedded power structures, it is often difficult to establish who has power, how power is exercised in policy processes and how power relations influence policy in relation to specific policy issues. For this reason, models have been designed to assist in the explanation of power relations and their contribution to policy development in organisations.

4.5 MESO LEVEL APPROACHES TO POLICY ANALYSIS

As the previous section indicates, power may be conceptualised as being embedded within the decision-making processes that shape policy development. To understand how and where power is exercised and who uses it, it is important to explore competing models of decision-making and examine ways in which power as a concept is operationalised in sport and in particular, in disability sport. What follows then is a discussion of some prominent models of policy analysis and the contribution that they might make to this study.

A critique of the Stages approach

A common starting point for the analysis of the policy process is to conceptualise it in terms of a series of ‘stages’, generally derived from the rational model, which begins with issue identification and agenda setting and then moves through to implementation, monitoring and review. While widely criticised, the stages approach has proved resilient and, therefore, makes a logical starting point for this review of competing meso level models of policy analysis. The purpose of what follows is to describe and critique the stages approach, providing a prelude to a discussion of three alternative models of policy analysis.

According to Sabatier (1999), policy-making is an extremely complex process, reasons for which he outlines as follows. Firstly, the policy process involves numerous actors from a variety of different groups and organisations, each with their own values, ideas and perceptions of the policy problems. Secondly, it can take as long as ten years before a substantive policy development moves from an idea or the identification of a problem, to the implementation of a policy solution. Thirdly, each
policy area typically involves a range of interacting departments working on joint initiatives and across different levels of the government. Fourthly, the severity and cause of a problem can undergo significant technical scrutiny, in an attempt to understand better the problem, as well as the efficacy of possible solutions. Lastly, as indicated by the earlier discussion on power, the values and ideologies of the key actors are all brought to bear on the policy process. For example, Sabatier (1999) believes that some policy decisions are so important to an actor’s own belief system or to their job security, that there can be a misrepresentation or biased presentation of information.

As the policy process is, therefore, a complicated process, the policy analyst needs a tool that simplifies and organises information so that the events that contribute to policy can be understood. Sabatier (1999), similar to Ball (1988), suggests that there are two perspectives or lenses through which policy can be analysed; the first of which is *ad hoc* and full of implicit assumptions while the second is more scientific, based on the formation of theories arising from critical relationships. The policy scientist or analyst, therefore, attempts to make sense of a situation by using logical sets of relationships and models, which apply the theory to a specific situation.

According to Sabatier, the stages heuristic model has been particularly influential in the development of policy analysis models. It was introduced by Lasswell (1950), developed by Jones (1970) and, recently defended by Deleon (1999). The stages model has been well supported because it imposes a theoretical framework that can be transposed onto a real world setting. In an earlier version of the stages approach, Lasswell, as its originator, believed there were seven stages of decision making (Deleon, 1999; Lasswell, 1950).

1. Intelligence
2. Promotion
3. Prescription
4. Innovation
5. Application
6. Termination
7. Appraisal
It provides a conceptual order and a linear series of logical steps through the chaotic process of policy-making (John, 1998). This approach is based on the policy process having an overt and identifiable beginning, middle and end and that these progressions can be divided up into discrete and discernible sections. This would provide a neat and organised series of steps that policy analysts can use, academics can write about and students can follow. Moreover, as Deleon (1999) indicates with his list of authors who have applied Lasswell’s stages approach, this model has been well used by established policy analysts, providing them, as was intended, with a workable framework to impose upon policy situations. John (1998) describes it as a straightforward and common-sense understanding of policy-making that clearly identifies the role that each actor plays. John (1998) claims that it provides a model to define the roles played by key agents such as politicians, civil servants and central government. Thus, due to its capacity to simplify a complex process, the stages model became the dominant policy analysis tool in the 1970s and 1980s.

In more recent years, however, the stages approach has received sustained criticism as analysts search for better theories (Sabatier, 1999). Whilst the stages model of policy-making offers an interpretation (or at least a description) which appears logical, it is criticised for over-simplification, for not providing an adequate explanation of how policy issues get onto the government policy agenda, and for failing to explain accurately the roles that agencies and actors play in the policy-making process.

Sabatier (1999), as perhaps one of the most influential critics of the stages model, offers a barrage of complaints regarding its validity. He accuses the model of not being a causal theory, in so far as it does not provide a model that can be generalised across its own stages or between policy areas. He also criticises it for inaccurate descriptions of the stages, claiming that they do not reflect the progressions that many policy processes follow. The stages approach also neglects, he claims, the influence of interest groups and ignores the multitude of policies that are developed across and between levels of government, as it assumes policies are driven from the top by single government departments. This last criticism is of particular significance given the importance attached to interest groups by the policy analysis models that follow.

In essence the stages approach assumes that policy is derived simply from the macro level of political processes. That is to say, the model assumes that policy emerges as a
result of explicit, observable and predictable relationships. Furthermore it is not, its critics claim, reflective of reality as it does not account for the variables that influence the policy process. Whilst there are examples of policies that have emerged as a consequence of what appears to be a sequential series of stages, the model may be insensitive to policy developments that emerge as a result of less systematic processes (John, 1998).

In recognition of the need for a criteria against which models for policy analysis can be considered, Sabatier (1999) suggests a theory ought to; 1) have concepts that are clear and consistent and have a falsifiable hypothesis, 2) have been tested and supported by scholars, 3) be able to explain the policy process, and 4) be able to consider the broad range of factors that influence policy. The following models which meet some, if not all, of these criteria, offer alternatives to the stages model of the policy process and may provide this study with what Sabatier (1999) describes as a range of theoretical perspectives. What follows then is a discussion of three of the most prominent models of policy analysis: Marsh and Rhodes’ Policy Network approach, Sabatier’s Advocacy Coalition Framework and Kingdon’s Policy Streams approach.

4.6 POLICY NETWORKS

As noted earlier, the corporatist and pluralist theories have been criticised as inadequate due to their inability to reflect accurately the complexity of interest group interaction with the government. Similarly, the stages model of policy analysis, despite its early dominance, also failed to account for the complexity of the policy-making process and the number and range of different interest groups that contribute. The strength of the neo-pluralist theories of power not only undermined the confidence in the stagist model but also encouraged the development and refinement of the concept of a policy community as a useful analytical tool for explaining the policy process (Dunleavy and O'Leary, 1987). According to Richardson (2000), the study of interest groups received little attention until the 1970s when it became recognised, particularly by neo-pluralists, that traditional institutions were not the only source of political power and that policy change often only took place when the organisations within a ‘policy community’ consented to the need for change.
In an attempt to provide some clarity regarding the significance of the relationship between organisations and the policy process, Rhodes (1988) proposed the policy network approach. He suggested that a ‘policy community’ is a group of policy actors or potential policy actors who are more directly involved in a policy-making process than the wider political universe, whereas an ‘issue network’ encompasses a more diverse range of interests (Rhodes, 1988). Thus, policy communities are characterised by stable relationships, a continuous and highly restrictive membership, shared responsibilities, and insulation from other networks. Whilst this and similar definitions (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992; Wilks and Wright, 1988) have been criticised for what may be perceived as an oversimplification, the policy network approach provides a conceptual framework for analysing the impact of a broader range of agencies on the development of policy.

To understand fully the uses of the policy network model, it is important to review, at least briefly, the American and British literature which led to its development. American literature has tended to focus more on the micro level of analysis dealing with the relationship between key actors and their role in the policy-making process, rather than, as in British literature, the relationship between key agencies and governments. American literature, illustrated by the work of Freeman, proposed that these relationships amounted to a sub-system which he defined as ‘a pattern of interaction of participants, or actors, involved in making decisions in a special area of policy’ (1955: 11). He saw public policy as the sum of all the decisions taken at the micro sub-system levels, suggesting that whilst decisions made in sub-systems may be considered minor or insignificant on their own, they are ‘collectively the stuff of which a large share of total public policy is made (Freeman, 1955:33). McConnell (1966) developed this argument by including the potential influence of individual actors or agencies to control rather than respond to their membership. This concept inspired a response from McFarland (1987) who, similar to the pluralists, suggested that decision making was far more open than McConnell contended and could be evidenced by the significant growth in interest groups.

British literature on networks seems to draw more on European than American studies, but Rhodes asserts that some seminal work by Richardson and Jordan (1979) was influenced by Heclo’s (1972) notion that decisions made in sub-systems or networks by government agencies and pressure groups, determine broader British
policy. Richardson and Jordan (1979) stressed the growth of interest groups and the increased role they play in the diverse array of policy networks. They also emphasised the significant role of individual actors rather than institutions in the decision making process and the impact their ideologies can have on policy outcomes. Whilst Richardson and Jordan are clearly influenced by American studies of relations within institutions, Rhodes is more consistent with the European literature in focusing on the relationships between, rather than within, organisations.

To understand further how policy is shaped, Rhodes developed a model representing a continuum of 'policy community - issue network' dimensions on which interest groups and policy actors can be placed. The dimensions include: the number of agencies involved and their interest or role, the frequency and life span of interaction, the ease with which participants reach consensus, and the distribution and balance of resources within the group (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992). For example, a pressure group would be considered as being inside and central to the policy community, enjoying the resultant benefits of this privileged location, if there is 'a consensus and ideology which limit the range of arguments that are permissible, legitimate and likely to be accepted as valid forms of controversy' (Smith, 1993: 63). An issue network, however, will involve a wider range of interests and pressure groups, be less likely to reach consensus, and be highly politicised. Marsh and Rhodes (1992) suggest that the policy network is a meso level concept bridging the micro level of government decision-making and the macro level of power distribution in society. As such, the study of policy networks is concerned with the relationship between organisations and the policy outcomes to which they may contribute. Marsh and Rhodes claim that this is a more useful tool for policy analysis than the pluralist and corporatist theories or the stages approach, as it provides a representation of interest group intermediation.

As well as the British literature on policy networks, Rhodes was greatly influenced by two Economic Social Science Research Council funded projects: 1) the central -local government relations initiative, and 2), the government-industry relations initiative. As a result of these and the thirty further projects that they generated, a rich resource for future discourse on the policy network concept was provided.

The central-local government relations initiative was based on the following five propositions that became known as the Rhodes model (1998):
1. Any organisation is dependent on other organisations for resources.
2. In order to achieve its goals the organisations have to exchange resources.
3. Although decision making within the organisation is constrained by other organisations, the dominant coalition retains some discretion.
4. The dominant coalition employs strategies within known rules of the game to regulate the process of exchange.
5. Variations in the degree of discretion are a product of the goals and the relative power potential of interacting organisations. This relative power potential is a product of the resources of each organisation, of the rules of the game, and of the process of exchange between organisations.

The Rhodes Model

In this early version of the policy network model, the actors were deemed to be interdependent agencies that operated across levels within the process. Rhodes considered the interrelationship between the macro level and meso level to be crucial to any explanation of the 'changing pattern of network relationships and their outcomes' (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992:12). Rhodes uses Benson’s (Benson, 1982: 148) definition of policy networks as a 'cluster or complex of organisations connected to each other by resource dependencies'. As illustrated in the table overleaf (Table 9), Rhodes identifies five types of relationship that he plots along a continuum from policy community to issue network. Acknowledging the inadequacy of this model’s capacity to explain how a relationship within a network can change, he subsequently clarified that the national government environment has the most significant impact on network changes. More specifically, he concluded that changes within, for example, the economy and the welfare state at a macro level, were likely to have impact on the relationships between and within networks at all levels.

Rhodes’ model is criticised, however, for its use of a continuum. Whilst it is relatively clear that his characterisation of a policy community seems directly opposed to an issue network, the other types of network that exist in-between do not enjoy the same level of clarity. Moreover, it has been argued by Marsh (1998) that Rhodes’ model confused two matters that are crucial to policy communities. Firstly, it is unclear what constitutes a relationship that is stable and robust and whether, if one organisation
dominates, whose interest it serves. Secondly, the model suggests that an intergovernmental network can never exist as a coherent policy community. That is to say, it does not easily cater for policy developments that involve various levels of government actors from a range of different government departments.

Table 9 Policy Community and Policy networks: The Rhodes Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Network</th>
<th>Characteristic of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy community / Territorial</td>
<td>Stability, highly restricted membership, vertical interdependence, limited horizontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Network</td>
<td>Stability, highly restricted membership, vertical independence, limited horizontal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>articulation, serves interests of profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental network</td>
<td>Limited membership, limited vertical interdependence, extensive horizontal articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Network</td>
<td>Fluctuating membership, limited vertical interdependence, serves interest of producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue network</td>
<td>Unstable, large number of members, limited vertical interdependence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Marsh and Rhodes, 1992:14)

Whilst the concept of a policy network was well supported, the definition of a policy community and an issue network and the characteristics that distinguish them is both unclear and contested. Rhodes identifies four characteristics to distinguish a policy community from an issue network (Rhodes, 1988: 77); interest, membership, interdependence, and resources. Grant (1989) however suggests only three; differentiation, specialisation and interaction. Marsh (1998) suggests more clearly that a policy community is characterised by a limited number of participants, frequent interaction, continuity, value consensus, resource dependence, positive sum power games and the regulation of members.

Wilks and Wright's Model

Wilks and Wright placed more emphasis than Rhodes on the micro level analysis of interpersonal relations as the key to conceptualising policy networks. Furthermore, different to Rhodes and as detailed in Table 10, they suggest that there is a 'policy universe', which consists of a 'large population of actors and potential actors (who) share a common interest in policy and may contribute to the policy process on a regular basis' (Wilks and Wright, 1987: 88). They reserve the term 'policy
community', for a network of actors and potential actors sharing an interest in an industry who interact with each other by the exchange of resources. Wilks and Wright consider a 'policy network' to be the outcome of those exchanges within or between a number of policy communities. They believed that their model allows for the 'closeness of relationships' to distinguish between the types of networks. In particular, they argue that their model allows them to recognise that not all the same policy issues in the same policy sub-sector are handled in the same network, and that 'members of a policy network may be drawn from different policy communities within the same policy area or even from different policy areas' (cited in Marsh and Rhodes, 1992:18).

Table 10 Policy Community and Policy Networks: the Wilks and Wright model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy level</th>
<th>Policy actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy area</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy sector</td>
<td>Chemicals, telecommunications,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundaries, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy sub-sector (focus)</td>
<td>For example, for chemicals policy sector: basic chemicals pharmaceuticals, agro chemicals, paints, soaps, and toiletries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Issue</td>
<td>For example, health and safety,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drug licensing, company profits,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or 'limited list'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Marsh and Rhodes, 1992:19, adapted from Wilks and Wright, 1987)

**Marsh and Rhodes’ Model**

Marsh and Rhodes developed the original policy network concept to provide a model of the process of intermediation between interest groups and the government. Thus using a hybrid of the corporatist and pluralist models, they argued that the membership, characteristics of, and relationships between the membership, influences the policy outcomes. Whilst they do not place an emphasis on interpersonal links, Marsh and Rhodes do recognise that ‘any interpersonal network of relations may also act as a constraint or a resource’ (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992:262). However, the type, distribution and exchange of resources and the use of power, is what Marsh and Rhodes consider being the more central aspects of the policy network approach. They contend that their model helps to explain the power of individuals and organisations in
the policy-making process. The model suggests that typically, policy communities are characterised by ‘large degrees of consensus, not necessarily on specific policy but rather on policy agenda, and the boundaries of policy agenda’ (Marsh and Smith, 2000:6). As Coleman and Perl (1999) claim, the extent to which there is consensus on basic values will determine the legitimacy of decisions. Thus, if the consensus on values fades, legitimacy is threatened and conflicts in the policy-making process can become more common.

Marsh and Rhodes' claim that the policy network approach allows the following four factors to be determined: 1) who makes policy, 2) how that policy is made, 3) why certain actors are in a privileged position and 4), in whose interest these actors rule and how that interest impacts on their role. In a typology of case studies, Marsh and Rhodes concluded in 1992 that a policy network could comprise of a range of varying relationships between policy communities and issue network. Table II (overleaf) clearly illustrates the dimensions on which those polarised concepts are determined.

Marsh and Rhodes concluded that whether a policy area forms a loose issue network or a robust policy community has a significant impact on the policy outcomes. In the case studies they investigated, agriculture and nuclear power were supported by strong policy communities, with high levels of continuity despite their changing memberships. Other case studies identified the existence of a range of policy networks, such as the sea defence network which was dominated by professional agencies. They found however, contrary to the impression given in Rhodes' earlier model, that within a policy area the types of network are not mutually exclusive and that they are not exhaustive. That is to say, within a policy area there can be two or more networks, and also policy networks can have more than one tier, often as a result of the different levels of influence brought about by the variability in resources. This is illustrated by the changes to the tobacco industry resulting from the British Medical Association's intervention in a policy network within which they normally played no part.

Marsh and Rhodes (1992) stated therefore, that policy networks are subject to changes in the economic climate, political or individual ideology, knowledge, and also technical or institutional developments. For example, the poor economy and in particular the concern surrounding youth unemployment, stimulated the development
of a policy network involving the Manpower Services Commission, the Confederation of British Industry, and the Trades Union Congress. A further example is provided by the ideological drive of the Conservative New Right in the 1980s, which prevented many professional agencies from inclusion in well-established networks. Professional bodies within education, for example, were excluded from policy discussions on youth training and vocational education.

Table 11 Types of Policy Networks: Characteristics of Policy Communities and Issue Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Policy community</th>
<th>Issue Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants</td>
<td>Very limited number, some groups consciously excluded</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of interest</td>
<td>Economic and/or professional interests dominate</td>
<td>Encompasses range of affected interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of interaction</td>
<td>Frequent, high quality, interaction of all groups on all matters related to the policy issue</td>
<td>Contact fluctuates in frequency and intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Membership, values, and outcomes persistent over time</td>
<td>Access fluctuates significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>All participants share basic values; agreement exists, and accept the legitimacy of outcomes</td>
<td>A measure of agreement exists, conflict is ever present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of resources (within network)</td>
<td>All participants have resources; basic relationship is an exchange relationship</td>
<td>Some participants may have resources, but they are limited, and basic relationship is consultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of resources (within participating organisations)</td>
<td>Hierarchical; leaders deliver</td>
<td>Varied and variable distribution and capacity to regulate members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>There is a balance of power among members. Although one group may dominate it must be a positive sum game if community is to persist</td>
<td>Unequal powers, reflecting unequal resources and unequal access. It is a zero sum game</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Marsh and Rhodes, 1992:251)

Whilst there has been widespread support for Marsh and Rhodes' (1992) policy network model, and substantial empirical application, some authors have expressed a concern for its implicit assumptions. Marsh and Smith (2000) for example, in a recent
analysis of the policy network model, stress the complexity of the relationship between policy networks and policy outcomes. They believe that policy actors are inextricably linked to policy outcomes, claiming that there is an 'interactive relationship...in which each [the actor and the policy] affects the other in a continuing iterative process' (Marsh and Smith, 2000:5). As Marsh and Smith (2000:5) assert, the actors have a 'strategic knowledge and structured context, which then in turn, shape, but do not determine the agent's future action'. Marsh and Smith indicate that approaches such as the policy network model, mistakenly they believe, privilege either structure or agency. Networks are, they suggest, structures, which can act as a constraint or an opportunity to its members. Networks institutionalise beliefs and values and form behaviour. They stress how networks can limit actions and decisions, and constrain which problems and solutions are discussed.

A more fundamental criticism is put forward by Dowding (1995; 2001) who claims that the metaphorical character of the policy network concept has reached the limit of its usefulness. He claims that without a more formal set of criteria that allows for deductive conclusions to be drawn, the policy network approach is just one of the many 'hopelessly vague theories of the policy process' (Dowding, 2001:102). Borzel (1998) also questions whether differing conceptions of policy networks, and the different use of terms, prevents the network approach from providing a useable model for analysis. However, Coleman and Perl (1999) have recently rejected Dowding's and others' criticisms, and defended the important role that the policy network approach can play, particularly given what they assert is a need for better co-ordination in international decision making.

4.7 SABATIER'S ADVOCACY COALITION FRAMEWORK

The advocacy coalition framework (ACF) was developed by Paul Sabatier in an attempt to find alternative ways to analyse policy other than the stages heuristic which had become so dominant by the 1970s (Sabatier, 1991). The advocacy coalition framework also claimed to offer a method of analysing policy which incorporated both neo-Marxist and neo-pluralist perspectives in that it recognised that policy is influenced by a diverse range of groups with varying degrees of influence.
In the 1980s together with Jenkins-Smith, Sabatier developed the ACF to integrate a variety of models. According to John (1998) the ACF has many features that are common to Marsh and Rhodes' policy network model, in that they both stress the impact of the relationships within policy sectors on policy outcomes. The ACF differs from the policy network approach, however, as it suggests that policy-making involves a far wider group of actors and that typically they are grouped into 'alliances' or 'coalitions' in the same policy area but with competing interests.

Sabatier's (1999) ACF was initially based on five key principles. Firstly it was believed that technical information relating, for example, to the knowledge and severity of the problem was needed. The increase in various government quangos and forums illustrates the governments' interest in acquiring technical knowledge. Secondly, a policy process would need to be evaluated over a long period before a real understanding of successes and failures could be understood. Thirdly, it was recognised that trying to understand policy areas necessitated knowledge of the policy subsystem, which as the fourth principle claims, includes the whole spectrum of organisations that may be involved in the decision making process. That subsystem may include, according to exponents of the ACF theory, administrators from government agencies, interest groups and researchers at all levels. The fifth premise on which the ACF was based, acknowledged the significance of institutional as well as individual ideologies in the development of policy. In the ACF, the values of key actors are deemed to be significant factors in the development of policy.

Sabatier believes that typically there are two, three or four policy coalitions within a policy area, each of whom have their own beliefs about the policy content and hence compete within their policy subsystem for the dominant role. Figure 3 (overleaf) represents the most recent version of the ACF. It shows that there are relatively stable factors such as government legislation and laws that clearly have a significant impact upon the policy process and thus the policy outcomes.
John (1998), in a critique of the ACF, suggests that dissimilar to the policy network model, the ACF recognises the significance of individuals within and outside of the interest group, and does not assume that policy-making processes are based upon consent and negotiation, believing that the ACF accounts for the complex
multifactoral determinants of policy. The ACF does not however, pay particular attention to institutions or their structures, instead it focuses on how 'ideas and interests socialise individuals into patterns of behaviour' (John, 1998: 170). Sabatier argues that policy-making depends on change and stability in the wider political system, in the economy, and in society generally. For example, the ACF suggests that changes in society or in the economy over a period of time will impact upon public opinion which in turn affects the values of political parties and interest groups, and thus policy. The stable parameters such as government taxes, whilst having a direct or indirect impact upon policy development, are slow to change and unlikely to shift radically public opinion, ideas or the formation of interest groups. However, in times of sudden economic crisis, governmental policy may change direction quickly and this may lead to changes in other policy areas and can even lead to the formation of new coalitions. In essence then, the ACF suggests that policymaking is stable at the meso level until a policy or crisis at the macro level of government changes the pattern of relationships between coalitions. This simple model has been a well used tool for analysing, for example, environmental policy (Coleman and Perl, 1999) and energy efficiency (Toke, 2000).

The ACF is criticised by John, however, for assuming that some relationships within the policy-making process are stable and because it cannot explain changes to policy subsystems without referring to external parameters. As such the ACF, similar to many policy analysis models, is criticised for being a model which assists in the description of policymaking but does not provide a model to build a causal theory.

4.8 KINGDON'S POLICY STREAMS

In his book 'Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies', Kingdon (1984) presented an approach to policy-making which considered the whole policy-making process and included the potential influence of individuals, ideas, institutions and external agents. Kingdon's approach is based on instability rather than stability. Rather than policy change as the result of stable relationships, Kingdon contends that the policy-making process is the result of continually shifting relationships between the range of individual, institutional and external agents. This perspective, according to John (1998), is one of the more embracing concepts of policy-making, providing a fair
reflection of the complex, yet often serendipitous, explanation of why and how policy changes.

The theory was developed following Kingdon’s belief that policy outcomes cannot easily be traced back to their original concept or starting point. That is to say, the inspiration for policy changes within one policy area, such as sport for example, may sometimes be the result of one politically powerful individual’s functionalist ideology on the health benefits of physical activity, yet other policy change may be attributed to drawn out negotiations between lobbying interest groups and government quangos. The only consistent feature of their origins, Kingdon suggests, is that they are ‘messy’, which led him to create a loose rather than rigid conceptual framework that can account for the range of influences on the policy process.

According to Kingdon, policy is formed as a consequence of three convergent processes or streams: 1) the problem stream, 2) the policy stream, and 3) the political stream. Problem streams are those processes of policy-making that arise due to financial or environmental crisis. A plane or rail crash, may for example, bring to the fore, a problem that gains wide political and public attention. ‘Policy streams’ is the term Kingdon gives to those processes in which individuals within or outside organisations, with a specialist interest in a policy area, demonstrate an ability to inspire and motivate others to change policy. Dependent on the problems and politics of the time, these individuals or ‘policy entrepreneurs’ can have a significant effect on policy. Individual academics, administrators, researchers and journalists all have the opportunity to highlight an issue that may gain attention via academic articles, conference presentations, ministerial meetings, hearings, government papers or newspaper stories. Their influence, however, is affected by a third ‘political’ stream, which accounts for those processes that change the perception of what the problems are and how they may be solved. The media and political parties for example, are key socialising agents that contribute to the public understanding of what the problems are and what might constitute a reasonable solution. Zahariadis (1999) contends that this third stream is influenced by the national mood, the state of interest group support, and the staff in office. Moreover, he stresses that the most significant influences on public perceptions of policy issues are the mood of the country and the extent to which a government officer has an interest in that issue.
Thus, the confluence of policy streams determines whether an issue is on or off the policy agenda. Kingdon claims that the complexity of these interacting variables means that in reality, whether a policy emerges or changes is often a matter of chance. There are occasions for example, when the circumstances of ‘problems, policies and politics’, prevent an issue from gaining attention despite significant political and public support, whilst another might appear on the agenda with neither substantial political nor public support. Kingdon claims that when the interplay of policy streams identifies problems with a common cause, groups and individuals may be able to provide a solution which exploits these windows of opportunity and furthers their own interests. His theory encourages the belief that because of the complexity of the policy-making process, policy entrepreneurs, who may have a knowledge of the policy area and the skills to mobilise the support of others, have as much chance of influencing policy as any complex network or coalition. According to Zahardiadis, the ‘combination of all streams into a single package, dramatically enhances the chances that an issue will receive the serious attention of policy makers’ (Zahardiadis, 1999:76). He goes on to suggest that when windows are open, a policy entrepreneur with the skills, time, energy and if necessary money, can capitalise on the opportunity if s/he acts immediately. However, as Zahardiadis (1999) stresses, entrepreneurs must act promptly as windows tend to close quickly, either because one of the problems may already have been addressed or because there is likely to be a shift in attention if no obvious solution presents itself.

According to Schlager (1999), Kingdon’s model can be criticised for its fluidity and validity. It is difficult to generate a false hypothesis using the policy streams model, which may explain why it has been so rarely used. This criticism notwithstanding, Exworthy, Berney and Powell (2002) provide one of the very few studies that have used the policy streams model. They use ‘policy streams’ to explain how health inequality issues get onto the government’s agenda.

The policy stream approach, therefore, suggests that policy-making is not just the result of power relations, as it originates from a ‘a number of contingent and often contradictory selection processes’ (John,1998:175) and thus, recognises the capacity of individuals to impact on public policy. As a policy analysis theory, the policy streams approach provides a useful tool for explaining why policy changes, and what role each actor plays in the policy-making process.
4.9 CONCLUSION

Whilst there are different perspectives on the meaning, form and value of policy analysis, it is clear that an examination of disability sport policy should be conducted using an analytical framework that takes account of the significance of the interaction of decisions, policy networks, organisations, actors and events.

The macro level theories offer broad interpretations of how power is distributed at the societal level and in doing so offer a range of 'lenses' through which politics and policy-making can be viewed. These different interpretations of power distribution can be applied to various agencies or structures within society thus offering alternative perspectives on the policy process at the meso level.

The theories of the policy process reviewed in this chapter vary considerably in the extent to which they acknowledge the role that interest groups play in policy-making. However, they all recognise that government is at the hub of policy-making and theories such as neo-pluralism recognise that having 'insider' status, that is, gaining direct access to the policy-making process, is what most interest groups strive for.

Power, and how it is distributed and deployed, is a central concern of both neo-Marxism and neo-pluralism. According to Lukes, power can be visibly or invisibly exerted within the policy process, and even if not deployed or exercised, the mere capacity or potential to affect others constitutes power. So, within this process, decisions as well as non-decisions influence policy. That is to say, decision makers bring to the process their own values, beliefs and assumptions and in doing so have the capacity to include or exclude issues for discussion and action, thus suppressing challenges that do not suit the interests of the decision maker or simply ignoring issues that do not correspond to the values of the powerful. To understand how, why and what disability sport policies are formed and implemented, it is necessary to consider which groups and individuals exercise power in the policy-making process. Moreover, if Lukes and Foucault are correct in their assertion that power is deeply embedded within the values of those who contribute to the policy process and within the fabric of the social structure, then it will be necessary to consider how the process is impacted by the ideologies of key actors. Indeed key actor’s ideologies of disability may have had a significant impact on both the emergence and the development of
disability sport policy. The almost unquestioned emphasis on the mainstreaming of disability sport, for example, may partly be explained by a view of disability which implicitly assumes that able-bodiedness and thus able-bodied sport is best, and that disability sport should emulate able-bodied sport.

At the meso level, similar to the macro level, the development of sport policy for disabled people in England may be best explained by a confluence of models and approaches. The stages model for example, whilst criticised for its simplicity, offers a conceptual order and a series of logical steps to the complex process of policy-making. It assumes that there is a defined beginning, middle and end, and that these progressions can be divided up into discrete and discernible sections. Whilst it may not account adequately for the range of influences that contribute to policy formation and development or cope adequately with the complexity of the policy process, the stages model may be an effective starting point in the analysis of some policy developments in disability sport. Moreover, concepts developed by those who have used the stages model, especially ‘agenda setting’ and ‘implementation’ may prove useful in the analysis of disability sport policy and may be used independently of the model and in conjunction with other meso level frameworks.

Although it may not account for the influence of key individuals, Marsh and Rhodes’ (1992) model of policy networks may help to establish how close an organisation is to being inside and central to the policy community and enjoying the resultant benefits of this power. The model may help to explain the impact of pressure groups within disability sport, representing specific sections of society that are striving for recognition and influence in government policy. Moreover, it may help to establish the extent to which disability sport is an issue network or a policy community with the latter’s attendant benefits of political influence.

Similar to the policy network approach and the advocacy coalition framework, Kingdon’s policy stream model also resides within a pluralist conceptualisation of power. However, Kingdon’s model places emphasis on the powerful role that can be played by the policy entrepreneur. Indeed, whilst the multiple streams approach has been criticised for its fluidity in organisation, making falsification difficult, it may provide an effective tool for the explanation of specific events during the short history of disability sport in England.
It is unlikely that the findings of this study can be explained using just one of the macro theories of power distribution and one model of policy analysis. As has just been argued, each of the theories may, to different degrees, help to shed light on the development of disability sport policy. It is likely, therefore, that an adequate explanation of disability sport will be derived from a range of theories, rather than a single theory.

While a fuller discussion on how each of these meso level theories of policy analysis help to explain the disability sport policy process can be found in the concluding chapter, this review indicates that at the macro level of power distribution, neo-Marxism and neo-pluralism provide perspectives on policy-making that are particularly useful to this analysis. However, Marxist’s insurmountable preoccupation with class at the expense of other forms of social stratification prevent it from offering a more thorough analysis of disability sport policy. Neo-pluralism offers a more suitable non-class based framework, which does not neglect the influence of individual and collective ideology. In addition the neo-pluralist perspective can accommodate each of the meso level models of policy analysis, of which Marsh and Rhodes’ policy network approach may be the most helpful. The concluding chapter will of course explore the utility of the other meso level models of policy analysis in the explanation of disability sport policy.
CHAPTER FIVE

METHODOLOGY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the methodology for the investigation and includes a discussion of the chosen epistemology, research paradigm, research design and means of data analysis. First, it is worth providing a brief reminder of the aim of this study, which is to establish whether there is a policy community for disability sport. To achieve this, and using a case study of 1) the formation of the English Federation of Disability Sport and, 2) the issue of the mainstreaming of disability sport in seven sports, the objectives are to:

1. establish the key characteristics of the disability sport policy process,
2. establish the interests, power distribution and relationships between organisations involved in disability sport, and determine the ideologies of key actors involved in disability sport policy

To answer these questions a number of philosophical and methodological questions need to be considered. What follows is a discussion of the various approaches to research and a justification of those that were employed for this study.

5.2 EPISTEMOLOGY AND RESEARCH PARADIGM

Epistemology

The epistemological position or research approach adopted by a researcher provides a perspective on how knowledge can be gathered, analysed and made meaningful in the social world (Bryman, 1989). The literature suggests that there are three research epistemological positions relevant to policy studies such as this, each of which provides a different perspective on what constitutes acceptable ways of gaining and examining knowledge: positivism, interpretivism, and critical realism.

Positivism suggests that the social world is external to the individual actors within it, and can be measured objectively by the independent observer (Higgs and McAllistair,
A central tenet of positivism is the notion that concepts can be measured through the systematic process of establishing theories on which hypotheses are derived and tested. Positivists assume that researchers can detach themselves from the research process and thus eliminate subjectivity. This would not be an appropriate epistemological position for this study as a positivist approach would not, for example, consider the influence of individual or collective ideology in the policy-making process, nor would it account for the potential impact of Lukes’ (1974) third dimension of power, which suggests that power can exist as latent potential.

By contrast to the positivist approach, interpretivists, according to Wildermuth (1993), claim that the social world comprises activities, relationships and influences that cannot be objectively measured. Interpretivists suggest the social world is open to our subjective interpretation which is influenced by the personal circumstances we find ourselves in. Thus a range of differing personal circumstances can lead to a divergence or even a conflict in the interpretations of the same phenomena. Interpretivists such as Wildermuth suggest that we live in a world of multiple realities and reject the assumption that social science research can simply adopt the objective measurement and theory testing approach of the human sciences. This provides a useful perspective for this study, as it may account for a divergence of ideologies within disability sport. For example, while one observer may perceive the Paralympics to be an empowering demonstration of disabled people’s ability, another observer may consider the same phenomenon to be an illustration of the continued marginalisation of disabled people. Thus the interpretivist approach allows for the variances in the beliefs of those involved in the disability sport process.

However, the interpretivist approach can be criticised for failing to take sufficient account of the deep structural influences on the social world. For example, while public perception of the significance of the Paralympics in the social world may be open to multiple interpretations, it would be difficult to deny the deep structural influences on its development. As discussed in Chapter three, an accurate explanation of the emergence and development of the Paralympics and disability sport more generally, must be placed in the context of wider structural influences of, for example, governments’ historical treatment of, and policies on, ‘sport’ and ‘disability’.
In contrast to both the positivist and interpretivist approaches, critical realists reject both the positivist assertion that the social world can always be explained by a series of causal relationships and the interpretivist explanation which reduces analyses to subjective personal perspectives. The critical realist position sits between the positivist and interpretivist approaches in that it measures the observable processes, but acknowledges the influence of external and internal actors. Critical realists would argue, for example, that while structures exist to facilitate or constrain the outcomes of policy for example, the nature of ‘structure’ is determined by individual and organisational actors. However, Hay (1989) suggests that political systems tend to favour particular structures and particular actors within it. He goes on to suggest that while the influences of structure and agency on policy may be theoretically separate, in practice their relationship can not be disaggregated. Thus the critical realist framework stresses the importance of the ‘consequences (both intended and unintended) of agency, and the impact and effects of strategic action upon the structured context in which that action must be situated’ (Hay, 1989:201).

As indicated in the preceding chapters, this study recognises the influences of the deeply embedded structures within which the policy of both sport and disability are located. However, the capacity of individuals to influence the development of disability sport policy is also recognised and, as such, considers the critical realist position to be the most appropriate to this study (Hay, 1989:199).

**Research Paradigm**

To adopt the critical realist or any other epistemological position requires the researcher to follow the research paradigm associated with that underlying philosophy. Bryman (1989:254) has argued, however, that good research is not ‘wedded to a method irrespective of the problem being examined’. Therefore, while it is important to adhere to whatever research approach is adopted, as Higgs and McAllister (2001) suggest, it is important not to ignore insights that might be gained from other research approaches. The following section will now consider the critical realist approach to some key methodological issues that are pertinent to this study.
One of the most debated issues in research is the relative merits of qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis. Bryman (1989), Mason (1996) and Patton (2002) and Gratton and Jones (2004) contend that quantitative approaches are propelled by a prior set of concerns investigated at a distance from the context in which those concerns are studied, whereas the qualitative researcher is more concerned with how the social world is interpreted. The emphasis of qualitative research is on the interpretation of the social world, the deepening of understanding and the gathering of rich contextual detail, which is, according to Mason (1996) and Bryman (1989), flexible and unconstrained by the laboratory environment. Qualitative research should, adds Mason (1996), provide a social explanation of intellectual puzzles and according to Gratton and Jones is generally inductive. The significant difference between qualitative and quantitative approaches, Byman asserts, is less to do with the methods employed, as surveys, for example, can often be the tool of both approaches, than with their assumptions on the way in which the social world ought to be studied. Furthermore, many have argued that deciding to employ quantitative or qualitative methods represents an exaggeration of the differences and a false dichotomy between the two (Mayring, 2000). Moreover, it is argued that the polarisation of these two approaches fails to capture adequately the range of options the social researcher is faced with, and ignores the importance of choosing methods which best suit the research question (Mayring, 2000; Stelter, Sparkes and Hunger, 2003).

Indeed while quantitative research is typically associated with experimental investigation and qualitative with participant observation and semi or unstructured interviewing, it would be misleading to suggest that these methodologies can be easily polarised (Bryman, 1988). Indeed many studies incorporate characteristics of both approaches but, according to Richardson (1996), whereas the quantitative approach is considered to be the more precise with the qualitative, he concedes, often judged against quantitative criteria and considered as 'something other than' and less than the quantitative approach. Richardson (1996), suggests, however, that qualitative research should be considered as being a complementary, rather than a competing, approach which, rather than seeking to test hypotheses, should be accepted for its ability to contribute to the understanding of experiences, actions and events in a way that is
substantially more challenging than that found in much quantitative research. Indeed the paradox of social science, contends Yin (1994), is that the ‘softer’ the research strategy, the harder it is to do.

Bryman (1989), Yin (1994) and Richardson (1996) stress that the debates that surround the differences between, and merits of, qualitative and quantitative research, should not prevent the integration of these two approaches. Notwithstanding the benefits of employing diverse methods to suit the study, according to Maxwell (1996) there a number of strengths to the qualitative approach which highlight the suitability of qualitative methods for this study. The five strengths that Maxwell (1996:17) identifies are:

1. understanding the meaning for the participants in the study, of the events, situations and actions they are involved with and the accounts that they give of their lives and experiences;

2. understanding the particular context within which participants act and the influence that this context has on their actions;

3. identifying unanticipated phenomena and influences, and generating new grounded theories about the latter;

4. understanding the process in which events and actions takes place; and

5. developing causal explanations.

Indeed the considerable increase in the use of qualitative approaches in the sports sciences over the last thirty years may be attributable to the attractiveness of a flexible, interpretative approach, less easily available in the quantitative paradigm (Stelter, Sparkes and Hunger, 2003).

Whether adopting a qualitative or quantitative approach, measurement is a key element of the research process that links concepts with data and, according to Bryman, attempts to establish connections between measures which are taken to be indicative of underlying causes (Bryman, 1989:34). In qualitative research this
linkage is largely achieved by the interpretation of reality through the eyes of the subjects being investigated. Whilst this interpretation could be influenced as much by the researcher's own perspectives as the subject's, Bryman (1989) claims it is this emphasis on informed and contextual interpretation that is the qualitative researcher's 'central motif'. That is not to say that qualitative research is non-scientific, but a lack of standardised techniques in qualitative research has encouraged criticism (Yin, 1994), particularly from human science researchers who use more quantitative methods. These criticisms, and the measures taken to address them, are discussed in the section on validity and reliability (5.5).

Consistent with the critical realist epistemology, this study recognises the need to utilise both qualitative and quantitative methods so that it can account for the embedded structures as well as the individual interpretations of those structures. In order to provide a comprehensive analysis of which organisations contribute and how they contribute to disability sport policy, the study utilises a questionnaire, so that data on the involvement of over one hundred sports organisations can be collected and analysed. The adopted approach is what Fielding and Margrit (2001) describe as a legitimate 'hybrid' of qualitative and quantitative methodologies, although it is predominantly qualitative, as this provides what Bryman (1989) describes as a 'better position to view the linkages between events and actions and explore people's interpretations of the factors which produce such connections' (Bryman, 1988:102). Acknowledging Bryman's (1988) concern that combining qualitative and quantitative methods is to fuse two 'fundamentally incompatible epistemological positions' (Bryman, 1988:153), this study does not attempt to combine so much as utilise both approaches for different reasons, an epistemological approach endorsed by Yin (1994).

As described in more detail later in the chapter, this study employed a quantitative methodology to gather and interpret data from a survey of 162 national sports organisations and qualitative methods to gather and interpret data from documents and interviews with key personnel thus allowing key issues to emerge and be explored in more detail through the analysis of text and transcript.
Detached or Involved

The achievement of the aim of this study will involve providing an explanation of how disability sport has developed in England and why it has developed in the way that it has and consequently requires an analysis of organisational policy. As has been discussed in Chapter four, policy analysis can and often does provide recommendations for the benefit of the organisations involved (Dye, 1976). The orientation of this ‘policy advocacy’ is criticised, however, as it compromises the integrity of research. Thus while this study may be of benefit to the development of future sport policy and in particular to those organisations analysed in detail, the primary purpose is to conduct a disinterested study, independent of the needs of the organisations it seeks to investigate. However, to suggest that the researcher is truly independent from the research process is a claim typically made by positivists within the natural sciences and is not in keeping with the critical realist epistemology.

The critical realist perspective employed in this study assumes that the researcher is a part of the social world that is being studied. Whilst impartiality or objectivity may be the intention of most researchers, the author acknowledges that all studies are influenced, at least indirectly, by the experiences, ideologies and priorities of the researcher. The potential influence of the non-disabled researcher is a particular concern expressed by Barnes (1996) and is an ethical and methodological issue that has much salience to this study.

Barnes (1996) claims that research in disability studies is predominantly carried out by non-disabled people and is based upon non-disabled perceptions of disability. Barnes suggests that whether the researcher is disabled or not can significantly affect the research approach. For example, techniques such as participant observation provide the opportunity to engage with the group being studied, so that the researcher may be involved in the daily lives of his/her subjects. Barnes (1996) identifies a series of concerns with the use of participant observation in disability studies, claiming that the practice of concealing a researcher’s identity and intention is ethically and morally reprehensible. Indeed, if research is to be undertaken by those empathetic with the participants, Barnes (1992) suggests that researchers themselves should be disabled. Furthermore, the mere involvement of an ‘independent researcher’ is a flawed concept as his/her mere presence may affect the behaviour of the group, by, for example,
selecting the participant whom he/she feels most comfortable with, and thus compromise the objectivity of the study.

Oliver (1992) is not convinced, however, that it is necessary to have an impairment to conduct and report good quality research. He believes the gulf in understanding of disability within the disabled community is vast, and individual experiences do not necessarily provide a prerequisite understanding of disability nor affinity with other disabled people. In an attempt to clarify the role of the non-disabled researcher, Oliver (1992) suggests that if researchers were to interact with disabled people on a regular basis, it may enhance the research outcome and, if empathetic, shift the balance of power between the researcher and the researched, eroding the myth of the professional expert. As discussed more fully in Chapter 2, Oliver believes that the historical belief in the professional expert has perpetuated the oppression of disabled people in western society. Researchers have, Oliver (1992) believes, controlled both the content and process of contemporary disability research. Research, he contends, has alienated disabled people from the products and process of research, from other disabled participants and from themselves.

He argues that research into disability has been dominated by, and has often reinforced, the medical model of disability which seeks to explain the experiences of disabled people in wholly individual terms. Moreover, the relationship between research findings and policy change is problematic. Whilst it cannot be assumed that research will positively influence policies, Oliver surmises that research often benefits the researcher whilst the disabled participant continues to suffer the same unchanged and oppressive policies.

This is a methodological issue the researcher considers important for two reasons. First, to ensure that the study is valid and reliable it is necessary to be as sensitive as possible to the research context. Second, as one aspect of this study seeks to investigate key decision makers' values toward disability sport, the non-disabled or disabled status of the researcher may have, as Barnes (1996) indicates, a significant impact on interviewees' responses and the researcher's interpretations of those responses.
Notwithstanding these particular concerns, the non-disabled status of the researcher and the process undertaken is considered an ontological fact rather than a criticism. While the author accepts the impact that non-disabled people may continue to have on the lives of disabled people it is, as Oliver (1992) contends, an epistemological impossibility to identify whether and how responses to interviews are influenced by the author’s ‘able-bodiedness’. However, the researcher endeavoured to ensure that the interview and survey questions were consistent and, as recommended by Bryman (1989) and, detailed in the procedure, a diary of each interview was kept providing an opportunity to record a description of the context and atmosphere of the interview.

5.3 RESEARCH DESIGN

According to Yin (1994) a common misconception is that research methodologies can be organised hierarchically, with case studies forming the exploratory phase, surveys and histories for the descriptive phase and experiments as the only true strategy to conduct explanatory or causal investigations. However, Yin (1994) claims that a research strategy can be exploratory, descriptive or explanatory. The goal of the researcher is to ensure that the methodology chosen suits the investigation which, according to Bryman (1989) depends upon a) the type of research, b) the extent to which the researcher has control over the researched events, and c) the extent to which the focus is on historical or contemporary events.

The research for this study was conducted in three distinct phases, the second and third of which were influenced by the previous phase/s. Semi-structured interviews with key personnel (between June and November 2000) were used in phase 1 combined with an analysis of policy documents and archive material. The purpose of Phase 1 was to establish how disability sport emerged and has subsequently developed and which organisations have been key to that process in England. This stage was crucial to the investigation not only to overcome the paucity of knowledge in this area but also to identify those organisations and issues that warranted further analysis. Informed by the data from Phase 1, in Phase 2 a survey of governing bodies of sport and disability sport organisations was undertaken (between May and July 2001) to establish a national overview of the organisations which were involved in the policy network, what role they played, what role they thought they ought to play, and how disability sport policy was formed. In Phase 3, informed by the data from Phases
1 and 2, two case studies were identified as a focus for more in-depth analysis. The first case study focused on the establishment, role and pattern of relationships which surrounded the formation of English Federation of Disability Sport and the second, was an analysis of mainstreaming disability sport in seven sports. Both case studies used interviews with senior officers (between August and December 2001) and documents as the main sources of data.

In the 1960s, case studies tended to focus on the in-depth study of one or two organisations. Since then, the case study approach has expanded to include specific events or activities and individuals (Bryman, 1989) and their impact on the organisation (Gronn, 1983). Often two or more sites are used and a range of methods employed to collect data in order to improve the ability to generalise findings. It is the difficulty in generalising from case studies that has been the main concern of the critics of the method. Bryman (1989) asserts however that the ‘case’ should not be considered from a quantitative perspective of being a sample of one. Rather, he contends, case studies should be ‘evaluated in terms of the adequacy of the theoretical inferences that are generated’ (Bryman, 1989:173). The aim is not, he goes on, ‘to infer the findings from a sample to a population, but to engender patterns and linkages of theoretical importance’ (Bryman, 1989:173). The methods chosen for this study will now be discussed and their contribution to the research process explained.

5.4 RESEARCH METHOD

As the previous section outlines, the methods of collecting data and generating knowledge in this study include the analysis of key documents, a survey of sports organisations and interviews with key personnel. What follows is a discussion of those methods of data collection.

The process of qualitative content analysis was used to examine the documents, survey and interview data that were collected for this investigation. A discussion of using documents, surveys and interviews and a justification for employing these methods is considered (Mayring, 2000). A summary of how data was analysed at each phase is detailed in the section on procedure (5.6).
Documents

Documentary or archival research, according to Bryman (1989) normally comprises different types of written information such as reports and policies which are often analysed in conjunction with interviews or surveys. Bryman goes on to suggest that studies which focus on organisations, often involve a blend of methodological procedures specific to the nature of the research. Yin (1994), in an analysis of the different case study methods, indicates that as a research methodology, the analysis of documents has four strengths. He suggests that it is: stable and can be viewed repeatedly; unobtrusive, as it is not created for the study; exact, because it contains details of an event and; can be used over a long span of time and settings. Mason (1996) and Yin (1994) surmise, however, that documentary analysis can be difficult to retrieve and if samples are omitted can be biased. The analysis of policy documents can also reflect the subjective opinions of the author. For example, reports of meetings or conferences may be skewed toward the interests or beliefs of the writer, and may not necessarily reflect the range and balance of opinion within a meeting either fully or accurately.

Yin (1994) accepts however that documentary evidence is often used effectively to corroborate other evidence or make inferences for further enquiry. This study uses documents such as policy statements, minutes of meetings and conference reports to identify issues worthy of further investigation and to corroborate the findings from the interviews and surveys. According to Mason (1996), this type of documentary evidence provides a representation of an organisation’s activities and values, offering the context in which the study exists and a background against which the study’s data is generated.

Survey

Survey research has been described by Bryman (1989) as collecting data on ‘a number of units, at a single juncture of time, with a view to systematically collecting a body of quantifiable data in respect of a number of variables which are then examined to discern patterns of association’ (Bryman, 1989:104). Critics of the survey method suggest that the complexities of social life cannot be understood and explained by scientific enquiry. Marsh (1982) for example, suggests that social life is mediated
through shared meanings that cannot be categorised by or into, a range of coded responses. Marsh claims that while it may be convenient to fit responses to a series of codes, this may not represent their true meaning. He contends that researchers should not assume that their interpretation of responses matches the intended meaning of the respondents.

Researchers should not assume, states Marsh (1982), that the meanings attached to responses by researchers are consistent with intended meanings of the subjects and whilst it may be convenient to fit responses to a series of codes, this may not represent their true meaning. He goes on to claim that structured questionnaires are used ‘too readily and with insufficient thought; many perhaps a majority, are inadequately designed and, too often for comfort, are not an appropriate way of collecting the information that was required’ (Marsh, 1982:57). Seale (1998) stresses, however, that surveys can be used legitimately with loosely specified aims which become clearer as the study progresses.

With these limitations in mind, the survey in this study has been designed to establish the characteristics of national organisations involved in disability sport, which according to Bulmer (1984) is consistent with the criterion for descriptive surveys. This method was chosen as it provided an opportunity to collect and analyse effectively large amounts of data and generate insights on a wide range of issues in an area with a paucity of previous research. The insights generated helped to establish which organisations were involved in disability sport and how key actors perceived the role and purpose of those organisations. As the survey used closed as well as open ended questions it provided an opportunity to make statistical as well as analytical observations.

The data generated from the survey allowed for descriptive statistics on matters which indicate the extent to which organisations are involved with disability sport. It also helped to establish the organisational network of disability sport and the range and type of structures within various organisations. In conjunction with the semi-structured interviews and the documentary analysis, the survey assisted in the development of criteria by which a sample of organisations was selected for Phase 3 of the research process.
Interviews

Mason (1996) proposes that qualitative interviewing should be considered as a conversation for a purpose, and can take structured, semi-structured or unstructured formats. However, as Patton highlights, in this ‘interview society’, interviews carried by social scientists have become indistinguishable in the popular mind from ‘interviews done by talk show hosts’, published in newspapers, magazines and websites and those broadcast on the radio (Patton, 2002: 340). It is important, therefore, to discuss the interview process and the skill and rigour required to make them meaningful in the research context.

Structured interviews, similar to self-administered questionnaires, provide limited flexibility in the issues considered and the types of responses given and thus reduce ambiguity and allow for comparison between responses. Whilst the variation between interviewees responses can be, as Bryman (1989) argues, attributed to genuine variations rather than the divergences in the order or style of questions asked, they do not allow for a range of responses nor for other issues to be addressed other than those identified by the researcher. Furthermore, structured interviews do not allow the researcher to explore the rich contextual detail in which the responses are made (Mason, 1996). Unstructured or ‘informal’ interviews provide greater opportunity for the interviewee to explore and expand upon the issues that interest them as they are not guided by the predetermined set of ideas or expectations of the researchers (Patton, 2002: 342). However, analysing a set of unstructured interviews can prove problematic because, while unstructured interviews can generate rich and interesting data, it can be difficult to identify and make comparisons between themes within what may be extremely diverse content.

Semi-structured interviews are a compromise between unstructured and structured interviews, allowing the interviewee greater latitude over what s/he may say and even in what order they may respond, but an aide-memoire used by the researcher ensures that all the questions are covered. Open-ended questions, followed by prompting and probing questions, encourage the interviewee to expand on points that interest the researcher (May, 1997:143). Patton refers to this approach as the ‘interview guide approach’ and claims that while its strength is that the interview can remain conversational yet situational, he highlights as its weaknesses, first, the potential to
inadvertently omit pertinent topics and second, the flexibility in questioning can lead to substantially different responses (Patton, 2002: 348). As Patton (2002: 348) summarises, however, there are strengths and weaknesses in all types of qualitative interview, whether they be ‘informal unstructured’ or ‘closed’ interviews with ‘fixed responses’.

As discussed within the earlier section and as noted by both May (1997) and Patton (2002), the interview process is a relationship between the interviewee and the interviewer. The responses of the interviewee will be influenced by the researcher’s behaviour in the process. In this study the researcher attempted to gain the trust of the interviewee by explaining the role of the interview and the purpose of the research and, whilst engaging in the discussion that ensued, attempted not to demonstrate partisanship. However, as the researcher was known to some of the interviewees the researcher acknowledges that this relationship may have had an impact on interviewee’s responses. To minimise the impact of this, ‘interview diary worksheets’ (appendix 2) were completed which allowed for such relationships to be noted. Other limitations, which have been taken account of, are discussed in section 5.7 of this chapter.

Semi-structured interviews were used in Phase 1 to begin the process of identifying key organisations, landmarks, relationships and processes in disability sport policy. In Phase 3 semi-structured interviews were used to investigate the policy development within a select group of organisations and to explore the perceptions of administrators who work for those organisations. A discussion on the criteria used to select interviewees is provided in section 5.6.1.

**Documentary, survey and interview analysis**

Although the study employed both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis, the use of qualitative content analysis predominated. Content analysis can be described as any technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying special characteristics of messages. Whilst content analysis has traditionally been associated with more quantitative approaches, in largely qualitative approaches such as the one utilized here, it typically refers to the relatively detached systematic analysis and deconstruction of written and verbal text (Krippendorf, 1969;
Mayring, 2000; Bryman, 2001; May, 2001; Patton; 2002; Gratton and Jones, 2004). Krippendorf (1969: 103) described qualitative content analysis as a ‘replicable and valid method for making specific inferences from text, to other states or properties of its source’. It is an empirical, methodological and controlled analysis of texts within the context of their communication and without rash quantification. However, Patton (2002) provides a much more rigorous discussion on the significant difficulties in qualitative content analysis. There are not he suggests any ‘formulae for determining significance...no ways of replicating the researcher’s analytical thought processes...and no straight forward test for measuring reliability and validity’ (Patton; 2002: 433). The advice given to the qualitative researcher by Patton (2002: 433) is to ‘do your very best with your full intellect to fairly represent the data and communicate what the data reveal given the purpose of the study’.

In this study, the process of qualitative content analysis involved noting and then analysing the significance of particular words, phrases or themes (Bryman, 2001; May, 2001; Mayring, 2000; Patton; 2002). That, in turn, formed the basis from which an analysis of the underlying themes found within the text could be performed (Bryman, 2001; May, 2001; Patton; 2002). Following this, the re-occurring words, phrases or themes in the written and verbal text were arranged into categories and textual data collected were entered into tables of responses using these categories.

This study used both inductive and deductive qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2000). Inductive qualitative content analysis involves the formulation of criteria derived from the theoretical background and the research questions. The categories were then identified, revised and finalised based on the analysis of the content. The frequency and detail of the content under each category was then examined and text assigned to each category (Arksey and Knight, 1999). This inductive approach allowed for themes to emerge from broad areas of enquiry. Deductive qualitative analysis was used so that categories could be derived prior to the analysis and a controlled assignment of the text to those categories undertaken (Mayring, 2000). This approach allowed data to be generated on predetermined and specific research questions.
5.5 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

A central methodological issue that needs to be considered by the researcher is the validity and reliability of data collected through the various methods outlined above. While there are a number of different types of validity, in essence, validity, according to Bryman (1989:58), is about ‘the correspondence between the measure and the concept in question’. As previously discussed, social science research in general and qualitative research in the social sciences is criticised by exponents of quantitative research in the human sciences for its subjective interpretation and the difficulty in generalising to a similar situation or population. According to Yin (1994), careful attention to validity and reliability helps to ensure rigour and objectivity, and addresses human science researchers criticisms of qualitative methods.

There are a number of different types of validity, the most relevant of which to this study are now discussed. One strategy to enhance the validity of the finding is to employ a ‘respondent validation’ whereby the respondent is provided with ‘an account of the findings for [their] assessment’ (May, 1997:164). This is perceived to be problematic, however, as respondent validation may compromise the researcher’s findings to suit the values and expectations of particular organisations and individuals. Moreover, the respondents may not be able to comprehend the researcher’s use of concepts and theories.

An alternative strategy is to ensure that the study has ‘construct validity’, whereby, as advised by Yin (1994), multiple sources of evidence are used. In Bryman’s view this is a more ‘exacting’ measure of the ‘likely connection between the concept of interest and another concept’ (1989:59). The documents, survey and interviews provide three sources of data that will be used to substantiate the claims made in the discussion. Fielding and Schreier (2001) recommend this type of triangulation of data as a method to improve the validity of the research findings.

‘External validity’ is another form of validity that can help to ensure rigour and objectivity. External validity is concerned with the extent to which the methods allow for the findings to be generalised to the wider population. This is not considered a particular problem in this investigation because the survey obtains responses from the majority of organisations and the interviews with the sampled organisations will seek
analytical rather than statistical generality. Consequently, concepts and theories that emerge from this study do not need to be repeated to gain credibility but will, as Yin (1994) indicates, seek support from diverse forms of evidence. Thus, the themes that emerged from Phase 1 were further explored in Phases 2 and 3 and, therefore, the findings are based on more than one account or data source.

In addition to a concern for validity, the researcher must also give consideration to the study's reliability. Reliability refers to the extent to which the same results will be derived, if the same procedures are followed but by a different researcher or at a different time. The transcripts of the interviews, the survey and the documentary material can all be made available to a different researcher thus allowing for a re-analysis of the same data. The methods detailed in this chapter also allow for a similar, but not the same, study to be carried out. It is possible, therefore, to conduct a study using a similar methodology, drawing on similar documentary, interview and survey data in order to establish whether disability sport has shifted its place on the issue network – policy community continuum. It must be noted however, that the methodology allowed for themes to emerge and be further explored as the study progressed, therefore, repeating the methodology adopted for Phase 1 could lead to an interpretation which identifies different themes and thus has a different focus. Also, given the nature of the research design, accurate replication of the research process is not possible due to the likelihood of changes in values, opinions and experiences resulting from the passage of time between the initial research, and subsequent replication of the study.

Whilst qualitative research is always open to subjective interpretation, the use of more than one form of evidence and the coding of the interview, survey and documentary analysis provides a reasonable basis for reliability (Mayring, 2000; Yin, 1994). Indeed the case study approach in phase 3 does not intend to generalise its findings, rather it provides an in-depth account of the policy developments within each of the chosen sports and a further examination of the themes that emerged from Phases 1 and 2.
5.6 PROCEDURE

5.6.1 PROCEDURE PHASE 1: INTERVIEWS WITH KEY PERSONNEL AND DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS

Semi-structured interviews were used in Phase 1 to generate insights on the emergence and development of disability sport organisations in England. These interviews targeted key personnel in the field of disability sport in England. The key themes and issues that emerged in the analysis of these interviews contributed to the survey and unstructured interviews that followed. This is a form of analytical induction, which, according to Johnston (1998), allows for the explanation of social phenomenon and contributes to methodological procedures in subsequent studies.

Sample

A purposive sample of key personnel was chosen for interview based upon current or previous experience as senior administrators in organisations involved in the disability sport policy field. Purposive sampling, according to (Bryman, 2001), is a crucial and legitimate method of developing an historical account and for identifying key themes and issues for further analysis.

The key criterion for the selection of interviewees was that they should have been or were, at the time of the research, involved in discussions, at a senior level, focused on affecting disability sport. Other criteria included the length of involvement in disability sport and that the selection of interviewees should contribute to a representative sample of organisations with a responsibility for general sport policy (such as Sport England), disability specific sports organisations (such as British Blind Sport) and sports specific disability sport organisations (such as the British Wheelchair Basketball Association).

As a result of this analysis twelve senior officers were identified. The list included a cross section of organisations that have been or currently are, active in the disability sport policy process, and contained no significant omissions. The interviewees included senior officers, typically Chief Executives, Presidents or Board Members who used to, or currently work for, or on behalf of, organisations such as Sport
England and the British Sports Association for the Disabled. However, the individuals were identified as much for their experience and knowledge in the area of disability sport, as they were representatives of particular organisations. Confirmation of the accuracy of the selection was obtained by first, seeking advice from one of the most experienced and senior participants in disability sport policy and second, further confirmation was obtained by asking each interviewee to suggest other potential interviewees. In general, no names were suggested that were not on the original list. A list of interviewees is provided in Appendix 1.

Design

The objectives for the interviews conducted in Phase 1 were to:

1. identify key organisations and individuals involved in the emergence and development of disability sport;

2. identify landmarks in the development of disability sport policy;

3. establish the pattern and character of the relationship between organisations;

4. identify the key aspects of the policy process for disability sport; and

5. identify current issues in disability sport policy.

Table 12 (overleaf) provides a summary of the methods used to answer the research questions and sub-questions and offers a rationale for the particular enquiry and how it relates to the objectives of the study.
Table 12: Phase 1 Research Questions, Methods and Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What are the key developments or landmarks in the political history of disability sport?</td>
<td>a) Semi-structured interviews with key personnel</td>
<td>Establishes whether there is a consensus on key developments and identifies key policies, events, actors and shifts in policy development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Which are the key organisations/individuals that have shaped disability sport?</td>
<td>a) Semi-structured interviews with key personnel</td>
<td>Identifies the key actors within the policy area. Contributes to an understanding of how discrete the policy area is, how stable the policy is, and who exercises power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What is the relationship between the organisations that have been or are still key to disability sport?</td>
<td>a) Semi-structured interviews with key personnel</td>
<td>Provides an illustration of who normally contributes, how significant that contribution is, and how it relates to other contributions in the policy process. Indicates whether the policy area is well defined and the boundaries commonly agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 What are the key aspects of the policy process in disability sport?</td>
<td>a) Semi-structured interviews with key personnel</td>
<td>Identifies the key features of the process of decision-making in disability sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 What are the current issues in disability sport?</td>
<td>a) Semi-structured interviews with key personnel</td>
<td>Provides an informed perspective on the state of disability sport policy, and identifies areas for future investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

Letters were sent on June 3rd 2000 to the chosen personnel providing a summary of the study and the contribution their interview would make. Consistent with guidelines outlined by Corti, Day and Backhouse (2000), prior to the start of the interview respondents were provided with further information relating to the study and the purpose of the interview. Interviewees were asked to give their consent to the interview being taped and transcribed and were informed that due to the nature of the study their responses would not be confidential. Interviewees were also made aware that their responses might be used within a publicly available PhD thesis. Interviewees were informed that they could request to pause or stop the tape during the interview, or, withdraw from the interview at any stage. All interviews were taped and transcribed by a third party (example in Appendix 3), using guidelines provided by Ives (1972), and checked for errors by the author. Interviewees were given the opportunity to amend the transcription of their interview. All interviews for Phase 1 took place between June 2000 and November 2000.
For each interview the researcher used an ‘interview diary worksheet’ (Appendix 2) which included 3 sections. In the first section, the ‘details of the interview’ were recorded, including the name of interviewee, the date, time, place and duration of the interview. In the second section responses to the ‘questions’ and areas for discussion including probe questions were recorded. In the third section an empty ‘commentary’ box was included. After the interview, the researcher used this ‘commentary’ box to provide a brief personal account of the interview with reflections on factors that may have influenced the interviewee- interviewer relationship. For example, the researcher found one interviewee with cerebral palsy difficult to understand, and in another the interviewee was a friend and previous work acquaintance.

Analysis

The study sought to explain the development of disability sport policy and required a qualitative interpretation of both textual documents as well as the oral accounts of key officers. The theoretical framework for the research questions, as well as the analysis of the research findings, was informed by the theories of disability, theories of policy analysis, and a knowledge of contemporary disability policy and sports policy in England.

The data was systematically examined using inductive qualitative content analysis (Arksey and Knight, 1999; Seale, 1998; Mayring, 2000). Qualitative content analysis was undertaken to examine the nature of the responses. The transcribed interviews and relevant documents were individually scrutinised in relation to the key questions. A summary of responses and illustrative quotations to the key questions were recorded in a table (Appendix 4). Recognising that data analysis can be influenced subjectively, a second independent researcher with experience in the field of sport policy analysis, examined the same interviews. The two researchers met and discussed their independent analyses and agreed upon the emergent themes derived from the interviews. The data from Phase One provided the themes for further investigation in Phase two and was also drawn upon as one source of evidence in the Phase three case studies.
5.6.2 PROCEDURE PHASE 2:
SURVEY OF NATIONAL SPORTS ORGANISATIONS

The survey identified the organisations which contribute to disability sport and in what context that contribution is made. It provided an overview of mainstream and disability sport organisations’ involvement in disability sport and established information on relationships between organisations identified in Phase 1. The survey offered an opportunity to gain a national perspective on the commitment to disability sport, how disability sport policy is made, ideologies of disability and disability sport, and the agreed as well as contested issues amongst mainstream and disability sport organisations.

Sample

Following an initial analysis based on the data collected from Phase 1, a survey of National Governing Bodies of Sport (NGBs n = 119) and Disability Sport Organisations (DSOs n = 43) was conducted. Using a purposive sampling technique the list was drawn from Sport England’s list of ‘recognised sports’ and the EFDS’s list of disability sport organisations. Whilst possibly not an exhaustive list and limited mainly to those organisations which are deemed to be either a recognised national body for a particular sport by Sport England, or a nationally recognised body in disability sport, the survey represented the significant majority of the national bodies which co-ordinate sport at a national level.

Design

Two questionnaires were designed, one (the mainstream questionnaire) for the national governing bodies predominantly concerned with sport for non-disabled people and the other (the disability sport questionnaire) for the national governing bodies and disability sport organisations predominantly concerned with disability sport. As recommended by Porretta (2000) pilot questionnaires were sent to five randomly selected mainstream sport organisations and five randomly selected disability sport organisations. As a result of the pilot minor technical amendments were made to the design to the questionnaires (for example – asking respondents to circle one pre-determined response rather than circle two or three responses). The two
questionnaires, titled ‘A Questionnaire on the Policy Process in Sport for Disabled People’, were divided into the following four sections:

A details of the organisation - including questions on the number of full and part-time able-bodied and disabled staff, the total income and funding sources;

B decision making processes - including questions on where policy decisions are made within the organisation and who is involved in making them;

C links with other organisations - including questions on which organisations they have contact with, and why; and

D policies - including questions on the role of organisations and beliefs relating to the organisation and development of disability sport.

The mainstream questionnaire contained 23 questions and the disability sport questionnaire contained 21 questions, with 17 questions that were common to each. The disability sport questionnaire included 4 questions specific to disability sport organisations and the mainstream questionnaire included 6 specific to mainstream NGBs. A range of closed and open ended questionnaire techniques were employed, including ‘yes’ and ‘no’ tick boxes, multiple choice responses, Likert scales, and open ended questions to elicit rich textual detail (Bryman, 1989). The examples that follow indicate the type of questions that were common and those that were unique to the two questionnaires.

**Example 1. A question common to both the mainstream and disability sport organisations’ questionnaires.**

| The development and co-ordination of competitive disability sport (i.e: disabled people competing against each other) should be the responsibility of: |
| SA=strongly agree, A=agree, N=no opinion, D=disagree, SD=strongly disagree | (please circle one) |
| mainstream governing bodies such as the Football Association and UK Athletics. | SA A N D SD |
| disability sport organisations such as the English Federation of Disability Sport or British Blind Sport. | SA A N D SD |
| governing bodies of disability sport such as The GB Wheelchair Basketball Association | SA A N D SD |
Example 2. A question common to both the mainstream and disability sport organisations’ questionnaires

What do you think have been the most positive and negative developments within disability sport during the last 15 years?
Positive

Negative

Example 3. A question specific to the mainstream sport organisations’ questionnaire

Does your organisation have a policy relating to the participation of disabled people in your sport? Yes No

If yes, please could you enclose a copy.

Example 4. A question specific to the disability sport organisations’ questionnaire

Approximately what percentage of your policy formulating body is disabled?
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Procedure

The finalised questionnaires were sent with a covering letter on May 4th 2001 to the remaining organisations. A copy of each questionnaire is in Appendix 5. After two weeks, a follow up letter was sent on June 4th 2001 and by July 1st 2001, 90 of the 162 returned a completed questionnaire, a response rate of 56%.

Analysis

The survey data was subjected to quantitative as well as qualitative analyses. The responses from the questionnaires were entered into a Microsoft Access database,
allowing the responses to be organised, sorted, and 'queried' to sift, filter and display information in table and diagram form (example in Appendix 6). The closed questions were analysed using simple descriptive statistics and frequency data (Arksey and Knight, 1999; Seale, 1998; Mayring, 2000) and the open ended questions were subjected to a qualitative content analysis to search for themes for subsequent analysis. Whilst the data from the survey was used as both an end in itself and as a means of identifying issues worthy of further exploration, the author recognised that the survey itself is a single contact point and that the interpretation of a particular response may not be agreed by the respondent (Mayring, 1995). The author accepts, therefore, that data derived from the interviews, together with the documentary analysis, provide the rich contextual detail of the survey responses, and the interpretation draws on the survey as one, rather than the only, source of evidence.

Table 13 Phase 2: Research questions, methods and rationale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>JUSTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the income and membership of NGBs and DSOs?</td>
<td>a) Survey</td>
<td>Provides an indication of the size and resources of those bodies that are and are not working in disability sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role do NGBs and DSOs play in disability sport?</td>
<td>a) Survey</td>
<td>Provides an overview of what each organisation (and type of organisation) contributes to disability sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do NGBs and DSOs make disability sport policy?</td>
<td>a) Survey</td>
<td>Provides insight into actor's perceptions of the process/es by which disability sport policy/ies are made and who is considered to be involved in that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role do disabled people play in the disability sport policy process?</td>
<td>a) Survey</td>
<td>Provides an overview of the perceived power that disabled people have (as end users) in the policy process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship between NGBs, DSOs, SE and EFDS?</td>
<td>a) Survey</td>
<td>Establishes the relationships within the disability sport policy network. Provides the opportunity to identify how power is distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do NGBs and DSOs believe should be responsible for disability sport?</td>
<td>a) Survey</td>
<td>Provides the opportunity to compare the ideologies of key actors toward disability sport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.3 PROCEDURE PHASE 3:

CASE STUDY ONE: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EFDS

CASE STUDY TWO: THE MAINSTREAMING OF DISABILITY SPORTS

Data from Phase 1 and 2 revealed that there was a wide range and type of organisations involved in the development of disability sport, with some disagreement over who should be responsible for provision and what policy objectives those agencies should strive for. It was considered that the use of two case studies which focused on the establishment and role of the EFDS and, the roles of, and relationships between a range of sports organisations, would provide a sharp insight into the contemporary policy processes within the disability sport policy network.

To ensure that the sample reflected the cross section of organisations interested in, or with influence over disability sport the selection included three main types of organisation, namely those with a primary interest in one sport for non-disabled people and an interest, or involvement in, disability sport, those with a primary responsibility for one or more impairment groups across a range of sports and those organisations with a primary interest in one or more sports specifically designed for disabled people. In addition to this analysis, the organisations were selected to reflect those with substantial resources, (the FA) as well as those with limited resources (the National Boccia Federation); mainstream organisations with established links with disability sport organisations (the ETTA), as well as those with limited links with disability sport organisations (UKA); and also, those with established “foundation to elite” infrastructures (ASA), as well as those without (FA).

It was also important to make sure that for case study one the sample included organisations which were as well as those which were not involved in the New Start process and the resulting creation of the English Federation of Disability Sport and, for case study two the sample included those organisations which were as well as those which were not, attempting to mainstream disability sport. Table 14a and b provides a description of the different types of organisations pertinent to these case studies and a list of those selected for the sample.
### Table 14a Selection criteria for Phase 3 sample: Case Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Criteria for organisation</th>
<th>Selected organisation for case study 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government agency for sport</td>
<td>Lead body for sport in England</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream sports organisation</td>
<td>Significant involvement in disability sport and the New Start process.</td>
<td>Amateur Swimming Association, English Table Tennis Association, Lawn Tennis Association, Football Association, UK Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited involvement in disability sport and the New Start process</td>
<td>Amateur Swimming Association, English Table Tennis Association, Lawn Tennis Association, Football Association, UK Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability (specific /general) disability sport organisation</td>
<td>DSOs with significant involvement in the New Start process.</td>
<td>British Blind Sport, Disability Sport England, CP Sport, English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports specific disability sport organisation</td>
<td>Sports specific DSOs with significant involvement in the new start process.</td>
<td>British Table Tennis Assoc. for the Disabled GB Wheelchair Basketball Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports specific DSOs with limited involvement in the new start process.</td>
<td>National Boccia Federation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 14b Selection criteria for Phase 3 sample: Case Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Criteria for organisation</th>
<th>Selected sports for case study 2</th>
<th>Selected organisations for case study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government agency for sport</td>
<td>Lead body for sport in England</td>
<td>Swimming, Table Tennis, Football, Tennis, Athletics</td>
<td>Amateur Swimming Association, English Table Tennis Association, Football Association, Lawn Tennis Association, UK Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream sports organisation</td>
<td>Sports with a lead organisation in one sport for non-disabled people.</td>
<td>Range of sports</td>
<td>British Blind Sport, Disability Sport England, CP Sport, English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisations with a lead role for one or more impairment groups across a range of sports.</td>
<td>British Table Tennis Assoc. for the Disabled GB Wheelchair Basketball Association, National Boccia Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability sport organisation (disability specific or disability general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability sports organisation (sport specific)</td>
<td>Sports with a lead organisation for one or more impairment groups in one sport</td>
<td>Table Tennis WC Basketball Boccia</td>
<td>British Table Tennis Assoc. for the Disabled GB Wheelchair Basketball Association, National Boccia Federation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design

Interviews were designed and documents (such as newsletters, minutes from meetings and conference reports) were collected to generate data relating to:

1. the extent to which there is consensus on the development of disability sport policy;
2. the distribution of power amongst, and the relationship between, mainstream and disability sport organisations;
3. the perceived role of key organisations in the development of disability sport; and
4. mainstream and disability sport organisations’ ideologies of disability sport.

More specific details of the questions asked and justifications for methods used can be found in Tables 15 and 16.

Procedure

Letters were sent on July 27th 2001 to the selected personnel providing a summary of the study and the contribution their interview would make. Interviews took place between August 2001 and December 2001.

A similar ‘interview diary worksheet’ to that described in Phase 1 (Appendix 2) was employed in order to provide a brief record of the interview details, interviewee responses and interviewer comments. While the interviews were also semi-structured, their purpose was different to that of the interviews in Phase 1. In Phase 3, the interviews were seeking to explore the developments of specific organisations and the perceptions of the interviewees on a range of pre-determined issues, derived from the analysis of data from Phases 1 and 2. All interviews were taped and transcribed by a

1 The interviews carried out between June 2000 and November 2000 as a part of phase I also contributed to the analysis of the phase 3 case studies.
third party and checked for errors by the author and interviewees were given the opportunity to amend the transcription of their interview.

Following an analysis of documents and interview data collected from Phase 3, findings suggested that a number of matters pertinent to the case studies needed further clarification. In accordance with the guidance provided by Mason (1996) policy actors from the interviewed sample or other key personnel from national governing bodies and disability sport organisations were contacted by telephone between January and October 2003 to provide clarification on key issues.

Table 15 Phase 3 Case Study 1: The establishment of the EFDS. Research Questions, Methods and Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 What policy developments led to the establishment of the EFDS?</td>
<td>a) Interview with key personnel b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td>Assists in the historical account of the factors that led to the New Start process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Was the establishment of EFDS supported?</td>
<td>a) Interview with key personnel b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td>Establishes whether there is consensus on key issues in the purpose of disability sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 What role did SE, DSOs, NGBs and other key organisations play in establishing the EFDS?</td>
<td>a) Interview with key personnel b) Documentary analysis</td>
<td>Provides details on the perceived roles that key organisations play in disability sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 How was this example of disability sport policy (the creation of the EFDS) made?</td>
<td>a) Interview with key personnel b) Documentary analysis c) Survey</td>
<td>Provides details on the process/es by which disability sport policy/ies are made and who is involved in that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Who contributed / impacted upon this example of disability sport policy?</td>
<td>a) Interview with key personnel b) Documentary analysis c) Survey</td>
<td>Identifies key actors and policy entrepreneurs and highlights the factors /organisations/power distribution that contribute to disability sport policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 What light does the establishment of the EFDS cast on the relationship between SE, the DSOs, the NGBs and other key organisations?</td>
<td>a) Interview with key personnel b) Documentary analysis c) Survey</td>
<td>Provides detailed accounts of the relationships within the disability sport policy network. Provides the opportunity to identify where and how power is distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 What is the perceived role of SE, the NGBs, and the DSOs in relation to the EFDS?</td>
<td>a) Interview with key personnel b) Documentary analysis c) Survey</td>
<td>Provides the opportunity to examine the ideological differences and similarities between actors and organisations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 Phase 3 Case Study 2: The development of disability sport policy in seven sports. Research questions, methods and justifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>JUSTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2 What role do SE, the EFDS, the DSOs, the NGBs and other key organisations play in the development of policies relating to the mainstreaming of disability sport? | a) Interview with key personnel  
b) Documentary analysis | Establishes where there is consensus on key issues in the purpose of disability sport and the aims of 'mainstreaming'. |
| 3.3 What is the relationship between SE, the EFDS, the NGBs, the DSOs and other key organisations in relation to the development of disability sport and mainstreaming of disability sport? | a) Interview with key personnel  
b) Documentary analysis | Provides details on the roles and relationships between key organisations, in relation to the development of disability sport policy. |
| 3.4 How is policy on the mainstreaming of disability sport made? | a) Interview with key personnel  
b) Documentary analysis  
c) Survey | Provides details on the process/es by which disability sport policy/ies are made by different disability sport structures and who is involved in that process. |
| 3.5 Who are the key actors who contribute to policies relating to the mainstreaming of disability sport? | a) Interview with key personnel  
b) Documentary analysis  
c) Survey | Identifies key actors and entrepreneurs and highlights the factors/organisations/power distribution that contribute to disability sport policy. |
| 3.6 What is the perceived role that SE, EFDS, NGBs, and DSOs should play in mainstreaming disability sport? | a) Interview with key personnel  
b) Documentary analysis | Provides the opportunity to examine the ideological differences and similarities between actors and organisations (on issues such as mainstreaming). |

Analysis

The first case study focuses on the establishment, role and relationships of the EFDS and the second provides an analysis of disability sport policy development in seven sports. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to investigate the policy development within a select group of organisations and to explore the perceptions of administrators who work for those organisations. It should be noted that the interview responses carried out as a part of Phase 1 were also used in the analysis of the two case studies.

A qualitative content analysis was performed to examine the content of the interviewees’ responses (Bryman, 1989; May, 1997). The interview transcripts were
scrutinised and subjected to a deductive qualitative content analysis, with responses to the key questions in the case study (detailed in Table 18 and 19) as well as key quotations, recorded in a table. The two researchers met and discussed their independent analyses and agreed upon the key points made by the interviewees.

As recommended by Yin (1994) a triangulation of interview responses, survey data and documentary analysis (of, for example, an organisation's policies and promotional literature) was used to provide a descriptive and illustrated answer to the questions posed.

5.7 LIMITATIONS

Research, which seeks to interpret the meaning of written and oral interview data, allows for the collection of rich and detailed material. However, there are a number of limitations to such methods. This section recognises the limitations of this study and also demonstrates how these shortcomings have been minimised.

First, the researcher chose the interviewees in Phase 1 who contributed to the identification of themes for further investigation in Phase 2, allowing the focus of the study to be swayed by the researcher's own selection of interviewees and the attendant bias that this allows. Second, two of the chosen interviewees did not respond to the numerous letters requesting an interview. Third, respondents to the interviews in the Phase 2 survey, and Phase 3 interviews, may not reflect the views of the governing body or disability sport organisation they were deemed to represent. Moreover, organisations that responded to the survey may not in practice reflect the type of organisation it was considered to represent. Fourth, the sports chosen for the case study in Phase 3 may, as a group be atypical, thus the conclusion drawn from these case studies may be skewed by an unrepresentative sample. Fifth, it is also acknowledged that the same documents, survey and interview data may be interpreted differently by an individual with an alternative perception of how the social world works. Sixth, and as discussed earlier within this chapter, this is an interpretative process, which is bound to be influenced by the researcher's predilections and values and the cultural context in which the research takes place. Finally, the responses to questions in the interviews (which took place between June 2000 and September 2001) were with reference to the policies and events of organisations up until the time
of the interview. It is the case of course, that interviewees may now have answers which were different to those provided in June 2000, even though the questions remained the same.

However, drawing on the recommendations of Bryman (1989) and Yin (1994), many of the limitations identified above have been overcome or at least taken into account in the analysis. First, the sample of Phase 1 interviews was influenced by the recommendations of those who were interviewed, thus the sample did not only reflect the key personnel as perceived by the author. Second, in Phase 1, the questions were open ended and the themes that were the focus of Phase 2 emerged from these findings - there was no priori intent. Third, an impartial third party transcribed the interviews thus decreasing the potential for bias in the recording of responses. Fourth, responses to the questions in the survey and the interviews were examined by the two researchers, who discussed and agreed upon themes and key points made within. Fifth, as this study was conducted at a specific time and in a particular context, the analysis may only be relevant to that context and thus it would be difficult to carry out a comparable study. However, as all raw original survey and interview material can be made available, a different researcher could analyse the same data and either confirm or offer an alternative interpretation.

While these strategies were employed to minimise the researchers bias and increase credibility of the analysis, the triangulation of data provides reassurance that the aims and objectives of this study can be met using a rigorous and robust methodology.
CHAPTER SIX

CASE STUDY ONE:

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ENGLISH FEDERATION OF DISABILITY SPORT

6.1 INTRODUCTION

As described in the methodology, the two case studies have been subjected to a qualitative content analysis to examine whether there is a policy community for disability sport. In addition, as discussed in chapters two, three and four, this analysis has been informed by theories of disability, accounts of disability policy and disability sports policy and models of policy analysis. While this provided a rich and detailed context, as indicated in chapter 4, Marsh and Rhodes’ model of policy networks was considered to be the most useful tool for this analysis of disability sport. Therefore, what follows as a preface to the two empirical chapters, is a brief reminder of the key features of Marsh and Rhodes’ policy network model.

In order to explain the power of individuals and organisations in the policy-making process, Marsh and Rhodes developed the policy network concept. They suggested that policy networks may form, at one extreme, a loose issue network and at the other, a tight policy community. Issue networks have a fluctuating and large membership of groups with varied interests and values, unstable relationships, and conflict between them is ever-present. Policy communities however, have a limited number of members, who interact frequently, agree on the distribution of resources, share similar values, and achieve consensus on key issues relatively easily.

In the first of the two case studies, data generated from the interviews with key actors, the survey of mainstream sport and disability sport organisations, government reports, conference summaries and organisation’s annual reports and newsletters, were used to describe the emergence, policies and relationships of the English Federation of Disability Sport (EFDS). More specifically, the case study provides an analysis of the perception of the EFDS held by other key policy actors, the events that led to the establishment of the EFDS and an examination of EFDS’s policies, how decisions are made and with whom the EFDS work.
6.2 THE EMERGENCE OF DISABILITY SPORT AND THE CREATION OF BSAD IN 1961

The emergence of disability sport organisations in England

This first section provides an historical overview of the establishment and development of organisations concerned to provide opportunities for participation in sport and physical activity by disabled people. Disabled people have traditionally been encouraged to participate in physical activity, as a means of physical or psychological therapy. For example, in the twentieth century the war injured were encouraged to use sport and recreational physical activity as a means of rehabilitation back into civilian life. This ‘therapeutic recreation’ concept became particularly well developed in America where hospitals and schools have continued to use recreation as a form of therapy. It was from this early involvement in therapeutic recreation that more organised competitive sporting opportunities emerged (Brasile, Kleiber and Harnisch, 1994).

While it is likely that disabled people have always engaged in a variety of sporting activities, with, along side or separate from their non-disabled peers, sports clubs for deaf people are acknowledged as the first formally organised ‘disability sport’ events (DePauw and Gavron, 1995). Following a series of organised sports events and activities for deaf people held in Berlin 1888, in 1924 the first World Games for the Deaf were held, prompting the establishment in 1930 of the British Deaf Sports Council (BDSC, 2003). The BDSC was founded to provide regional and national competitive sports events for deaf people. The BDSC has since continued to develop interclub sporting competition for deaf people and promoted deaf sport within the disability sport structures. However, the BDSC has retained its distinct view of the wider political and cultural relationships between deaf people and society and has consequently opposed any homogeneous perception of disability groups and in particular has rejected the association between deafness and disability (BDSC, 2003).

Despite the activities of organisations concerned with sport for deaf people it was not until the competitive international events organised in the 1940s, specifically for physically impaired people, that disability sport began to enjoy the significant growth that was to follow over the next 60 years. Although, it should be noted here that while
deaf people were one of the first impairment groups to have their own sports organisation in England, deaf sport has remained peripheral to the developments within both mainstream sport and disability sport (Atha, Interview, 2000; Casey, Interview, 2000).

Sport and competition specifically for disabled people, and in particular those with spinal cord injury, was first organised by Sir Ludwig Guttmann, a neurosurgeon at Stoke Mandeville hospital in England. Although the initial rationale for his intervention was to provide therapeutic recreational activities he soon recognised the wider potential of competitive sport. Consequently, many key actors in disability sport policy, such as Atha (President of the English Federation of Disability Sport), acknowledge Guttmann, and the International Stoke Mandeville Games Federation (ISMGF) which he then formed, as instrumental in the early development of disability sport in England. One of the earliest international competitive events for physically impaired people was held in 1948 when sports clubs and hospitals were invited that year to Stoke Mandeville to coincide with the Olympic Games being held in London. On July 28th 1948, the day of the Opening Ceremony of the 1948 Olympic Games in London, the Stoke Mandeville Games were founded and the first competition for wheelchair athletes was organised.

The British Paraplegic Sports Society (BPSS) was established as a result of the Stoke Mandeville Games in 1948 and caters for those with spinal injury, although soon after BPSS began to cater for wheelchair users generally (and was then renamed the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation). The BPSS became recognised as the national organisation responsible for developing sport for paraplegics, tetraplegics and other related disabilities in the UK. It had, in membership, 12 individual sports associations and owned the Guttmann Sports Centre for the Disabled in Aylesbury. However, to facilitate the development of sporting opportunities for those with a disability other than those catered for by the BPSS, the British Sports Association for the Disabled was formed.

1961 – the creation of BSAD

The British Sports Association for the Disabled (BSAD) was founded by members of the British Ex-Service Men’s Association, the Disabled Drivers Motor Club, the
British Council for the Welfare of Spastics, the Pony Riding for the Disabled Trust and the Organisation of the Stoke Mandeville Games. Inaugurated on February 15th 1961 by Guttmann at Stoke Mandeville, BSAD promoted itself as the recognised national body with responsibility for providing, developing and co-ordinating sport and recreation opportunities for people with disabilities (BSAD, 1985; Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989; Lewis, Interview, 2000; Price, Interview, 2000). As such it developed events and activities, and in addition, provided a governing body on behalf of disability sport organisations (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989). BSAD encouraged organisations such as the CCPR and the NGBs to be in its membership and become ‘involved in the development and co-ordination of sport for people with disabilities’ (BSAD 1989:13).

Price (Ex-President and Chief Executive of BSAD and currently President of the European Paralympic Committee, Interview, 2000), Craven (President of the International Wheelchair Basketball Federation, Interview, 2000) and Atha (President of the English Federation of Disability Sport, Interview, 2000) agree that BSAD was created by Guttmann to deal with disabilities other than spinal cord injury, but claim that Guttmann ‘never felt any great affection for non-physical disability groups or any great inclination to open the doors of the British Paraplegic Sports Society or the BSAD to those other groups’ (Price, Interview, 2000). According to Atha, President of the English Federation of Disability Sport, ‘although Guttmann was a most remarkable pioneer he was a single minded autocrat and maverick, whose interest was limited to those with spinal cord injury and he would not entertain the involvement of other disabilities which I, as Vice-Chairman of the Sports Council, wished him to do’ (Interview, 2000).

Furthermore, according to Marshall (Sports Council member and member of the Minister’s Review Group in 1989) BSAD was ‘always perceived by the paras [paraplegics] as a secondary organisation and this social or sporting snobbery lasts to this day’ (Marshall, Interview, 2000). Indeed even though sport for other disabled groups such as the deaf, was, according to Price, established long before wheelchair sport, the inclusion of these disabilities was ‘far removed from the consciousness of Guttmann’ (Price, Interview, 2000). Notwithstanding his reluctance to include disabilities other than spinal cord injury, Guttmann was regarded by all those interviewed as an entrepreneur (Atha, Interview, 2000), and considered to be ‘the
right man for his day because there was nothing until he came along and when he left there was something’ (Price, Interview, 2000).

Illustrating the respect that Guttmann commanded, Kevin Baker (Chairman of the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation) stated that:

‘On the 3rd July [1999], Ludwig Guttmann would have been 100 years old. It seems right somehow that in his 100th year BWSF is planning to redevelop the Centre [Gutmann Centre, Stoke Mandeville]. We are proud to have been a major part of Sir Ludwig’s work and his achievements will be celebrated by many involved in wheelchair sport around the world’ (British Wheelchair Sports Foundation, 1999:2)

Based at the purpose built rehabilitation and sports centre in Stoke Mandeville, BSAD initially focused on the development and provision of competitive sports events. For example, in 1963 BSAD introduced the first Annual Multi Disabled Games and in 1974 organised and hosted the Multi Disabled World Games. During the late 1970s, in addition to the running of events, because of his belief in the benefits of sport, Guttmann took the decision to promote the participation of disabled people in sport through regional development activities (Guttmann, 1976; Lewis, Interview, 2000). Guttmann (1976) believed that sport was:

‘invaluable in restoring the disabled persons’ physical fitness i.e.: his strength, co-ordination, speed and endurance... restoring that passion for playful activity and the desire to experience joy and pleasure in life, ....promoting that psychological equilibrium which enables the disabled to come to terms with his physical defect, to develop activity of mind, self confidence, self dignity, self discipline, competitive spirit, and comradeship, mental attitudes....to facilitate and accelerate his social re-integration and integration’. (Guttmann, 1976:12-13)

BSAD’s constitution summarised in Table 17 highlights the wide ranging and, as suggested later in this section, ambitious remit that it developed. Indeed the objectives that BSAD set itself and which the Sports Council was pleased to support suggested that it could act as both a provider of opportunities as well as a coordinating
‘umbrella’ agency for all aspects of sport and recreation for people with all types of impairment.

Table 17 BSAD Objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>To provide and assist in the provision of interests of social welfare of facilities (sic) for physical recreation and sport for people having a physical, sensory or mental disability and in the furtherance of this object but not otherwise:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>To encourage disabled people to take part in physical recreation and sport, for pleasure, for physical, emotional, psychological and social benefit; and as an aid to rehabilitation and to promote opportunities for integration with able bodied people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>To coordinate and support physical recreation and sport for disabled people and to promote the development of physical recreation and sporting organisations of and for disabled people, where such organisations do not exist and are considered to be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>To secure the provision and improvement of facilities for physical recreation and sport for disabled people by national and local government and national sports organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>To make more widely known the opportunities and the benefits to be gained from physical recreation and sport by disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>To encourage, where appropriate, the enforcement of all statutory enactments, regulations and instruments of guidance concerned with or relating to disabled people including in particular the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970 and any amendments, or revisions thereof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>To provide a forum for the free discussion of all matters concerning physical recreation and sport for disabled people, to identify needs relating to such activities and to plan to meet those needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>To promote and encourage the training and coaching of disabled athletes and sports men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>To disseminate information on matters relating to physical recreation and sport for disabled people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>To do all such things as shall be necessary to fulfil these objects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Extracted from the BSAD Constitution 2nd June 1984: BSAD, 1985)

BSAD’s perceived failure to coordinate disability sport and the emergence of other disability sport organisations

BSAD was perceived by some, such as Atha (President of the English Federation of Disability Sport), Casey (Chief Executive of the Sports Council) and Marshall (Member of the Sports Council) to be failing to coordinate adequately the development of sport for disabled people. As a result, numerous organisations were established, with a specific remit to improve the range and quality of opportunities for disabled people. For example, Cerebral Palsy Sport (CP Sport) was formed in 1968 as a part of the Spastics Society (now SCOPE) to provide opportunities for athletes with cerebral palsy to compete in regional and national competitions (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989; CP Sport, 2003). CP Sport was established as a charitable
organisation with limited funding and few staff, but provided a calendar of competition specifically for people with Cerebral Palsy in preparation for international events regulated by their international Association CP-ISRA: a service that CP Sport believe was hitherto not available (CP Sport, 2003).

Concern for the perceived lack of development by BSAD also prompted the establishment of British Blind Sport (BBS). BBS was formed in 1976 ‘by visually impaired people to enable them to have control of their various sports’ and to improve the opportunities for blind athletes (BBS, 2003; Bright, 2001). Originally the British Association for Sporting and Recreational Activities of the Blind (BASRAB), BBS became the recognised governing and co-ordinating body of sport in the UK for blind and visually impaired people, providing and facilitating opportunities from ‘grass roots to national level’ (BBS, 2003). BBS also began to act as the selector of teams for international, European, world and paralympic competition. Reliant on Sports Council funding to assist clubs and individuals in coaching and training up to international level, in 1987 BBS had 256 individual and 63 club members (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989).

According to Marshall, organisations such as CP Sport and BBS evolved as a direct result of BSAD’s untenable position as both a membership and a development agency, and its failure to support a wider range of disability groups (Marshall, Interview, 2000). Whilst at an international level disability specific organisations liaised with their own equivalent disability specific international federations, for example, British Blind Sport with the International Blind Sport Association, it was at local, regional and national levels that BSAD was failing to develop sport equally effectively for all the disability groups in their remit.

It was acknowledged by both Atha and Casey that while BSAD played an invaluable role in the early development of disability sport, the organisation failed initially to represent the breadth of disability sport interests. This failure became more pronounced as more disability specific organisations were established and began to impose higher expectations for policy action and lobbying on BSAD. Notwithstanding these organisational shortcomings Price claims that the smaller NDSOs were envious of BSAD’s position. BSAD was regarded by Atha as a ‘splendid organisation’ (Atha, Interview, 2000), having a ‘regional membership that was the envy of many other
disability sport organisations' (Price, Interview, 2000). Price goes on to suggest that ‘others did not have then and have not developed since, the network of grass roots clubs and regional organisations’ similar to BSAD (Price, Interview, 2000). Nor did any DSOs other than BSAD enjoy such a close relationship with the Sports Council. Not only had BSAD become the main recipient of funding for disability sport from Sports Council but Sports Council continued to perceive BSAD as the lead organisation in disability sport.

However, BSAD’s policy was determined by a board of trustees who ‘fell neatly into two camps which had quite different ambitions and expectations’ (Price, Interview, 2000). In 1982 the BSAD board had representatives from seven NDSOs and from ten BSAD regions. Consequently, half of the board was made up of regional BSAD representatives whose interests were in its members and the other half were representatives from other DSOs (mainly NDSOs) ‘who had to use BSAD for coordinating purposes’, for example, ‘to access funds’ as ‘they only got what they got [from Sports Council] through BSAD’ (Price, Interview, 2000). Price summarises BSAD’s position by suggesting that BSAD was almost ‘schizophrenic when one half existed for one reason and the other half existed for a completely different reason’.

The proliferation of disability sport organisations did not go unnoticed by the Sports Council. On his move from Scotland to be Chief Executive of the Sports Council in England, Derek Casey was ‘actually quite surprised at how disparate the different organisations were’ finding that, in contrast to his experience of the Scottish Sports Association for the Disabled, ‘there was almost a drifting apart of the attempted co-ordination’ and other disability sport organisations were not ‘too happy with their [BSAD’s] performance’ (Casey, Interview, 2000). According to Casey, BSAD’s financial problems, its weaknesses in some of its regions and the increasing pressure to mainstream, contributed to the difficult position that officers of the BSAD found themselves in. For example, according to Price ‘BSAD had to compete for its funding with national governing bodies of sport’ (BSAD, 1985:19) and did not receive the funding from Sports Council that allowed them to play the role that the Sports Council expected of it. In relation to the diversity in BSAD’s regions, while some had fulltime-employed officers others were solely reliant on voluntary support. Also, despite the aims set by BSAD’s national executive, some regions had their own influential executive committees with priorities that were specific to the region and
not always reflective of BSAD's national aims. There developed, therefore, a wide variety in the way that BSAD's regions operated, and the quantity and type of work they undertook.

Summary

The emergence of disability sport was more to do with the significant entrepreneurial influence of Guttmann, than a government or even interest group recognition of a need to put disability sport on the policy agenda. Since his early inspiration, the developments from 1940-1985 reflect a lack of coherence among the disability sport policy network and no strong link between disability sport organisations and the government or indeed with mainstream sport. At this stage it seemed that disability sport did not have the characteristics of a policy community. The dominant characteristics of this early period of development are first, a rapid proliferation of narrowly focused organisations, second, an incoherence in the role of BSAD, third, a growing sense of frustration among DSOs at BSAD's impact, fourth, a lack of clarity of expectations from the Sports Council and finally, a deeply rooted and unresolved tension at the heart of BSAD.

6.3 THE ISLE OF MAN THINK TANK (1985) AND THE RECONSTITUTION OF BSAD

Isle of Man Think Tank 1985

The failure of the British Sports Association for the Disabled to coordinate the activities of other DSOs, the disability sport organisations' dissatisfaction with BSAD, together with the enviable alliance that BSAD had struck with the Sports Council, prompted the Sports Council in 1985 to sponsor the Isle of Man Think Tank (11-14 December 1985). Organised by the BSAD, and chaired by Dr. Bob Price (then Chief Executive of BSAD), the purpose of the Think Tank was to 'investigate the current status and future needs of the provision of physical recreation and sport for disabled people in Britain' (BSAD, 1985:2). The three day meeting focused on discussing; why BSAD exists, how BSAD relates to the Sports Council, and how it relates to those it serves. The meeting was attended by 56 delegates from 38 organisations representing a broad range of disability sport and mainstream sport
organisations including the Sports Council, the Central Council for Physical Recreation, the British Olympic Association, the National Coaching Foundation, the Amateur Swimming Association, the English Basketball Association, the British Amateur Athletics Board, the Physical Education Association, the Disabled Living Foundation, the British Deaf Sports Council, the British Paraplegic Sports Society, the United Kingdom Sports Association for People with Mental Handicap, the British Amputee Sports Association and the Welsh and Scottish Sports Associations for the Disabled.

The ‘Think Tank’ involved a series of presentations and discussion workshops, the first of which provided the Sports Council’s perspective on the future of sport for disabled people. Liz Dendy (senior officer of the Sports Council) highlighted the significance of the ‘historical beginning of the work in sports for disabled people’ (BSAD, 1985:8), and emphasised that while BSAD ‘begins its activity with disability’, the Sports Council ‘begins with sport’. Dendy went on to suggest that while BSAD and the Sports Council may be approaching the ‘problem from different ends – they could and do easily meet in the middle’ (BSAD, 1985:8). Dendy stressed that BSAD is ‘not a governing body of sport… but it is a coordinating body …and it was now being asked [by the Sports Council] to indicate just what is needed in sport for disabled people’. She suggested BSAD needed to ‘come up with plans, programmes and outlines for financial support’ which have been based on ‘discussions with regional representatives, member organisations, and local authorities’. In this way, Dendy claimed ‘BSAD fulfils its role as co-ordinator and the Sports Council keeps in contact and guards the purse’ (BSAD, 1985:9).

As the Chief Executive of BSAD, Price highlighted the problems that BSAD faced, emphasising that, by 1982, BSAD had in membership over 450 clubs serving an estimated 40,000 disabled sports persons, but also included in its membership seven disability groups [the NDSOs] and 25 other national members. Alluding to BSAD’s constitution, he pointed out that ‘BSAD’s responsibility is not just to ‘do’ in its own name but to enable others to do likewise …and as such has a responsibility to a much broader public than its constitutional membership’ (BSAD, 1985:11). Price encouraged a debate on what role BSAD could and ought to play, and how it should relate to the Sports Council and, in response, participants at the Think Tank expressed concern over the dual role within BSAD’s constitution. With regard to BSAD’s role
as both a membership and a development agency, it was agreed by the delegates that ‘it was not appropriate (indeed not possible) for BSAD to do either job effectively, let alone attempt to do both’ (BSAD, 1985:20). It was felt at the meeting that ‘many agencies expected too much of BSAD, forgetting that it is a membership agency of limited resources’ (BSAD, 1985:15).

It was also agreed at the meeting that BSAD was already doing the Sports Council’s job and expectations of the BSAD officers were too numerous and various. ‘Serving finite membership while at the same time attempting to compensate for the relative inactivity on behalf of disabled people for the Sports Council, the Central Council of Physical Recreation, and national governing bodies was an unrealistic expectation’. (1985: 20). Despite what was considered to be ‘the obvious diversity of interest and understanding among those present [at the Think Tank] on the whole question of sport and disability’, the meeting was ‘virtually unanimous in its view of the most appropriate relationship between BSAD and the Sports Council’ (BSAD, 1985:3).

The Conference identified that ‘there had been widespread misconceptions about BSAD’s role’ and it had become clear to all as a result of the Conference that ‘BSAD was not a national governing body and performed for disabled people many of the functions of the Sports Council, the CCPR and the NGBs’ (BSAD, 1985: 20). The overwhelming recommendation that emerged from the Think Tank was that ‘it would be in the best interests of all concerned for BSAD’s development role (and its development staff) to be adopted by the Sports Council itself’ (BSAD, 1985:20) and that BSAD could concentrate on providing events and activities for its membership.

Price claimed in his report of the Think Tank that despite sponsoring the Think Tank, the Sports Council largely ignored the recommendations that emerged (BSAD, 1985:20). While the government carried out its own investigation into sport for people with disabilities in 1988 (discussed in section 6.4) and produced a policy statement on ‘Sport for People with Disabilities’ in 1993 (Sports Council, 1993a), according to Price (Interview, 2000), there was neither at the time nor since any clear response to the Isle of Man Think Tank deliberations and recommendations.

However, the Sports Council was further prompted to intervene in the organisation and provision of sport for disabled people following the introduction, in 1986, of the European Charter on Sport for All: Disabled Persons. The Charter was adopted by the
Government’s Committee of Ministers following the United National General Assembly resolution in, 1975, to provide disabled people with the same fundamental rights as their fellow citizens. The Charter provided a series of guidelines for the ‘encouragement’ of all relevant public authorities and private organisations to be aware of the needs and wants of disabled people. It stated that:

‘the government of member states should encourage where appropriate the setting up of an umbrella body for the development of sport for all disabled persons to bring together all appropriate and relevant interests and expertise’.

(Council for Europe, 1986)

Whilst continuing to support, but not entirely adopt the role of BSAD, the Sports Council endorsed the recommendations of the Charter and in addition, in 1987, funded the ‘Everybody Active Project’ in the North East of England (as one of the National Demonstration Projects), to investigate how to improve the physical education experiences and sporting opportunities of disabled young people (Stafford, 1989). Results of the study revealed that 96% of the 51 mainstream schools where disabled children attended, excluded disabled pupils from specific activities, the explanation for which lay in the lack of suitably trained teachers. The ‘Everybody Active Project’ clearly indicated the lack of first, PE training for special school teachers, second, disability related knowledge among mainstream teachers, and third, an awareness of sport and disability issues amongst leisure providers. The Project also highlighted the need for better coordination between disability sport organisations and mainstream providers such as local authorities and governing bodies.

The creation of BSAD 1987 Ltd

The Sports Council continued to fund BSAD, but also charged Dr Price with setting up a working party to consider the establishment of a new coordinating umbrella body for disability sport. Following a survey conducted in 1987 of ‘Sporting Opportunities for Disabled People in Britain’ Price presented the Sports Council with two suggestions. The report suggested that either, that BSAD be divided into two bodies, a membership body and a development body, or that, BSAD create a new membership body which it would service and that the Sports Council adopt BSAD’s development role. The (1987) report concluded by offering BSAD’s support to the Sports Council,
for whatever decision was made and hoped that one of the two suggestions would be deemed satisfactory. However, the Sports Council neither accepted nor rejected either of the suggestions contained within the 1987 report. In 1988 a government review of sport for people with disabilities was launched which had the effect of pushing off the agenda both the recommendations of the Isle of Man ‘Think Tank’ and the recommendations that came out of the BSAD survey in 1987.

However, the ongoing dissatisfaction with BSAD’s policy and practice led to a gradual decline in its membership and a weakening of the credibility of BSAD’s claim to be the primary advocate on behalf of other disability sport organisations. According to Price this strategic aim, which he shared with the Sports Council (BSAD, 1985, 1987), was over-ambitious and misguided because BSAD could not encompass all disability groups and consequently was faced with the untenable dual responsibility of promoting participation for other organisations as well as developing its own sports club and event infrastructure.

By 1987 BSAD’s untenable dual role had still not been resolved. The by now long standing concern expressed by the DSOs as well as the Sports Council prompted BSAD’s Executive Board to reconstitute itself as BSAD Ltd 1987 and to relinquish its coordinating role and concentrate on development and membership (BSAD, 1987). Consequently, the seven NDSOs withdrew from membership of BSAD and on June 20th 1987, BSAD became a company limited by guarantee, the executive comprising of ten elected delegates from the ten English regions, representatives from each of the home countries, an elected Chairman and two executive directors.

While BSAD continued to organise its range of regional and national events for its membership, BSAD also recognised the support needed by local authorities and governing bodies which in the late 1980s were beginning to address inequities within their provision. The National Demonstration Projects and the Sports Council’s Action Sports programmes encouraged and provided funding for many local authority sports development programmes, which sought to tackle disabled peoples’ low participation. As discussed in chapter 3, the Action Sports Programmes led to the significant growth in the number of sports development officers, some of whom had a specific remit to work with disabled people. The Sports Council’s Strategy for Sport 1988 – 1993 highlighted those local authorities such as Northamptonshire, and governing bodies,
such as the Amateur Rowing Association, as examples of organisations using innovative schemes to promote mass participation opportunities for disabled people (Sports Council, 1988). BSAD furthered its development role, in conjunction with the United Kingdom Sports Association for People with Mental Handicap (UKSAPMH), by providing advice and support to governing bodies and local authorities such as these. In addition, BSAD and UKSAPMH launched, in 1987, a series of Disability Awareness Training courses for providers of services in the leisure industry (BSAD, date unknown). The Sports Council recognised the important development and training role provided by BSAD and continued to fund its activities. By 1988 the Sports Council were providing (nationally) the British Sports Association for the Disabled with a grant of £100,000 a year (BSAD, 1989).

Summary

It is clear that by the mid 1980s the large number of organisations that had emerged to cater for specific issues or groups varied greatly in their objectives and in their access to resources, and were often dissatisfied with BSAD's role both as an advocate on their behalf and as a distributor of the limited government funds available. The Isle of Man 'Think Tank' signalled a commitment by the Sports Council to address the lack of coherence within the disability sport policy area and put the Sports Council firmly at the forefront of the disability sport policy process. The result of the 'Think Tank' also heralded for the first time not only some consensus on key issues, but significantly, the need to shift responsibility for disability sport onto mainstream providers.

However, the Sports Council largely ignored the recommendations of the 'Think Tank' and chose instead to support another enquiry into disability sport. The government while recognising the complex mess within the disability sport policy area, and that it should take a lead role in resolving the lack of coherence, was unsure what that lead role should be.

The evidence at this stage indicates that disability sport policy lacks the key elements of a policy community. In particular it demonstrates a lack of coherence and weak leadership from the government.
By 1989 there were a vast array of organisations concerned with the provision or development of sport for disabled people. The British Sports Association for the Disabled (BSAD) and the United Kingdom Sports Association for People with Mental Handicap (UKSAPMH) were the main development agencies, while the British Paralympic Association, was the national link to international, European and world and paralympic competition. Table 18 (overleaf) shows the array of disparate organisations representing a range of disability and sporting interests that emerged between 1930 and 1989, seven of whom became recognised as the National Disability Sport Organisations (in italics).

In 1989 Colin Moynihan, the Minister for Sport in the Conservative government, initiated a government review prompted, in large part, by the suspicion and discontent aimed at BSAD by the other NDSOs and mainstream governing bodies. Colin Moynihan brought together key individuals to discuss the development of disability sport. The Membership of the Review Group chaired by Moynihan (Member of Parliament) was: Cllr Bernhard Atha (Chairman Leeds City Council, Chairman Leeds Sports Council, Chairman British Paralympic Association), Liz Dendy (Sports Council officer with responsibility for sport for people with disabilities), Duncan Goodhew OBE (Olympic Champion), Eva Loeffler (Vice-Chairman, British Paraplegic Sports Society), Tim Marshall (Member of Sports Council, Chairman of Wheelchair Road Racing Association), Ivor Mitchell OBE (former Vice-Chairman of British Sports Association of the Disabled), and Dr Adrian Whiteson (Chairman, World Boxing Council Medical Commission).

Tim Marshall recalls how he received a phone call 'out of the blue' from the Minister asking if he would like to serve on a Committee to further the development of disability sport. As far as Marshall recalls it was not organisations that were invited, rather it was just a few individuals selected by Moynihan. As Moynihan clearly states 'I established my review Group [to] provide a spread of administrative and medical expertise in able bodied sport and sport for those with disabilities' (1989:i). Phil Lewis (Chairman of BSAD) confirmed BSAD's lack of involvement when he stated that Moynihan had 'selected people to serve on the Review Group ...and we [BSAD]
await with interest the report of the review Group which we understand is likely to be produced in June 1989’ (BSAD, 1989:13).

Table 18 Historical Landmarks in disability sport policy 1930-1989

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LANDMARK</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>British Deaf Sports Council formed</td>
<td>Providing competitive sporting opportunities for profoundly deaf people. In 1989 a total membership £8,000 and an expenditure of £37,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>British Paraplegic Sports Association formed (later renamed British Wheelchair Sports Foundation)</td>
<td>Established following the Stoke Mandeville Games in 1948 to cater for those with spinal injury. In 1989 a membership of 8,000 and an expenditure of £828,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>First International disability sport event.</td>
<td>Sports clubs for the disabled and hospitals were invited to attend a series of competitive events at Stoke Mandeville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>British Sports Association for the Disabled formed</td>
<td>Inaugurated by Sir Ludwig Guttmann at Stoke Mandeville, BSAD promoted itself as the recognised national body with responsibility for providing, developing and co-ordinating sport and recreation opportunities for people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Cerebral Palsy Sport formed</td>
<td>CP Sport was formed as a part of Spastics Society. CP Sport focussed on national events and spent under £48,000 in 1987/88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>British Blind Sport</td>
<td>British Blind Sport formed to improve the opportunities for blind athletes. BBS became the recognised governing and co-ordinating body of sport in the UK for blind and visually impaired people, providing opportunities at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>British Amputee Sports Association formed</td>
<td>BASA had a membership of 500 amputees in 1987/88 in the UK, and focussed on providing training weekends and competitive events. BASA’s expenditure in 1987/88 was £21,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>United Kingdom Sports Association for the People with Mental Handicap formed.</td>
<td>Set up as a coordinating agency of organisations concerned with sport for people with a learning disability. Similar to BSAD, UKSAPMH, was part-funded by the Sports Council, providing training, events and development work. Its expenditure in 1989 was over £230,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>British Les Autres Sports Association formed</td>
<td>BLASA was formed to cater for all those athletes that were not catered for by the growing number of disability specific organisations. A membership of 450 individuals who attended training weekends and events. Expenditure in 1987/88 was £40,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>BSAD hosted the Isle of Man ‘Think Tank’ on behalf of the Sports Council.</td>
<td>A 3 Day conference funded by the Sports Council and organised by BSAD to investigate the current provision of physical recreation and sport for disabled people in Britain, and their future needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Sports Council’s Everybody Active Project in Sunderland</td>
<td>The Project investigated the physical education experiences and sporting opportunities of disabled young people. Results indicated massive structural inequality facing disabled people in sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Creation of BSAD 1987 Ltd</td>
<td>BSAD reconstituted itself as BSAD 1987, relinquishing its coordinating role to concentrate on development and membership. The 7 NDSOs withdrew from BSAD’s membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>British Paralympic Association formed</td>
<td>BPA formed to coordinate national squads and events for elite level disability sport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Review lasted 18 months and included a survey of 133 governing bodies and 33
disability organisations, meetings with 47 organisations and a conference attended by
106 disabled athletes and 12 coaches. The Review also included a Conference for
Sportsmen and Women with Disabilities, held on 26th April 1989 at Kensington Town
Hall. The Conference was opened by Colin Moynihan and Nicholas Scott MP
(Minister for the Disabled) and focused on a range of workshop topics led by key
figures in disability sport and mainstream sports, such as a session on coaching by Sue
Campbell (then Chief Executive of the National Coaching Foundation). While
Marshall believed that Moynihan ‘had a real interest’ in sport for disabled people, he
considered Bernhard Atha, Liz Dendy and himself to have had the ‘heaviest input’
(Marshall, Interview, 2000) in the recommendations contained within the final report.

The Review Group’s report, entitled Building on Ability, recommended that ‘all those
involved in sports provision should ensure that a wide range of opportunities are
available for disabled people so that they can choose when and how they wish to
participate’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989:6). The report provided a
comprehensive account of the current providers, an analysis of the deficiencies in the
provision of sport for disabled people, and a series of recommendations for the Sports
Council, health authorities, local authorities, disability sport organisations, governing
bodies and education and youth services. The report called on the Sports Council to
‘ensure that the needs of disabled people are taken into account in all of its activities’
(Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989: 17). The report also recommended that the
Sports Council should continue to provide ‘financial support towards the costs and
should seek to foster closer links between the disability sport organisations’ (Minister

The report identified a wide range of problems inhibiting the development of sport for
people with disability (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989:1). While the report
acknowledged that there were problems concerning a general lack of awareness,
understanding and knowledge among mainstream providers of sport, some problems
were directly related to the lack of coherence and coordination among disability sport
organisations at a national level. For example, the report identified that that there were
‘concerns arising from BSAD’s decision to discontinue its national umbrella function’,
the ‘isolationist attitude of some disability sport organisations’, and the reluctance of
some disability sport organisations to seek closer cooperation or amalgamation' (Minster for Sport Review Group, 1989:1)

In a summary of the activities of the National Disability Sport Organisations the report highlighted the important coordinating and development roles of both the UKSAPMH and BSAD. The report recognised ‘without reservation the major contribution BSAD has made to the development of sport for people with disabilities’, but stated that it would be ‘remiss not to report the less favourable perceptions of BSAD at a national level’ (Minster for Sport Review Group, 1989:9). The report stated that there was a ‘wide and deep dissatisfaction with BSAD’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989:9), and recommended that BSAD should continue to coordinate centrally the development work in the regions and should also ‘address the reasons for the suspicions which exist about its performance at a national level’ (Minister of Sport Review Group, 1989: 9).

A main recommendation of the Review for governing bodies (as well as other mainstream agencies) was to afford disabled people the benefits currently enjoyed by the non-disabled, as it was perceived that segregated disability sport organisations did not have the resources to do so adequately. The report stated that:

‘Governing bodies should accept in principal that they will ultimately assume responsibility for disabled people in their sport and should set a timetable for achieving this’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989:21)

In order to support governing bodies in this role, the Report emphasised the need for better coordination of disability sport. As well as BSAD’s failure to coordinate disability sport, sport in Britain was becoming increasingly bureaucratic and as disability sport ‘moved from therapy to recreation and sport’ (Casey, Interview, 2000), the Sports Council wanted ‘neatness’ and a centralisation of the activities and resourcing of disability sport (Nichol, Interview, 2001).

Of particular significance for this case study was the Review Group’s consideration to restore the coordinating role that BSAD had relinquished in 1987. The Review Group claimed however, that this ‘would not command sufficient acceptance for it to be effective’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989:12) and considered instead the
establishment of a new umbrella body. While accepting that a single body was a ‘potential way to achieve administrative simplicity’, the Review Group did not believe that ‘existing organisations would favour such a move’ (1989: 12). Moreover, the Review Group questioned the concept of having a single organisation to represent disability sport claiming that this does not happen in able-bodied sport and was ‘equally inappropriate in disabled sport’ (Minister of Sport Review Group, 1989:12).

The Review Group thought that the most appropriate way forward was for the Sports Council to establish a Standing Conference on sport for people with a disability which brought together the ‘various organisations to discuss issues of common concern and to agree forward strategies’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989: 12). They considered the Standing Conference would be a consultative body operating within the Sports Council which would advise the Government on its policies and plans for sport (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989: 12).

Price suggests that in the history of disability sport in England, the Minister for Sport Review Group’s Report is perhaps the only policy that ‘comes close to being the embodiment of that working party’s view of what the government of the day should do about disability sport’ (Price, Interview, 2000). While it may be regarded by some, such as Price, as one of the most comprehensive reviews of disability sport, Marshall contends that ‘it didn’t really bite the bullet and go forwards’ as many of the recommendations that emerged were not implemented. As a result, Marshall contends, disability sport has continued to lack the coordination that the ‘Building on Ability’ report called for. For example, the recommendations for governing bodies to set a timetable for assuming responsibility for disability sport were not enforced, reflecting what Price suggests was a lack of clear commitment on the part of the Sports Council. Price illustrates this point by highlighting a 30 page report he was sent describing the activities of all government departments. Sport was afforded a ‘very small mention in passing and disability didn’t even get a mention’. He postulates that ‘if you put the two together...disability sport is a long way down the list of government priorities’ (Price, Interview, 2000).

Following the review and the subsequent publication of ‘Building on Ability’, £150,000 was made available by the Sports Council to a selection of National Governing Bodies able to demonstrate, and willing to share examples of, good practice (Sports Council, 1993c). After forty projects were initially identified, twenty
four NGBs benefited from the Sports Council funding, although, as reported in the ‘Guidelines for Governing Bodies’ subsequently published, not all the projects were successful, indeed in the final analysis only four were highlighted as exemplary (Sports Council, 1993b).

In the same year that the Minister for Sport Review Group published ‘Building on Ability’, the British Paralympic Association was formed as the agency responsible for selecting, preparing, entering, funding and managing Britain's teams at the Paralympic Games and Paralympic Winter Games (BPA). Broad policy direction for the Association is set by the National Paralympic Committee which is made up of elected representatives of sports federations and national disability sports organisations. In its aim to develop opportunities and select and improve the performances of elite athletes, the BPA developed strong relations with some DSOs but in particular the national governing bodies of sport as they provided the relationship with sports specific organisations that BPA sought and, reflecting the role played by the British Olympic Association for non-disabled sport (Price, 2000; Craven, 2000). The BPA established itself as the single coordinating body for Britain's elite disabled athletes and teams, and has not since its inception involved itself in the concerns surrounding BSAD, nor has it played a significant role in national level policy developments such as the New Start Conference.

Summary

By 1989 the number of organisations involved in disability sport policy had increased and their interests had varied. While the National Disability Sports Organisations had become key to the disability sport policy network they had been joined by other disability sport and sports specific bodies. The structure of disability sport and the relationships between these organisations was untidy and conflict ever present regarding their respective roles and the basis for distributing funding between them. This organisational complexity was highlighted in the Minister’s review. However, it is important to note that this review was a personal initiative and not a response to the lobbying activities of disability sport organizations. It is also important to note that this review marginalised the Sports Council’s own Think Tank. This pattern of intervention and policy-making started by the Sports Council’s own Isle of Man
'Think Tank' highlights the fragility and looseness of the policy network, its lack of continuity and its openness to individual (Ministerial) intervention.

6.5 SPORTS COUNCIL'S POLICY ON SPORT FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES (1993)

As the earlier sections identify, the Sports Council had become central to the disability sports policy, and the concept of mainstreaming embedded in the debates surrounding the future of disability sport that it contributed to. In 1993 the Sports Council published a policy statement 'People with Disabilities and Sport: Policy and Current/Planned Action', which noted that the need for a strategic approach to the planning and development of sport was well established (Sports Council, 1993: 4). This policy reflected a commitment on the part of the Sports Council to equity, which they defined as 'fairness in sport, equality of access, recognising inequalities and taking steps to address them' (Sports Council, 1993a: 4). The Sports Council goes on to state that:

'This will require the providers of sport, as a matter of principle, to consult, represent, involve and employ people with disabilities. It is this principle of sports equity that the Sports Council is determined to promote both in its own work and that of its partners'. (Sports Council, 1993a:4)

The overarching aim of the policy was to 'ensure equality of opportunity for people with a disability to take part in sport and recreation at the level of their choice' (Sports Council, 1993a: 7) and included seven policy objectives:

1. raise the profile of people with disabilities within mainstream sport;
2. to ensure that the needs of people with disabilities are taken into account in strategic planning for sport and recreation;
3. to provide opportunities for people with disabilities to become actively involved and to reach their full potential at all levels of sport and recreation;
4. to improve access to sport and recreation both in terms of facilities and in programme content;
5. to encourage British involvement for and by people with disabilities in international sport;
6. to make effective use of available resources through partnerships and seek additional finance;
7. to ensure that the structure of sport for people with disabilities is appropriate to demands and needs;

For each objective a series of sub-objectives were listed with summaries of current activities, as well as future planned action that achieved the objectives. It was stated that in 1992-3, £1,461,000 was provided to disability sport organisations and £1,786,000 was the estimated budget for 1993-4. However, it was also made clear that while in 1992-3 the Sports Council had provided grant aid to British Blind Sport and the British Deaf Sports Council, future Sports Council action stated that they would provide support for sports specific rather than disability specific development.

Sports Council recognised the 'close working relationship that had developed between UKSAPMH and BSAD', illustrated by the submission of a joint BSAD/UKSAPMH development plan in 1992 (Sports Council, 1993a). The Sports Council also recognised the important development work that both organisations were engaged in, but urged mainstream organisations to be more active in the provision of sport for disabled people. The Sports Council recommended that sport for disabled people was at a stage where 'having developed its own structures, it [the provision of disability sport] should move from a target approach to the mainstream' (Sports Council, 1993a:5). In other words, echoing the recommendations within 'Building on Ability', the Sports Council proposed a gradual shift of responsibility for the organisation and provision of sport for disabled people away from the NDSOs toward the mainstream sports-specific National Governing Bodies. In doing so it highlighted those agencies that it considered were involved in the network of disability sport. However, the policy did not define the roles of, for example, the National Disability Sport Organisations, facility managers or teachers. They were all identified as being potential partners and providers, but no clarification was offered to distinguish between those that may act as consumers, supporters, administrators or providers. This demonstrates however, clear evidence of the government, via the Sports Council, intervening to try to establish a stronger policy for disability sport.
The Sports Council also highlighted the importance of regional sports fora but recognised the diversity of regional circumstances. By 1993 there was a Regional Disability Forum and a PE for All Group in the West Midlands, a London Sports Forum, a Special Needs Sports Development Forum in the East Midlands and a Yorkshire and Humberside Federation of Sports Organisations. The Yorkshire and Humberside and London Regions in particular, were highlighted as ‘examples of good practice’ (Sports Council, 1993a: 17), which the Sports Council wished to extend to other regions.

However, BSAD retained a number of activities, which demonstrated its intent to continue at least in part, with a coordinating role. For example in the early 1990s BSAD established an English Coordinating Committee which was attended by the Chief Executives of the NDSOs. The English Coordinating Committee was an informal body which met quarterly at BSAD’s headquarters in London to discuss collaborative initiatives. For example, in 1990 BSAD secured funding from Comic Relief and the Sports Council to employ a National Development Officer for Young People. While the post was managed by BSAD and the English Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability (ESAPLD), the officer’s work programme and key areas of development were designed in consultation with the English Coordinating Committee. While BSAD was successful in securing the support of the NDSOs, typically the NDSOs’ limited finance to conduct their own development work, coupled with the encouragement by the Sports Council to improve coherence, meant that they, the NDSOs, had little choice but to attend the English Coordination Committee meetings. In other words, while the NDSOs were disenfranchised with BSAD they attended the ECC meeting because they recognised the financial and political power that BSAD held.

Despite the Sports Council’s concerns surrounding the continuing lack of coordination within disability sport, BSAD continued to receive a Sports Council grant, and together with the UKSAPMH, enjoyed a turnover well in excess of other NDSOs. By 1994 BSAD received 29% of their £1 million turnover from the Sports Council and more than 50% from the sponsorship of national corporate companies such as Grand Metropolitan, National Westminster Bank and British Telecom, the largest proportion of which (62%) was spent on sports development and competitive events. The Sports Council provided funding to regions where there was a presence of
UKSAPMH and BSAD development work. However, the regional network of BSAD officers diminished due to the decrease in Sports Council grants as well as BSAD’s failure to secure enough income from local authorities, businesses and charities. Due to the concern surrounding BSAD’s legitimacy as the effective coordinator of disability sport organisations Sports Council provided more of its financial support to local authorities (Casey, Interview, 2000).

Carole Bradley (BSAD’s Chief Executive in 1995) was clear on the role that BSAD ought to play. She believed that BSAD’s role remained strongly with ‘the discovery and development of talent, the encouragement of youth and providing clear pathways from foundation to levels of excellence’ (BSAD, 1995: 6). BSAD continued to publish its mission to ‘provide, develop and coordinate sports and recreation opportunities for people with disability nationally, in partnership with other relevant agencies’ and claimed that it was still recognised by the government in this role’. By 1995 BSAD had in its membership, 40,000 individuals, and held 15 national championships in a wide range of sports including archery, air weapons, boccia, basketball, snooker and table tennis. In addition, and fulfilling the development role for which the Sports Council was providing funding, BSAD also provided:

1. Awareness training to Local Authorities.
2. Coaching sessions to schools and clubs.
3. Advice on access to facilities and programmes.
4. Regional events mirroring national competition.
5. Assistance with policy guidelines to national governing bodies and local authorities.

(BSAD, leaflet, undated)

While in its reconstitution in 1987, BSAD formally relinquished its role as a coordinator of disability sport organisations, its role as both a membership and a development agency were still evident in its wide ranging objectives. BSAD clearly believed that until the Sports Council or another agency adopted its development role, it would and needed to continue its coordinating and development role alongside its commitment to provide event and activities to its own members. For example, the intention ‘to support the membership in the provision of sport and recreation for
people with disabilities and to encourage new membership' denoted a clear intention of BSAD to serve its membership'. The objective 'to provide opportunities for people with disabilities to participate in and enjoy sport and recreation' indicates a much broader commitment to the development of opportunities for individuals beyond its own membership (BSAD, leaflet, undated).

**Summary**

Despite relinquishing its coordinating role in Britain in 1987, BSAD's attempts to coordinate disability sport in England, illustrated the loose 'governance' and the continuing lack of coherence and organisation within disability sport. While the Sports Council's 1993 policy firmly established the Council as a key policy actor in disability sport, its failure to enforce the recommendations from the Minister's review demonstrated the lack of political will and did nothing to improve the ongoing conflicts over key issues and resource allocation.

More generally then, the government (through the Sports Council) have intervened in disability sport and tried to impose a neater order on the policy network by encouraging disability sport to be mainstreamed. There is a lack of will or resources to implement the changes that mainstreaming suggests because: i), as an inequality issue in the late 1980s and early 1990s disability was not regarded as an important policy issue compared to ethnicity or gender; ii), there was no cohesion in the view of disability sport organisations and hence, the lobbying was limited, confused and as a result easily ignored; iii), DSOs remained unenthusiastic about mainstreaming as they were unsure whether they would lose their role; and iv) NGBs had a low level of interest in mainstreaming disability sport.

The 1993 policy did, however, further reinforce the concept of mainstreaming and in particular re-emphasised government's interest in governing bodies taking on more responsibility for disability sport.
The New Start Conferences

In recognition of the continued poor co-ordination between the disability sport organisations, together with the wider political trend toward integration, the Sports Council convened the 'clear vision' conference on December 2-3 1995, to consider the future structure of sport for disabled people. Seventy delegates attended, representing the Sports Council, BSAD regions, and the DSOs. This signalled the start of a series of conferences (which became known as the 'New Start' conferences) held by the Sports Council between 1995 and 1998. One of the guiding principles for 'New Start' was to improve co-ordination between the myriad of organisations that claimed to represent a disability sport interest. As one officer of the EFDS stated, the New Start process was 'driven by Sport England (sic)' to 'sort out the mess' within the organisational operation of disability sport (Hodgkins, Interview, 2000).

The 'New Start' process evolved following a paper from Dermot Collins (National Development Officer for the Sports Council) on behalf of the Sports Council, which highlighted a need for a reorganisation of disability sport. Following the 'Clear Vision' Conference, the Sports Council convened a National Disability Sport Conference in March 1996, a result of which was the establishment of a Task Force to 'lead to the mainstreaming of disability sport in England by the year 2000' (Sports Council -Disability Task Force, 1997: 2). The Sports Council's Disability Task Force included key representatives from the Sports Council, the national disability sport organisations and governing bodies of sport. The remit of the Task Force was to:

i) advise the Sports Council on matters relating to disability sport and,

ii) to consider and make recommendations as to the future of disability sport within England.

(Sports Council -Disability Task Force, 1997:9)
At its first meeting the Task Force divided into 2 groups to focus on:

1. the structure and remit of a single federated national body and its relationship to regional structures and other agencies,

2. enabling NGBs to assume greater responsibility for disabled people within their sport.

The Task Force prepared a series of recommendations most notable of which was a revised disability sports structure. The revised structure suggested that disability sport policy be determined by a National Coordinating Committee which could 'sieve for what are local concerns and what is of national significance' (Sports Council - Disability Task Force, 1997: 7). The Task Force was clear in the belief that the 'new structure should not simply add another tier' (Sports Council - Disability Task Force, 1997: 3), but should safeguard existing work, promote a sports specific approach, have direct responsibility for disability sport policy, and link local needs with national plans. They recommended that the National Coordinating Committee be composed of 3 representatives from a Sports Assembly, 2 from the Regional Unions and representatives from all of the NDSOs. The Sports Assembly was intended to provide a forum for NGBs responsible for the sports specific interest in disability sport, and the NDSOs the considerable 'expertise, contacts, networks of participant and resources' (Sports Council - Disability Task Force, 1997: 7). The English Sports Council sent out its proposals for wide consultation in preparation for a third conference.

In June 1997 the National Disability Sports Conference was reconvened to receive the Task Force’s recommendations and the results of the consultation exercise. At the Conference, Marshall (as a member of the Task Force and Chair of the Conference) provided an overview of the Disability Task Force’s work. Casey (Chief Executive of the English Sports Council) provided the ‘bigger picture’ in English Sport, and Collins of the English Sports Council provided the results of the consultation exercise. The remainder of the conference was spent in discussion groups and feedback sessions.
Collins (1997:1) suggested in the conference report that there was a ‘unity of opinion’ on the future of disability sport policy, which contrasted with earlier attempts to gather support for change. According to Collins (1997:1) ‘the most important outcome of the Conference was the clear mandate received from delegates to proceed with the implementations of the Task Force’s recommendations’.

According to the Sports Council’s report of the 1997 conference, the implications of the Task Force’s recommendations had three aspects; 1) the development of Regional forums, 2) the establishment of a National Development Agency (a rewording of the Task Forces’ National Coordinating Committee), and 3) the integration of disabled people into the mainstream of English sport (Collins, 1997:2).

Meanwhile, during the three year ‘New Start’ process, BSAD continued to organise the English Coordinating Committee. An illustration of this working relationship and the coordinating role played by BSAD was the creation and publication of a joint Calendar of Events (BSAD, 1997). The Committee agreed upon a joint calendar which provided disabled athletes with a chronological list of all national disability sport organisation’s events, and in the process prevented a duplication of and gave increased coherence to the organisation and running of a national events programmes. A further example of a developing working relationship developing between the NDSOs was the appointment, in 1994, of a National Governing Bodies Disabilities Project Officer. The post was jointly funded by BSAD (later renamed Disability Sport England) and the English Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability and the Sports Council, and was a direct follow on from the projects resulting from the Minister for Sport Review Group funding (DSE/ESAPLD, 1997:1).

Given BSAD’s apparent success in its coordination of the English Coordinating Committee, Price as President of BSAD, had hoped that the review of sport and disability brought about by the New Start conferences would result in a ‘revitalised and refocused BSAD’ (BSAD, 1995: 2). However, the New Start process led English Sports Council to marginalize the activities of BSAD and to establish, in 1998, the English Federation of Disability Sport.
The decision to create the EFDS: Consensus or coercion

The extent to which those involved in the New Start process agreed with the decision to establish the EFDS is contested. There were three conferences, the first two of which were acrimonious due to the different values and aspirations of the senior officers in attendance but the third, at the Kings Fund Centre in London, coordinated by Collins and Casey was ‘staggering...totally different...there was cooperativeness, and a feeling that we are all in this together’ (Marshall, Interview, 2000). Marshall suggests that ‘people at the New Start Conferences wanted an umbrella organisation’ to coordinate the activities of all the DSOs, but clearly BSAD was not perceived as being capable of fulfilling that role’ (Marshall, Interview, 2000).

Collins, in his report of the 1997 Conference, claimed that ‘it marked the first occasion on which a representative national consensus on the future structure and role of disability sport can be seen to have been achieved’ (Collins, 1997:3). According to Casey and Nichol the majority of the participants at the meeting agreed with the principle of a new umbrella organisation. Nichol states that ‘we would not have set up the EFDS if there hadn’t been a commitment from the NDSOs’. Price (Interview, 2000) has a contrasting view of the 1997 conference to that provided by the Sports Council officers. He contends that no such consensus was reached. Bright (BBS) contends that consensus may have been reached, but only because of the Sports Council’s significant influence on the policy process as well as the funding available, which coerced the DSOs to subscribe to the Sports Council’s view (Bright, Interview, 2001).

Respondents to the Disability Task Force’s consultation exercise indicated that creating the EFDS may simply add an additional tier to the existing structures, as the roles and relationship between the NDSOs and a new organisation had not been clarified (Collins, 1997). The structure that the Disability Task Force had proposed was based on a reorganisation of the relationships between existing organisations by the creation of the National Coordinating Committee. Yet, at the end of the New Start process, despite the Review Group’s belief that a new ‘umbrella body would simply add to the confusion created by the current multiplicity of bodies’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989:11) and the reservations expressed by those involved in the consultation exercise, a new organisation, the EFDS, was established.
According to Lewis (2000) 'in creating the EFDS they [Sport England] have actually gone back to BSAD, because on the board of BSAD were the seven disability groups and Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland'. Notwithstanding the inherent problem with BSAD's role and the dissatisfaction with its performance, Lewis and Atha, (Interview, 2000) believed that BSAD could be 'reorganised and broadened' to serve as the coordinating development agency if 'it had been prepared to alter its attitude'. Neale (Chief Executive of Disability Sport England formerly BSAD) claims that BSAD could have been an effective co-ordinating agency, but by the early 1990s 'people were looking for a change because of history...opinions were against the old BSAD because they [BSAD] were seen as taking the money out of the mouths of others [disability sport organisations]'(Neale, Interview, 2001).

The Sports Council wanted a 'neater order to the structure of disability sport' (Nichol, Interview, 2001) and continuing its traditional relationship, 'preferred to keep disability sport at arms length'. Furthermore, to justify the decision not to 'adopt the disability sport development role' hitherto played by BSAD, Nichol claims, there was a need to 'draw on the expertise that existed within the disability sports world as a whole'. Furthermore, she stresses that 'we [Sport England] were not allowed to increase staff numbers but were allowed to fund a body that could deliver this kind of work' (Nichol, Interview, 2001).

While the Sports Council may have made a 'much greater effort [to address the incoherence in disability sport] in the last 10 or 15 years', BSAD provided a vehicle for the Sports Council to 'honour its remit to sport for all through an external agency' (Price, Interview, 2000). In Price's view (Interview, 2000) we still have a 'Sports Council acting on behalf of the government department, which would love to put all of its disability headaches into one basket'.

Table 19 (overleaf) provides a summary of the policy developments in disability sport between 1989 and 2002.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LANDMARK</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>British Wheelchair Sports Foundation (BWSF) formed.</td>
<td>The British Paraplegic Sports Society changed its name to BWSF to extend its provision to all wheelchair users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Sports Council launch ‘People with Disabilities and Sport: Current and Planned Action’.</td>
<td>The policy aimed to ensure equality of opportunity for people with a disability and recommended that greater responsibility was placed on mainstream providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Appointment of a National Governing Bodies Disabilities Project Officer.</td>
<td>The post was jointly funded by BSAD and the United Kingdom Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability and the Sports Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>English Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability (ESAPLD) formed.</td>
<td>In response to the Sports Councils restructuring, UKSAPMH reorganised itself into ESAPLD and the UKSA. ESAPLD focussed on development work and UKSA on coordinating the work of the home countries and the links with international sports organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>National Disability Sport Conference</td>
<td>A further conference attended by DSOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sports Council’s Disability Task Force established</td>
<td>As a result of the 1996 conference a Task Force was established to ‘lead to the mainstreaming of disability sport in England by the year 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>New Start Conference</td>
<td>In June 1997 the National Disability Sports Conference received the Task Force’s recommendations and the results of the consultation exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Disability Sport England (DSE) launched</td>
<td>BSAD’s name is changed to DSE and its activities focus on membership and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The English Federation of Disability Sport formed</td>
<td>The EFDS was established by Sport England as the umbrella agency for the DSOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>EFDS launch Building a Fairer Sporting Society</td>
<td>Federation’s mission is to be the united voice of disability sport in England, working with mainstream and disability sports organisations and campaigning for increased choices for disabled people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A range of concerns were expressed at the Conference and reported in Collins’ report. Bright (Chief Executive of British Blind Sport) believed that many of those who proclaimed their interest in mainstreaming disability sport may be doing so reluctantly and, consider that they have been given ‘no choice but to agree to the Sport England agenda’ (Bright, Interview, 2001). He describes the New Start process as an ‘us and them situation’ with NDSOs on one side and Sport England on the other. Bright claims that the NDSOs were coerced into supporting the creation of the EFDS, and claims that ‘if you didn’t sign up [to the formation of the EFDS] you were going to feel pretty uncomfortable in the future’. Neale (Chief Executive of Disability Sport England) concurs with Bright’s analysis, claiming that ‘consensus was forced rather than reached ...people were made to believe that was the only way things were going to go...and [thought that] perhaps there is going to be money at the end of it’ (Neale, Interview, 2001). Bright’s perspective indicates the importance of the Sports Council in the distribution of resources for disability sport as well as the power it exerts in the disability sport policy process.

It is interesting to note that at the National Disability Conference in 1997 delegates were asked, ‘would you be happy to see this structure [which included the formation of a new disability sport organisation] being implemented’. Collins’s interpretation of the response was that it was ‘inconclusive’ and those delegates before agreeing to such developments, had ‘reservations’ that needed to be addressed (Collins, 1997: 9). As a number of important reservations were not resolved, such as those concerning the role of the remaining National Disability Sport Organisations and the relationship between the national and regional structures, Sport England’s intention to establish a new disability sport organisation could not be considered to enjoy the full support of all agencies. Bright is adamant in his belief that the EFDS ‘was not needed and the hard graft is still left to the charities’ (Bright, Interview, 2001). Chaytors (Chief Executive of the EFDS) accepts that the establishment of EFDS has been ‘tortuous’. Notwithstanding the reservations of at least two key National Disability Sports Organisations, Chaytors maintains that the EFDS ‘came together because the disability sport organisations and the organisations operating within it felt that was the right way to go’ .... and eventually ‘everyone had signed up to it’ (Chaytors, Interview, 2000).
In the New Start process, and via the Sports Council, the government demonstrated its interest in controlling the development of disability sport and, while seeking views of key interest groups, illustrated powerfully its potential to influence the decisions of key organisations. The diverse views on core issues discussed during the New Start Conferences highlighted the different values and ideologies of disability sport. The lack of consensus and limited resources among those organisations interested in disability sport enabled the Sports Council to control the outcome of New Start and in doing so ensured that disability sport policy remained peripheral to mainstream policy issues.

6.7 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ENGLISH FEDERATION OF DISABILITY SPORT

EFDS's role, management structure and development plan

A number of reasons combined to contribute to the establishment of EFDS in 1998. The first was the continuing ambiguity regarding the primary role of BSAD. Not only was there ambiguity within the Association as indicated by its persistence in pursuing its initial dual role of development and membership, but it was also apparent among key external organisations including Sports Council (until the 1997 Conference) and a number of NDSOs. The second reason was the perceived failure of the Association to coordinate effectively disability sport. During the 1990s it became increasingly apparent that if there was to be effective advocacy on behalf of disability sport there needed to be a more tightly coordinated national organisational profile. Third, the BSAD had clearly failed to generate significant commitment among both NDSOs and NGBs to the government policy of mainstreaming. However, it was unclear how the establishment of the EFDS would, of itself, prove more effective at overcoming these challenges than BSAD.

Nevertheless, similar to the role occupied by BSAD during the 1980s, the EFDS became the body recognised by Sport England as the 'umbrella body responsible for coordinating the development of sport and recreation' for disabled people (EFDS, 2000:8). The EFDS was to act as the umbrella agency for the DSOs and work through
ten regional federations which would co-ordinate and support the delivery of its
national development plan. The EFDS was a company limited by guarantee, had
charitable status, could actively fund raise and would receive core funding of over
approximately £1.2 million a year from Sport England, which represented 60% of
EFDS’s operating costs for 2000/2001. Representatives from each of the 7 NDSOs
and 4 representatives of the regional federations make up the 11 directors on the
Board which manage the affairs of EFDS. Also, due to its close relationship with, and
the significant investment in, the EFDS, Sport England has observer status on its
Board.

In 2000 EFDS was formally launched with a four-year development plan titled
‘Building a Fairer Sporting Society’ (EFDS, 2000). The publication of this plan
followed a year long consultation involving written responses from 20 individuals
from disability sport organisations, 15 from mainstream sports organisations, and 18
from local authorities. While the Plan refers to the Disability Task Force’s
recommendations (Sports Council – Disability Task Force: 1997), it makes no
reference to the discussions, concerns and recommendations of the Isle of Man ‘Think
Tank’, the Minister for Sport’s Review Group recommendations (1989) or the Sports
Council’s 1993 policy on Sport for People with Disabilities.

‘Building a Fairer Sporting Society’ (EFDS, 2000) states that the Federation’s mission
is to ‘be the united voice of disability sport in England campaigning for increased
choices for disabled people’ and has three corporate goals:

- to increase choices for, and inclusion of, disabled people in all sporting
  communities,

- to provide a professional first stop shop service on all matters relating to sport
  for disabled people [and],

- to increase the effectiveness of existing disability sport structures.
  (EFDS, 2000:14)

- To meet their corporate goals, the plan stated that EFDS would work in 4 key
  areas; development, marketing and information, organisational development
and regional plans. The objectives of each of these can be summarised as follows. The development programme focuses on improving the equity of sporting provision and opportunities, by working with mainstream sports organisations and schools. The EFDS is committed to working in partnership with the NDSOs, and other key agencies and to empowering disabled people. The EFDS also intends to establish an extensive information service, raise its profile, and communicate more effectively. In recognition of the variances in regional needs and interests the EFDS planned to facilitate development work that was specific to each region as determined by its federation.

However, by 2001 the EFDS had slightly revised its aims as follows:

- To expand sporting opportunities for disabled people, and increase the number of disabled people actively involved in sport.

- To ensure disabled people are included in all sporting communities.

  (EFDS, 2001:5)

While it is unclear why the EFDS's aims had changed within such a short time, an independent review of EFDS carried out by Wrightson-O'Brien Partnership claimed that there was a 'lack of accepted vision, single voice or collective [stakeholder] purpose' and suggested they needed to 'to develop stronger corporate priorities in order to drive the organisation forward' (Wrightson-O'Brien Partnership, 2001:5).

**EFDS's relationships with national agencies**

EFDS's four year development plan, 'Building a Fairer Sporting Society' (EFDS 2000), states that it intends to serve four groups of customers: disabled people, government and sporting agencies such as the Department for Culture Media and Sport and Sport England, mainstream providers of sport such as national governing bodies and local authorities, and statutory and voluntary agencies, such as social services and education departments. This section will examine EFDS's relationships with key agencies.
EFDS claims that it works with bodies such as the Department for Culture Media and Sport, Sport England, the Central Council of Physical Recreation, Sports Coach UK and the Youth Sports Trust ‘to try to influence national sports policy’ (EFDS, 2000:16). The EFDS appear to have a similar relationship with the Youth Sports Trust as it does with Sports Coach UK, in that it is actively working to ensure that both organisations develop opportunities that are ‘appropriate to the needs of disabled people’ (Vemon-Way, Sports Coach UK, Interview, 2000). For example, Sports Coach UK have worked closely with the EFDS in the preparation of their equity plans, a role that Nichol (Sport England) and Chaytors (EFDS) believe may become a major part of EFDS’s work. The relationship between the EFDS and Sport England is very different.

As the previous section indicated, the EFDS is perceived to have a very close relationship with Sport England because Sport England drove the ‘creation of the EFDS’ (Atha, Interview, 2000) and the EFDS are ‘doing the work of Sport England’ (Atha, Interview, 2000). While Nichol (Sport England) agrees with Atha, she claims that the EFDS is provided with significant funding by Sport England to carry out its development work on their behalf (Nichol, interview, 2001). Moreover, while the government may be keeping the development of disability sport at ‘arms length’ (Price, Interview, 2000) by creating another agency to do its work, the EFDS is perceived by some to be in ‘the pocket of Sport England’ (Atha, Interview, 2000). As a result of this close relationship and the united voice that officers of the EFDS claim to have, Chaytors points out that he is able to lobby central government much more effectively than previous disability sport organisations have been hitherto able to. For example, Chaytors stated, at a recent EFDS Board of Directors meeting, that he was in discussions with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, the Department of Education and Skills and the Department of Health regarding a collaborative project which focuses on increasing the physical activity levels of disabled people (EFDS, 2002, May).

While key actors from sport policy have been involved in disability sport policy since the creation of BSAD, if key actors from disability policy, such as Bert Massie (Chairman of the Disability Rights Commission), become involved in disability sport policy, it may signal the beginning of a new partnership for the EFDS and an indication of what Chaytors believes is a much improved relationship between
disability sport and departments within the government that are key to the future of
sport for disabled people. It is perhaps worth remembering however, that the
Conference on Sportsmen and Women with Disabilities held as part of the Review of
disability sport (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989), was introduced by Colin
Moynihan (Minister for Sport) and Nicholas Scott (Minister for the Disabled). A more
recent example illustrating the weak relationship between disability sport and key
policy actors in disability policy and sport policy is provided by EFDS's first national
Conference titled 'In Your Hands' held on October 21st 2003 in Manchester. The
conference details stated that Richard Caborn (Minister for Sport) and notably Bert
Massie were due to give keynote speeches (Huggan, personal communication, 2003).
However, neither attended.

While the EFDS may be trying to develop its relationship with some organisations
that are central to sports policy and indeed with those central to disability policy, it is
interesting to note that there is no clear working relationship between the EFDS and
some key organisations such as and, in particular the Central Council of Physical
Recreation (CCPR). This is despite the CCPR being the umbrella organisation of the
governing bodies that the EFDS wish to influence and what Price believes to be the
'obvious' agency to lead the mainstreaming of disability sport. Indeed prior to the
establishment of the EFDS, there was no strong policy-making relationship between
the CCPR and other DSOs. For example, while BSAD and UKSAPMH have worked
closely with the CCPR in the design and development of the Community Sports
Leaders Award, which provides basic training on running sports activities to include
disabled people, the CCPR has not been a key contributor to wider discussions on the
development of disability sport, and few disability sport organisations are members of
the CCPR. Furthermore, as of 2nd December 2002 of the seventy-eight members of the
Games and Sports Division of the CCPR, the only disability sport organisations
among them are the British Table Tennis Association for the Disabled and CP Sport
(CCPR, 2003: 1).

While the CCPR has never been central to disability sport policy, each of the
disability sport organisations has striven for a key decision making role. According to
Collins' interpretation of the National Disability Sport Conference, in 1997, NDSOs
were considered to have a role to play in the future of disability sport. However, since
its formation, the relationship between the EFDS and some NDSOs has been
fractious. Bright (British Blind Sport) states that while the NDSOs may have a place on the EFDS's Board of Directors, he believes that they 'don't have any real impact upon the policy at all' (Bright, Interview, 2001). He goes on to state that the EFDS 'try to inflict their policy on us' and as far as Bright is concerned the British Blind Sport 'don't bloody need the EFDS' (Bright, Interview, 2001). Bright declares that 'we have been around for 25 years and have been doing very well, and the EFDS are not giving us any money...they [the EFDS] are interfering’ (Bright, Interview, 2001).

According to John Chatsworthy (BBS representative on the EFDS Board), with reference to the EFDS Board Meetings 'some individuals are starting to run away with the idea that they can steamroller their policies into any plan without consultation’ (British Blind Sport, 2002:2).

British Blind Sport is not the only DSO to consider the EFDS as an unnecessary and unhelpful addition to the myriad of disability sport organisations. In 1997 the BSAD's name was changed to Disability Sport England, partly to be consistent with the restructuring within the GB Sports Council and partly to focus upon their membership and events programme and relinquish their development role, as they could foresee this role being usurped after the New Start process (Neale, interview, 2001). Disability Sport England now have to find funding for all of their events and as 'Sport England only give their money to EFDS', Neale claims that the 'other disability groups have to jump through hoops to access a part of the £60,000 set aside for events (Neale, Interview, 2001) and insists that without the EFDS, the NDSOs are working effectively together with the governing bodies to develop a coordinated events programme. Furthermore, Neale feels that the 'NDSOs are the EFDS' and 'without the NDSOs - EFDS is nothing'. Neale is concerned however that the new activities and initiatives that the EFDS is taking on such as the Inclusive Fitness Initiative (EFDS, 2001:8) which aims to ‘enable disabled people's access to fitness equipment’, will not be sustainable as it is difficult enough, he stresses, to run the current programme with such limited resources. While EFDS received a £1 million grant from the Sport England Lottery Fund to develop the pilot phase of the Inclusive Fitness Initiative, according to Neale such grants are having a drastic effect on the available funding opportunities for the other NDSOs. Neale claims that some NDSOs are in serious financial difficulty because of the creation of the EFDS. For example, he suggests that CP Sport is not likely to ever run a world championship again which
concerns the NDSOs because these events, Neale and Bright believe, can not be delivered by the EFDS or any other organisation due to a lack of expertise.

Hughes (CP Sport) concurs with Neale’s analysis of the EFDS, suggesting that while ‘we sit on the Board [of EFDS] we are the EFDS’, but the EFDS, she insists, are just one of the many partners that we [CP Sport] work with’ (Hughes, personal communication, 2003). However, Hughes and Cruice (CP Sport) are concerned that since the establishment of the EFDS, the financial support available to the remaining DSOs has been threatened (CP Sport, 2002). Cruice believes that CP Sport is particularly vulnerable because SCOPE no longer consider CP Sport as a part of its priorities (CP Sport, 2002a). According to Cruice (Chair of CP Sport), ‘CP Sport now belongs to us [CP Sport] and every one of us must accept responsibility for ensuring that we not only survive but go from strength to strength’ (CP Sport, 2002a: 1). Cruice is concerned, however, that they are now reliant on membership subscriptions and donations, and is ‘worried that we [CP Sport] will run out of money’ (CP Sport, 2002a: 1).

Atha recognises the difficulties that some DSOs may face, but insists that the EFDS provides ‘a much needed united voice for disability sport in England’ which combines the ‘specialist expertise of the NDSOs, thus enabling the EFDS ‘powerfully [to] demonstrate that disabled people have a right to access sport as a matter of common practice’ (EFDS, 2000). The success of the EFDS will depend upon a diverse range of factors, including its capacity to retain the respect of disability sport organisations and national governing bodies.

However, Price claims that a significant opportunity to progress sport for disabled people has been missed by not placing greater responsibility on the mainstream agencies. He is critical of the current organisational arrangements and especially the attitude of Sport England, suggesting that it [Sport England] sees the EFDS as it did the BSAD, that is, a ‘very convenient [resource] which could do all the things it [Sport England] did not want to, putting all of its headaches in one basket’ and keeping disability at ‘arms length’ (Price, Interview, 2000). Indeed, the failure of Sport England to regularly attend the EFDS’s Board of Director meetings (EFDS, 2002, November), may provide evidence for Price’s assertion that disability sport is being kept at arms length.
In contrast, Atha is much more optimistic and contends that the disability sport organisations, currently under the direction of EFDS, should retain control and power, as the mainstream organisations ‘will never take on disability fully’ (Atha, Interview, 2000). He goes on to suggest that for this reason ‘we will always need disability sport organisations’ (Atha, Interview, 2000).

**EFDS’s relationship with its regional federations**

The EFDS claims to ‘develop their national sporting priorities’ and use their ‘network of 10 regional offices’ to ensure that they ‘look after local needs’ (EFDS, 2001:5). EFDS stress that the regions work ‘closely with local agencies to encourage participation’ (EFDS, 2000:8). As Bright highlights however, there are tensions between the EFDS’s national office and its regions. Whilst the EFDS was formally launched in 1998, some of the regional federations that it subsumed were autonomous and active long before the EFDS, and those regions ‘set their own policy because there was no central body to coordinate the policy’ (Bright, Interview, 2001). A good example of the tension between the EFDS and its regional bodies is provided by the London Sports Forum which was established in 1993 as a charity to coordinate disability sport in greater London (London Sports Forum, 2002).

In 1998 the London Sports Forum ‘became the founder member of the English Federation of Disability Sport’ (London Sports Forum, 2002:2). However, the London Sports Forum while a member of the EFDS, has its own aim which is to ensure that all disabled people in London have more opportunities to get involved in sport at a level of their choice. They also ‘encourage participation, promote the sporting interests and needs of disabled people and work to enable organisations and groups to improve opportunities’ (London Sports Forum, 2002:2). The London Sports Forum states that it will be continuing its ‘fruitful partnership as the regional arm of the EFDS’ and ‘play their part in developing and delivering national projects aimed at the inclusion of more disabled people in mainstream sports provision’. It is clear, however, that the London Sports Forum is interested predominantly in servicing the needs of its region. For example, London’s list of target sports includes goalball and tenpin bowling, which do not reflect those sports targeted in 2000 by the national office. Furthermore, the London Sports Forum has its own Schools Development
Officer, a resource no other region enjoys. While regional priorities, resources and ways of working are diverse, the Yorkshire and Humberside Federation of Disability Sport Organisations [YHFDSO] illustrates their autonomy from EFDS, when stating in EFDS’s Inclusive Sport magazine, that it [the YHFDSO] works ‘closely to ...but independently of the EFDS’ (EFDS, 2002:34).

It seems, therefore, that regions have different needs and priorities as well as different resources and relationships, with some regions enjoying well-established networks and seven or more full-time staff, while others rely solely on volunteers. For example, Bright claims that some regions ‘have a specific officer for blind sport and other regions don’t, so there is more going on for blind people in that region because they have got a person who does that’ (Bright, Interview, 2001). The EFDS’s ‘Inclusive Sport’ magazine provides a summary of regional activities and highlights the diversity in size and activities (EFDS, 2002). To exacerbate this disparity, Bright and Neale are both concerned that NDSOs are expected to have representatives in each of the regions when they clearly do not have the necessary resources, and consequently, some regions are bound to have a more developed policy infrastructure and programme of support than others (Bright, Interview, 2001; Neale, Interview, 2001).

While the EFDS is aware of the regional diversity in resources, expertise and needs, Bright (British Blind Sport) contends that ‘there shouldn’t be this sort of disparate policy, there should be one clear concise policy that we [NDSOs] should be given ‘so that each region is working toward a central plan’ (Bright, Interview, 2001). Whilst differences between regions needs to be recognised in national policy, Bright maintains that without a strong central steer there cannot be a ‘coherent policy’ (Bright, Interview, 2001).

The regional versus national dilemma was highlighted by Dendy long before EFDS existed, when discussing the growth and independence of BSAD regions. She warned that ‘BSAD’s strength is in its regions through which it obtains feedback. ...so...and this is a cautionary note, how will this regional view be maintained?’ (BSAD, 1985: 8). Prior to EFDS’s formation, concern surrounding the relationship between EFDS and its regions was also expressed at the 1997 New Start Conference. The Conference report stressed that ‘national programmes have to be meaningful at a local level’ and
in addition stated that 'regional federations should be an integral part of a national organisation and not autonomous' (Collins, 1997:6).

The extent to which regions should direct or be directed by national policy was one of the key issues identified as needing attention in the EFDS Review carried out by the Wrightson O’Brien Strategic Partnership Ltd (2001). Wrightson O’Brien carried out face to face interviews with a wide range of EFDS staff, clients and customers, many of whom highlighted the differences between the regions. One interviewee stated that ‘two [regions] are semi autonomous and independent, those being Yorkshire and Humberside and London’, they are established and well resourced while others are ‘just getting off the ground’ (Wrightson O’Brien, 2001:7). In this draft review document it was noted that while some regions are being left to pursue their own agenda, others are given more direction. The review suggested that the EFDS needed to ‘create a greater level of coordination set against national priorities and a common agenda’ (Wrightson O’Brien, 2001:7). There is clearly tension between the aims and aspirations of EFDS’s national and regional offices. While the EFDS may recognise the differences in regional needs, priorities and resources, these differences make it difficult to develop and implement initiatives consistently across the country.

To further illustrate the tensions that have developed between EFDS, the DSOs and the regional networks, it was agreed at a recent Board of Directors meeting, that in response to the Sports Councils confirmation of EFDS’s standstill budget for 2003/4, a paper would be presented to Sport England by the Board to, ‘highlight the fact that the NDSOs currently receive no assistance and stress that the public relations role of the EFDS needs to be improved to show what is being achieved in the regions for the monies received’ (EFDS, November, 2002: 6).

It seems clear that the argument put forward by Price is at the centre of the debates that have surrounded the development of disability sport since its inception in the early 1900s. The extent to which mainstream agencies can or should take responsibility, and the role that these and the disability sport organisations should play remains a complex issue that continues to cause confusion and conflict. While mainstreaming may have been used as a phrase to underpin much of the developments within disability sport, as Chaytors acknowledges, there are different understandings of what it means and how it affects the activities of organisations. This was illustrated
at the National Disability Sport Conference in 1997, which indicated that there ‘was
general agreement on mainstreaming but more definition sought on what was meant
by the term’ (Collins, 1997:4).

While the national disability sport organisations have remained key members of the
disability sport policy network, the Sports Council has increased its role in, and
control over, the disability sport policy-making process. Thus, DSOs capacity to
affect policy has diminished. While the Sports Council initially supported the
activities of BSAD, after 1985 they began to intervene in BSAD’s policies and
disability sport more generally. Following years of conflict between and within the
Sports Council and disability sport organisations, the Sports Council, unhappy with
the lack of coherence, created the EFDS to carry out work on its behalf. However, the
EFDS’s relationship with disability sport organisations, mainstream governing bodies
and its regions is similar to that experienced by BSAD. While the disability sport
policy network has grown and the government are increasingly controlling policy
outcomes, the disability sport policy is still characterised by a lack of consensus,
conflict, incoherence and diversity and imbalance in power remain as consistent
features.

6.8 CONCLUSION

This analysis of the establishment of EFDS has provided a sharp insight into the
disability sport policy environment and has revealed a number of key themes that are
relevant to this examination of the disability sport policy process.

1) There has been a rapid increase in the number of disability sport organisations
since the 1960s. BSAD’s untenable dual role of membership and coordination
resulted in its failure to adequately represent the diverse interests in disability sport
and led to the emergence of many other disability sport organisations (DSOs). The
disability sport organisations that emerged ranged from, those such as CP Sport which
was established to cater for people with cerebral palsy to sport specific disability sport
organisations such as the British Table Tennis Association for the Disabled.

2) Disability sport organisations are typically small and lack influence. Although
some DSOS have been in existence for over 20 years they have generally remained
small organisations, with relatively little influence on disability sport policy or sport policy. With the exception of BSAD during the 1980s, DSOs such as CP Sport and the BTTAD have generally had limited financial resources and few if any full time staff. These independent organisations have typically operated outside of established mainstream governing body structures and have not enjoyed strong relationships with Sports Council and Sport England. Consequently their access to decision making in sport has been extremely limited.

3) Mainstream sport organisation’s attitudes toward disability sport is variable. EFDS has recently developed stronger working relationships with national bodies such as Sports Coach UK than their predecessors (BSAD) because EFDS is seen by Sports Coach UK to provide a more united voice for disability sport. However, disability sport is not a priority for most mainstream bodies and interest in disability sport does not lead to the involvement of EFDS.

4) Mainstreaming has been a consistent issue in the development of disability sport policy. Policy documents of the Sports Council, objectives of BSAD and the aims of EFDS all indicate an interest in mainstreaming disability sport. However, mainstreaming has also provided a major tension among the disability sport and mainstream sports organisations, as there has been little consensus on the role that these organisations should play.

5) Disability sport policy has been in continual flux. Since the formation of BSAD in 1961 there has been considerable change in the organisations involved in disability sport. However, it is clear that the organisational infrastructure of disability sport is still in a state of transition with tension and conflict as consistent features within the relationships between the growing number of disability sport organisations.

6) Relationship between key organisations is generally weak. While EFDS has been given the remit by Sport England to provide the unifying role that Sports Council had hoped BSAD would occupy, EFDS has also been charged with building relations with mainstream sporting agencies. Unfortunately, the level of organisational coherence among the disability sports organisations that EFDS represents is still poor, and the links between disability sports organisations and mainstream governing bodies lacks clarity and consistency.
7) There is a lack of clarity in government and in particular Sport England's objectives in relation to disability sport. Despite the increased intervention of the government, as Bob Price claimed, 'you could go to the Sports Council, you could go to the DCMS, you could go anywhere to find out the official line on disability sport and ask what this country is trying to achieve and it hasn't been stated or consolidated into a single policy document anywhere ever (Price, Interview, 2000).

8) While governments' aims in relation to disability sport are unclear it is certain that disability sport is low on its list of priorities commanding little attention from departments concerned with either disability policy or sport policy. Despite the governments increased intervention in disability sport policy, the EFDS's relationships with the DSOs remain similar to those of BSAD. While Sport England has become more influential in the disability sport policy process it has used this position of authority to retain its traditional distance from embedding disability sport policy into its own duties, reflecting the low status of disability sport in government policy.

9) Though the government has a limited interest in disability sport and its involvement in disability sport is not always clear, through the Sports Council and Sport England it is noticeable how easily government has been allowed to intervene in disability sport policy.

10) That said, the Sports Council and Sport England have generally been unwilling to exert pressure on either the DSOs or the NGBs, often preferring to obtain consensus and avoid conflict where possible.

11) Lastly, and as a result of the lack of clarity and consensus between organisations concerned with disability sport, there exists the opportunity for the intervention of individuals in the policy process. The failure on the part of the disability sport organisations to work within a clearly defined policy area together with the reticence of the government to dictate policy, allows disability sport policy to be heavily influenced by the intervention and the ideological beliefs of individuals.
These themes that have emerged from the first case study are useful in highlighting some of the key characteristics in disability sport policy and help us to establish whether there is a disability sport policy community. We will, therefore, return to these themes following the second case study.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CASE STUDY TWO:

APPROACHES TO THE MAINSTREAMING OF
DISABILITY SPORT IN SEVEN SPORTS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The review of literature, the interviews from Phase 1 and the survey in Phase 2 revealed that mainstreaming was a central tenet of contemporary disability sport policy and, as discussed in the previous chapter, a key objective of the newly formed EFDS. The purpose of this chapter is to provide an in-depth analysis of the policy of mainstreaming in seven sports.

The data analysed thus far have revealed diverse views on the definition of mainstreaming. Consequently, the next section provides a further discussion of key actors’ perceptions of mainstreaming in disability sport and provides a framework within which mainstreaming in each of the seven can be discussed. The seven sports are swimming, table tennis, football, athletics, wheelchair basketball, boccia and tennis.

7.2 MAINSTREAMING

Chapter six indicated that since BSAD’s inception, mainstreaming has been a key issue within disability sport policy. The aims of BSAD, debates at BSAD’s ‘Think Tank’ in 1985, the recommendations of the Minister for Sport Review Group in 1989, the Sports Council’s policy on people with a disability in 1993 and the ‘New Start’ Conferences between 1995 and 1997 all focused on shifting the responsibility for disability sport away from disability sport organisations and on to mainstream providers such as the national governing bodies of sport. However, while the term ‘mainstreaming’ has been central to the rhetoric espoused by BSAD, EFDS and Sport England, actors within mainstream as well as disability sport organisations have different views on what mainstreaming is. As Chaytors (Chief Executive of EFDS) recognises, ‘mainstreaming may mean different things to different people’ (Chaytors, Interview, 2001).
Of the various policy statements and conference reports which dealt with mainstrearning, the Minister for Sport Review Group’s report ‘Building on Ability’ provided the most detailed account of how governing bodies ‘should’ mainstream disability sport. The Report recommended that governing bodies should:

- include the needs of people with disabilities in their coach training;
- nominate a senior officer to take responsibility for [disability sport] events;
- actively encourage disabled athletes to take part in events and competitions they organise, either in direct competition with able bodied athletes or in parallel events;
- work with disability sport organisations to modify their award schemes to cater for people with disabilities;
- involve disabled people in both their decision making and administrative structures; and
- see the promotion of participation amongst people with disabilities as an integral part of their function and encourage clubs to be more welcoming.

(Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989: 19-21)

While acknowledging the degree of vagueness and variation in definitions of mainstrearning these recommendations of the Minister for Sport Review Group will be used as a reference point for examining the extent to which each sport in the case study has achieved or is progressing toward the mainstrearning of disability sport.

As far as Sport England and the EFDS are concerned, mainstrearning is about national governing bodies of sport taking on responsibility for the co-ordination and provision of opportunities for disabled people (EFDS, 2000). EFDS suggests that disability sport organisations (such as British Blind Sport) should provide an excellent source of expertise and assistance to support policies and programmes but believe that it is the responsibility of ‘mainstream governing bodies to provide opportunities for disabled people to play a full and active role in their chosen sport as a participant, coach, administrator, official, or spectator’ (Survey, 2001). Thus EFDS consider the mainstream governing bodies to be the lead body and the DSOs should assist and support.
While the EFDS may have a clear vision of mainstreaming, the survey from Phase 2 revealed that not all governing bodies of sport shared its vision. Responses to the survey indicated a divergence of views on what mainstreaming means and what role disability sport organisations and national governing bodies of sport ought to play in the development of disability sport. What follows is a brief summary of respondents views in relation to the roles that disability sport organisations (such as British Blind Sport), governing bodies of sport for disabled people (such as Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association), governing bodies of sport of mainstream sport (such as the Football Association) and Sport England, ought to play in the development, coaching, organisation and competitive structure of disability sport.

Of the 24 disability sport organisations surveyed, 11 agreed or strongly agreed that mainstream providers should be responsible for disability sport and 13 that disability sport organisations should. The responses from 66 mainstream organisations was less polarised, with 25 believing that both mainstream and disability sport organisations should share responsibility. Indeed 43 agreed or strongly agreed that mainstream providers should be responsible for disability sport, 39 that disability sport organisations should be, and 38 that responsibility lay with governing bodies of disability sport. Many believed, therefore, that responsibility should be shared between 2 or more of these three types of organisation. Whilst the majority of mainstream organisations considered the responsibility to be shared between themselves and either the disability sport organisations or the governing bodies of disability sport, less than half of the DSOs believed that it should be the mainstream providers that should be responsible (Survey, 2001).

When questioned on the roles that mainstream and disability sport organisations ought to play, respondents’ own descriptions provide further evidence of the lack of consensus within the disability sport network. For example, DSOs such as the English Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability believe that the mainstream governing bodies should ‘provide opportunities to the same level as those for mainstream competitors’ (Survey, 2001). This view was also supported by some mainstream sports organisations who were similarly strident in their commitment to mainstreaming, believing that DSOs and governing bodies of disability sport should ‘force able-bodied organisations to open up to all’ (Survey, 2001). However, other disability sport organisations such as the British Wheelchair Bowls Association
believed that the ‘lead role in the development and delivery of disability sport should be with the disability sport organisations’ and that mainstream organisations should ‘leave it to the experts’ (Survey, 2001). The British Wheelchair Bowls Association stated that the mainstream NGBs should ‘help but not lead’, claiming that it [BWBA] should be the governing body of bowls for wheelchair users. The Fencing Association agreed with this position simply stating that the DSO should be the ‘lead body’ and mainstream governing body the ‘support agency’ (Survey, 2001).

Given that mainstreaming has been key to the policies of both Sport England as well as some disability sport organisations such as BSAD, it was interesting to discover from the survey that mainstreaming as a policy objective received such equivocal support, and explains EFDS’s varied relationship with the National Governing Bodies of sport (NGBS). EFDS has deliberately worked more closely with some NGBs than others, originally selecting a series of ‘priority sports’ based predominantly on disabled peoples’ level of interest in those sports (EFDS, 2000). However, Mahesh Patel (National Development Officer for the EFDS) believes that working with some governing bodies was like ‘flogging a dead horse’; so now EFDS work with governing bodies that ‘want to work with us [EFDS]’ (Patel, 2003, personal communication). Given the range of attitudes and commitment toward mainstreaming, it is unsurprising that few mainstream organisations have taken on responsibility for disability sport.

Casey (former Chief Executive of Sport England), Price (former Chief Executive and President of BSAD) and Atha (President of the EFDS) agree that there has been slow progress in mainstreaming disability sport. The slow progress they suggest is due, in part, to the reluctance of mainstream sports governing bodies to acknowledge disability sport as a significant issue and also because of the unwillingness of the non-disabled administrators in existing disability organisations, to relinquish what Price suggests has become for many a personal crusade. Indeed Casey, Price and Atha concur that the attractions of working in elite disability sport had encouraged the retention of roles better served by different and possibly mainstream organisations. According to Price and Atha, many officers from disability sport organisations who have invested their time and energy in developing services for disabled people are unwilling to relinquish their role. Price, recalling a recent debate on mainstreaming, claims that many DSOs ‘would not argue against mainstreaming as a positive force
and a sensible development, but if you translate that into practice, give up your job on
the assurance that the non-disabled body would do it for you... they all said no,
everyone one of them’ (Price, 2000, Interview).

To compound the reticence of disability sport organisations, Casey (Interview, 2000)
highlights that ‘30 or 40 years ago, if you said to the mainstream governing bodies of
sport... in due course you will take on responsibility for disability sport, I think most
of them would have said “we can’t do that or don’t want to do that”, because they
actually saw that [disability sport] as something quite separate and the responsibility
of someone else’. Casey’s observation reflects the findings of the Minister for Sport
Review Group, which expressed disappointment when their survey revealed that
‘some [NGBs] see little relevance in their own activities for people with disabilities
either now or in the future’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989: 18).

Price recalls a discussion that illustrates further some mainstream sports officers’
antipathy toward disability sport. Price once asked a Sports Council Regional Officer
responsible for table tennis in his region, ‘if tomorrow morning a letter landed on your
desk, saying “I live in your region, I am a 23 year old male, who would just love to
start playing table tennis, but I happen to have a right sided hemiplegia because I was
born with cerebral palsy ... and I don’t know where to start, can you help me?” His
answer was, “I wouldn’t even answer it, I would pass it straight on to the guy down
the corridor who works with disabled people”, who happens to know nothing at all
about table tennis and doesn’t have any contact within the table tennis world’ (Price,
Interview, 2000).

The NGBs apparent lack of perceived responsibility for disability sport was reflected
in the findings from the survey conducted as a part of this study. The survey revealed
that despite 79% of the mainstream governing bodies having discussed issues relating
to disabled peoples’ participation in sport, only 39% had a disability sport policy and
37% an officer with responsibility for disability sport. Furthermore, 52% of
mainstream organisations (and 71% of DSOs) recognised that mainstream governing
bodies are not doing enough for disabled people. Aware of NGBs’ lack of interest,
Atha believed that while the national governing bodies should take on responsibility
for the sporting needs of disabled people they are not likely to do so adequately. He
asserts that if we handed responsibility for disability sport over to the national
governing body 'what the hell would they do with it... most of them couldn't possibly cope...and some would say it's nothing to do with us' (Atha, Interview, 2000). Bright concurs in this analysis suggesting that disability sport will never be a priority for mainstream governing bodies. Moreover he contends that the NDSOs are still needed to work on behalf of those disabled people who wish to play sports that are not the priority of EFDS or Sport England.

Price claims that by creating the EFDS, a significant opportunity to progress sport for disabled people has been missed and is disappointed by the current organisational arrangements. As Price indicates, the relationship between Sport England and EFDS seems reminiscent of that between BSAD and the former Sports Council, with Sport England, like the Sports Council before it, seeming to prefer a single outlet for all disability needs and interests. While Price (Interview, 2000) does not ignore the gradual, and welcome, increase in the involvement of NGBs and others in the mainstream of sport at the elite end of the spectrum, he expresses disappointment with the slow pace of movement in that direction and the apparent lack of emphasis on the involvement of mainstream providers closer to the grassroots (Price, personal communication, 2003). Atha is generally more optimistic and contends that the disability sport organisations, currently under the direction of EFDS, should retain control and power, as the mainstream NGBs ‘will never take on disability fully so we will need disability sport organisations well into the foreseeable future and quite possibly always’ (Atha, Interview, 2000).

Chaytors (Chief Executive of EFDS) insists, however, that governing bodies should really take much more ownership of disability sport and stresses that the EFDS is committed to facilitating this shift in responsibility. He states, ‘we can’t just sit back and accept that governing bodies will get round to disability when they have a chance’ (Chaytors, Interview, 2000). He suggests, for example, that ‘as a footballer ...whether you have got one leg, are visually impaired, hearing impaired or whatever’ the governing body should be lead agency (Chaytors, Interview, 2000). As highlighted in Chapter six, the EFDS was created by Sport England to facilitate the mainstreaming of disability sport (Collins, 1997) and, according to Chaytors (EFDS) and Nichol (Sport England), both agencies work closely to achieve this objective despite the fact that Sport England no longer has an officer with specific responsibility for disability sport, women or ethnic minorities in sport. Instead, Mary Nichol of Sport England
now works with the EFDS as part of her fulltime responsibility to address inequity in
sport. The funding Sport England received from the DCMS was, according to Nichol,
contingent upon Sport England improving the equity in mainstream sports provision,
which she contends is a real challenge. Nichol suggests that, despite the commendable
example of a few governing bodies such as the Royal Yachting Association, which
she suggests, has taken on responsibility for disability sport, ‘progress has been slow
with governing bodies’. In support of Nichol’s claim that governing bodies need to be
coerced into mainstreaming, the survey revealed that while the majority of
organisations believed that they should take more responsibility for disability sport,
only 29% of mainstream organisations agreed that they should only be funded if
disabled people benefited equally (Survey, 2001). Nichol may be correct in her
assertion, therefore, that ‘making it [mainstreaming] compulsory was likely to have a
greater effect’ than simply encouraging it (Nichol, Interview, 2001).

To support the mainstreaming of disability sport and to address the inequities within
governing body provision generally, in 2000, Sport England produced ‘Making
English Sport Inclusive: Equity Guidelines for Governing Bodies’. This provided
‘general guidance on planning for inclusion and gives specific advice in relation to the
following groups: ethnic minority communities, people with disabilities, women’
(Sport England, 2000:3). Nichol suggests that despite the interest that NGBs may
have in disability sport, ‘they do not know what they should be doing, and the equity
planning that they now have to engage in, does this effectively [by providing] a tool
not just a stick’ (Nichol, Interview, 2001). It provides ‘guidance as to how to make
sport more equitable’, and was ‘endorsed by a large number of governing bodies’
(Nichol, 2001).

Sport England is working alongside the EFDS to achieve mainstreaming, and
according to Nichol (2001), EFDS’s role is to ‘drive the work of others’ and the
equity planning process provides a useful tool with which to do it. Although Atha
believes that Sport England ‘take their responsibility for disability sport very
seriously’ he suggests that the ‘genesis of the EFDS was partly due to the fear [of
Sport England] to mainstream’ (Atha, Interview, 2000). He acknowledges that the
EFDS are ‘doing the work of Sport England’ but claims ‘it is a really good
arrangement’ as both agencies ‘work very closely together’ to assist NGBs and the
NDSOs to provide better opportunities (Atha, Interview, 2000).
Mainstreaming is a long-standing focus of interest in disability sport policy. There are however, clear divisions between key actors and organisations on whether mainstreaming should be a policy aim and if so how it should be achieved. Mainstreaming is therefore the focus of this case study and provides the tool for a richly detailed insight into the disability sport policy process.

According to the definition of mainstreaming provided by the Minister's Review Group, a governing body would be mainstreaming successfully if it: has responsibility for the provision and co-ordination of its sport for disabled people; has implemented policies which provide disabled people with equitable club, event and coaching opportunities; has in place decision making processes which involve disabled people and works effectively with disability sport organisations; and has values of mainstreaming which demonstrate a belief in retaining responsibility for servicing the needs of disabled people as a part of its general duties. Therefore, in relation to the mainstreaming of disability sport in seven sports, and by using survey, interview and documentary evidence this chapter will examine:

a) each governing body's role (how involved it is in the provision and coordination of its sport for disabled people?),

b) key policies and activities (what is its policy on disabled people and what has it done to improve club, event and coaching opportunities?),

c) decision-making processes and relationships (how does it involve disabled people and relate to disability sport organisations?),

d) values (what the key actors values are toward mainstreaming?)

The analysis of each sport will be concluded by providing brief comments on the key actors involved, the source of policy shifts, the progress that each sport has made toward mainstreaming (by using as a framework the Minister for Sport Review Group's recommendations outlined earlier) and the dominant perceptions of key actors toward mainstreaming.
7.3 SWIMMING

The mainstream governing body and its role in swimming for disabled people

The Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) was established over 100 years ago as the governing body of swimming in England. The ASA comprises five Districts through which it has 1554 affiliated swimming clubs and 200,000 individual members (ASA, 2001). The ASA has 77 full-time and 39 part-time able-bodied officers and 1 full-time and 1 part-time disabled officer. Supporting the activities of the ASA are 119,000 volunteers. The ASA estimates that there are 59,700 able-bodied and 300 disabled competitive swimmers and 1590 swimming clubs (Survey, 2001).

The core mission of the ASA is to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to learn to swim and reach his or her own goal. It also aims to deliver ‘Gold medals at the Olympics’ by professionals and volunteers ‘working in partnership towards a clear business plan’ (ASA, 2001:1). The ASA derives its income from commercial activities, sponsorship, membership subscriptions and National Lottery and exchequer funding. In 2001/2 swimming (but not necessarily through the ASA) received £340,000 from exchequer expenditure and over £18 million was awarded from the National Lottery to ‘swimming’ (Sport England, 2002). Between July 1999 and March 2000, as a Paralympic priority one sport, disability swimming received £803,223 from the Lottery for its World Class Performance Plan (UK Sport, 2000) and in 2001/2002 received £1 million pounds (UK Sport, 2002).

According to David Sparkes (Chief Executive of the ASA), the ASA became involved in swimming for disabled people and in particular teaching training courses for ‘disability swimming’ because it was felt that ‘we [the ASA] ought to’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). ASA’s involvement in the coordination of swimming for disabled people has a long history. At the BSAD Think Tank in 1985 Liz Dendy (Sports Council) provided a summary of the Sports Council’s involvement in sport and disability, highlighting the establishment in 1969 of an informal coordinating group for swimming and disabled people. In 1974 the ASA appointed an officer to develop swimming for disabled people and, in 1976, due to the interest of the ASA and the activities of DSOs such as BSAD, a National Coordinating Committee on Swimming for People with a Disability was established. Membership of the Committee included
mainstream organisations, disability sport organisations and general non-sport related
disability organisations (such as the Spastics Society). Its membership in 1985
included the Amateur Swimming Association, the Swimming Teachers Association,
the Royal Life Saving Society UK, the Institute of Leisure and Amenity Management,
Disability Sport England, British Blind Sport, English Sports Association for People
with a Disability, Cerebral Palsy Sport, National Association of Swimming Clubs for
the Handicapped, SCOPE and the National Federation of Gateway Clubs (BSAD,
1985). The Committee aimed to ‘coordinate and liaise with all constituent members
on matters pertaining to swimming for people with disabilities’ (Sport England,
2000:27) and was one of the earliest sports specific committees to bring together
mainstream and disability sport organisations (BSAD, 1985).

Further illustrations of ASA’s early involvement in disability swimming are provided
by its officers’ attendance at BSAD’s ‘Think Tank’ in 1985 and its application for
funding from the Sports Council in 1986. The ASA, in its submission to the Sports
Council, had a ‘planned programme of conferences, seminars and courses...a national
bi-annual high level conference in liaison with BSAD’ and, at a district level, a plan to
hold ‘one day seminars with BSAD’s regional officers’ (BSAD, 1987:32). It is worth
making the point here that the ASA was one of only two governing bodies that
attended BSAD’s ‘Think Tank’.

By the late 1980s BSAD had developed its relations with a few NGBs and in the 1987
Survey of Provision and Need, BSAD stated that it should not be ‘surprising that
those NGBs with whom it had forged the strongest links are those sports in which
BSAD has national championships’, as these high profile events involved coaches and
officials from the mainstream governing body (BSAD, 1987:7). The ASA’s
commitment to sport for disabled people was recognised by the Minister’s review of
disability sport in the United Kingdom (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989).

Since these early developments there has been a growth in competitive swimming
events for disabled people, in large part due to the activities of DSOs and in particular
BSAD’s British Telecom sponsored swimming development programme. That is not
to suggest that BSAD was the only DSO that provided regional and national
swimming events for disabled people. Indeed, DSOs and other voluntary and local
organisations have traditionally provided a wide, if unstructured, variety of
recreational and competitive swimming opportunities. For example, despite the
funding and organisational problems encountered by CP Sport (explained in Chapter
6), it has since its foundation, had a comprehensive swimming programme for athletes
with cerebral palsy. Gill Stidever as the current (voluntary) swimming coordinator for
CP Sport, organises ‘squad training sessions in Nottingham for elite swimmers with
cerebral palsy’ (CP Sport, 2002b:2).

According to Sparkes, however, it was the introduction of national events led by
BSAD that heralded the beginning of well-organised, high performance and high
profile swimming events for disabled people. Sparkes suggests that coupled with the
improving profile of national and international events, aspiring disabled swimmers
have shifted ‘away from disability specific groups’ and have begun to seek support
from ‘traditional [mainstream] swimming clubs’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001).

During the ‘New Start’ process it became clear to Sparkes that the DSOs were playing
the role that governing bodies ought to play. Sparkes believed that there was a
‘plethora of disability specific organisations with a plethora of agendas’ and that ‘if
disability sport was ever to mature and grow up it would only do so through
governing body interference’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). Sparkes recommended to
the ASA’s Great Britain and England Committees that they (the ASA) should
‘proactively get involved’, and in 1997 at a meeting in the ASA Head Office in
Loughborough, the Swimming Committee considered the implications of taking
responsibility for disability swimming (ASFGB/ASA, 1997). Sparkes warned the
committee that there would be a down side to taking responsibility for disability
swimming, as in his view, the organisations that the ASA would have to work with
could be ‘over demanding... they will want your attention and drag on your
resources...and your management time’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). However, with
Sparkes’s support, 8th November 1997, it was agreed to establish a GB Disability
Swimming Committee (ASFGB/ASA, 1997).

The ASA has, therefore, made significant steps toward, and is keen to promote itself
as a governing body that is taking responsibility for the provision and coordination of
swimming for disabled people. Notwithstanding a long standing involvement and
interest in the coordination of disability swimming, to establish the extent to which
the ASA has mainstreamed disability swimming, it is important to examine its key policies and activities.

Key policies: the development of the governing body’s club structure, events and coaching activities

In August 2002 the ASA published a Disability Development Plan 2002-2006 which identified a series of objectives to improve talent identification, competitive opportunities, opportunities for coaches, teachers and officials, club structures, and the promotion of disability swimming (ASA, 2002: 62). The objectives demonstrate the ASA’s commitment to take responsibility for the development and delivery of disability swimming. For example, the plan states that ‘each ASA district should have its own classification team’, all disabled swimmers should be ‘registered on the ASA swimmers’ database’, and ‘all coaches and teachers should have disability swimming as a part of their continual professional development’ (ASA, 2002:63-66). To this end it is ASA policy that all ASA officers, rather than just the ASA’s Disability Officer, who provide advice and information on disabled peoples’ participation in swimming.

Sparkes insists that the ASA ‘take disability swimming seriously’ and is committed to implementing a policy that meets the needs of disabled swimmers (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). Sparkes recalls when there was a demand for more swimming competitions from the disability sport organisations so ‘we [the ASA] went to our swimming committee and said, can we incorporate some of our competitions into yours’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). To provide another example of how the ASA is developing sport for disabled people, Sparkes recollects how the ASA Swimming Committee highlighted the need for a set of rules for disability swimming. The ‘rules people’ were then charged with writing a set of rules to enable access by disabled people to ASA’s swimming events. The ASA Rules handbook now includes criteria for disabled swimmers and disability swimming events.

The ASA are also running 10 regional talent identification and development camps for non-disabled and disabled swimmers aged 10-14 years old. They recognised in the Annual Report however, that teaching and awareness courses are needed at ‘local grass roots level to identify and develop the range of swimmers participating in water activities’ (ASA, 2001: 28). To this end the ASFGB appointed a Coordinator for
Disability Swimming in 1998 to 'liaise between the disability sport organisations and the performance programme' (National Governing Bodies Project, 1998: 3). The ASA also has a National Development Officer who is currently working with the EFDS to develop 30 mainstream and disability swimming clubs so that swimmers with a disability that are identified within Sport England's Active Sports programmes can move easily into the club environment.

The ASA’s Annual Report for 2001 details further examples of the work undertaken by the National Development Officer for disability swimming, together with the Education and Development sub groups of the ASA’s Disability Swimming technical committee. Through these sub groups and the National Development Officer, the ASA has developed a programme which ‘will enable the ASA to classify swimmers with a functional impairment’ and thus assist in creating opportunities for competitive swimming in the ASA’s integrated events or championships run by the disability sport organisations (ASA, 2001:28). The ASA also demonstrates its commitment to offering disabled swimmers competitive event opportunities by providing an information pack detailing both the integrated mainstream events and the disability sport events. This encourages swimmers to make use of the wide range of events and activities available whether they be provided by the DSOs or the ASA. According to Briddon (ASA’s temporary National Disability Development Officer) it is important that swimmers know what is available and for them to choose the competitive environment in which they are most comfortable (Briddon, personal communication, 2003).

The ASA’s comprehensive polices on disability swimming, together with the changes to event rules and the improvement in club and coaching structures all indicate a commitment to mainstreaming that runs through all the Association’s activities. However, according to Patel (National Development Officer of the EFDS) the progress that the ASA have made in implementing these policies has been ‘disappointing’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003). Patel recalls how he met regularly with Tara Smith (the ASA’s Disability Development Officer) to agree on joint targets. For example, Patel and Smith agreed that EFDS and ASA regional officers could work together to make ‘at least 3 swimming clubs in each region accessible and welcoming to disabled people’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003). Patel concludes that while Smith was ‘keen to effect change within the ASA’, there is
not enough genuine commitment on the part of the ASA (Patel, personal communication, 2003) and consequently it has not delivered many of its mainstreaming promises.

Decision-making processes: relationships with disabled people and disability sport organisations

The Amateur Swimming Federation of Great Britain and the ASA committee have overall responsibility for swimming in Great Britain and England respectively, and both committees discuss matters relating to disabled swimmers. For example, at the ASFGB meeting on June 9th 2001, it was clear that the discussion and decisions surrounding the kit and equipment guidelines for swimmers for the forthcoming European Championships also applied to athletes attending the European Championships for the Disabled (ASFGB, June, 2001: 6).

The ASA has a policy on disability and a specific Disability Swimming Committee to discuss matters relating to the development of swimming for disabled people. EFDS is a member of this committee but, according to Bridgen (ASA), a representative of EFDS does not always attend. Patel as the EFDS’s lead officer on governing body developments receives minutes of the Disability Swimming Committee meetings but is aware that while the interests of some disability sport organisations such as CP Sport are represented at these meetings, other DSOs are not invited. This is unsurprising given that Sparkes prefers to involve ‘experienced and dedicated officers with expertise in swimming for disabled people rather than disability sport officers and all the political baggage that comes with it’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001).

The Disability Swimming Committee reports to the ASA Committee where key policies relating to disability swimming are discussed and decided upon. For example, minutes of the ASA Committee meeting held on November 30th 2002 report that following proposals made by the DSC, ‘amendments to the rules relating to the certification of disabled players to prevent disqualification were agreed’ (ASA, 2002b:5). The ASA’s Chief Executive routinely reports the activities of the Disability Swimming Committee and the ASA Committee to the ASFGB Committee. For example, on 28th September 2002 Sparkes suggested that ‘thought needs to be given to our [the ASA’s] long term requirements for a Performance Director in Disability
Swimming [after the Paralympics 2004']. These examples are indicative of how the ASA, as well as creating a post and a Committee specific to disability swimming, has also embedded decisions about disability swimming into its mainstream decision making and policy-making processes.

To ensure that disabled people are involved in the decision making process, the ASA has included disabled members on their Board. Sparkes indicates that originally ‘it was the carers and helpers who provided the lead...making decisions for the disabled’ but it is disabled swimmers that are ‘increasingly taking a leadership role’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). While he considers it important to have a committee which can reflect the interests and concerns of the disabled athletes, the coach and the administrator, Sparkes claims that the ‘the worst possible case would be for the disabled athletes to be 100% in charge’. He clarifies his position by arguing that they would be ‘as selfish as any other group’ and illustrates his point by suggesting that he would rather ‘fly to the moon’ than put ‘a bunch of synchronised swimmers in charge of synchronised swimming’. However, Sparkes does indicate that disabled people should have more control of the developments meant to serve them (Survey, 2001), and to this end has included disabled representatives on its Athlete’s Council (Survey, 2001).

The ASA has developed an internal committee structure which relies much more on its own volunteers and its own swimmers than on DSOs, even though DSOs remain major providers of national events. While the ASA are keen to cooperate with the disability sport organisations, Sparkes believes that the DSOs are very difficult to work with. The ASA’s Disability Development Officer works with the EFDS and uses its regions and network of contacts to implement ASA programmes. However, according to Sparkes, the EFDS do not influence the work of the ASA and are certainly ‘not providing leadership’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). He goes on to suggest that the ASA dictates what happens at the elite end because ‘we [the ASA] have got the money’ and the ASA will soon begin to influence the swimming opportunities for disabled people at a regional and local level. The Disability Development Officer works closely with the disability sport organisations because they provide very good competitive swimming opportunities. According to Gibbons (ASA’s temporary Disability Development Officer), while the EFDS are invited to the Disability
Swimming Committee, it is the relationship between the ASA and EFDS's national and regional officers that is most productive.

However, the ASA's relationship with both the EFDS and a few DSOs such as Disability Sport England and CP Sport has been strained according to Sparkes, because the DSOs are, in Sparkes's, view 'not providing a united front' and tend to work in isolation (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). As an example, he claims that the organisers of the CP World Championships may be angry that the ASA have run their [ASA's] trials for the European Championships at the same time and thus may reduce the number of athletes at the CP event. While sympathetic to their position and recognising that organisations such as CP Sport and Disability Sport England (previously British Sports Association for the Disabled) 'may see us [the ASA] as taking over their role', Sparkes is clear that running events for those 'who aspire to go to the Paralympics' is 'central to the ASA's role' (Sparkes, Interview, 2001).

Indeed Sparkes suggests that the DSOs and, in particular Disability Sport England, have 'distanced themselves from us [the ASA] because they have become increasingly reliant on sponsorship gained through national events' and are not in his view, prepared to relinquish such activities. Sparkes goes on to state that Disability Sport England 'make no attempt to work with us [the ASA], they tend to work in isolation... perhaps because of the personal agendas, jobs and money' and the need to secure 'sponsors' for their event programme (Sparkes, Interview, 2001).

While Neale (Chief Executive of Disability Sport England) agrees that the coordination of disability sport in general is poor, with regard to swimming he insists that BSAD has had a 'profound influence on the swimming programme [for disabled people] in this country' and 'if it wasn't for the BT [British Telecom] programme and the financial influence of BT and the co-ordination through BSAD, we would not be on the swimming rostrum that we are on now' (Neale, Interview, 2001). While BSAD and now DSE have worked closely with the ASA, Neale suggests that the relationship is 'not as co-operative as it could be' (Neale, Interview, 2001). However, with the co-operation of the ASA, Disability Sport England has continued 'running its programme of national swimming events' because, according to Neale, the ASA admit that 'they haven’t got the finance... they haven’t got the experience' (Neale, Interview, 2001). Neale stresses however that 'they are gaining the experience and
they are employing people now [to develop disability swimming] so hopefully the experience will come’ (Neale, Interview, 2001).

British Blind Sport also work in cooperation with the ASA. BBS has its own swimming committee which ‘talks with the ASA’ (Bright, Interview, 2001). Bright insists however that ‘the mainstream governing bodies [such as the ASA] aren’t really interested in blind swimmers unless they are elite performers’ (Bright, Interview, 2001). Bright states ‘I can’t see the ASA bothering with blind swimmers who are not potential paralympians’ and asks, ‘even if they do have an interest, where are they going to pick up these potential paralympians?’ (Bright, Interview, 2001).

**The mainstream governing body’s values towards mainstreaming**

Sparkes believes that the ASA’s role is to provide ‘training, coaches, competition, doping control, support structures, kit, transport...what ever is needed...our job is to take swimmers from learning to swim to the Olympic podium’ and this responsibility, he indicates, includes those with a disability (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). He suggests that the DSOs can provide ‘additional competitive opportunities specific to the blind or CP’s for example’, similar to Schools Sport Associations which provide additional opportunities for young swimmers. He insists that DSOs’ role is to ‘augment and complement our [ASA’s] policies’ but not ‘get in the way’. Sparkes sees Disability Sport England for example, as having a ‘tremendous role in introducing children to swimming’ but emphasises that there is just one governing body of the sport in England, that is, the Amateur Swimming Association (Sparkes, Interview, 2001).

While Sparkes thinks that NGBs should be responsible for the provision and co-ordination of their sport for all people, thus including disabled people, he admits that the ASA are not doing enough for disabled people (Survey, 2001). While he plans to increase the ASA’s commitment to disability sport aided by the launch of World Class Potential, he stresses that the funding is needed before those plans can be implemented. Moreover, he indicates that while the generic DSOs such as the EFDS may have a role, they should not be responsible for specific sports (Survey, 2001). EFDS concur with this view. According to Hodgkins (Regional Development Manager of the EFDS), it is getting the idea across to people while there may still be a
need for a disability swimming club... its the ASA who are administering that club' (Hodgkins, Interview, 2000).

Given the policy direction in disability sport (Sport England 1993a; Collins, 1997; EFDS, 2000) whether coerced or otherwise, NGBs may be gradually absorbing the work of the DSOs into their activities. In this regard, according to Sparkes, DSOs should take a ‘strategic view of where their organisation wants to go’ and criticises the DSOs for ‘not being run like a business’ (ASA, 2001:1). He goes on to proclaim that the EFDS should ‘stop being a bloody patronising charity’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). While Sparkes recognises that officers in the DSOs are ‘terribly caring about what they do’, he proposes that they need to ask of themselves and their organisations ‘what is our purpose, what is our role...and what have we got to do’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). Sparkes believes that DSOs, like NGBs, should be more ‘outcome focused’ rather than process driven. He describes disability sport generally as being ‘at the other end of the spectrum...and in a mess’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). Sparkes believes that they write business plans because Sport England tell them to but are ‘just going through the hoops to get money...they play at structures...and don’t stand back and ask what are we here to do’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001).

Despite the efforts of the ASA to mainstream swimming for disabled people, some organisations such as the British Blind Sport remain unconvinced that the mainstream governing body has the interest or expertise to cater adequately for disabled people. Sparkes however, while recognising the successes of a few separate disability sports organisations and in particular the specific sports bodies such as the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association, believes that ‘ultimately the successful sports will be those sports that are sports rather than disability specific sports [emphasis added]’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). He also believes that this is what athletes want. In Sparkes’s view, ‘the Sarah Baileys [Paralympic swimmer] of this world want to be in a governing body of sport [emphasis added] because they want to be recognised as sportsmen [sic] and not disabled’ (Sparkes, Interview, 2001).

The organisation and discussions that surround policies on elite swimming for disabled people are described by Sparkes as being ‘coherent’ and ‘reaching agreement’ easily (Sparkes, Interview, 2001). On the preparation for the Paralympics, he proclaims that ‘we were clear about our objectives...nothing was going to deflect
us from ...what was best for the Paralympics and we tried all the time to find consensus’ (Sparke, Interview, 2001). The ASA have been cited by Sport England as an example of good practice claiming that the ‘ASA has taken a full responsibility for the integration of Paralympic swimmers within its World Class Performance Plans’ (Sport England, 2000:33). As far as Price is concerned, the ASA provides a good example of a governing body which is ‘beginning to change...and has actually or is trying to take on board the needs of disabled people in swimming (Price, Interview, 2001).

However, in Chaytors’ view, although the ASA has portrayed itself as being at the cutting edge of disability sport, he believes, ‘there has been lots of rhetoric’ and not much action (Chaytors, Interview, 2001). Whilst not wanting to ‘rock the boat’, Chaytors is waiting to see if the ASA actually deliver all that it claims. According to Patel (National Development Officer for the EFDS) the ‘policies and developments of the ASA look inclusive’ however, he suggests that ‘there is little to demonstrate that the ASA have embedded disability swimming into its routine activities’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003).

**Conclusion**

BSAD and now DSE have until the last 10 years or so been the key policy actors in disability swimming, coordinating development and providing regional and national swimming events for disabled swimmers particularly for those with a physical impairment. While other DSOs such as CP Sport and BBS provide their own small-scale events they have not developed the comprehensive programme offered by DSE (and previously BSAD). While the Sports Council and the ASA have been involved in the development of disability swimming since the 1960s it was not until 1997 that the ASA took the decision to be the governing body of disability swimming. Supported in particular by Sport England, the ASA is now the key policy actor in disability swimming. However, the ASA has a very weak relationship with EFDS and a weak and often fractious relationship with the other disability sport organisations.

While it is difficult to identify the precise motives for the ASA’s shift toward taking greater responsibility for disability sport, it is clear that the pressure from DSOs and the Sports Council to take responsibility for disability swimming was important as it
lacked coordination and coherence. This lack of consensus and coordination at a time when funding was available from the World Class programmes provided the ASA with an opportunity to lead disability swimming. It was a decision influenced by opportunism more than government or interest group pressure demonstrating the negligible influence of Sport England and the EFDS in policies relating to disability swimming.

In relation to the Minister for Sport Review Group’s recommendations, which provide a useful framework for the examination of mainstreaming, the ASA has met many of these. While the ASA has officers dedicated to disability swimming, it also has disability specific, inclusive policies and runs events, which suggests that the promotion and provision of swimming opportunities for disabled swimmers is a core function for its officers. For example, ASA’s competition rules encourage the inclusion of disabled swimmers into mainstream as well as DSOs events, with the DSO events considered as a complement and an alternative to those provided by the ASA.

While the ASA involves disabled people within its own decision making processes, the ASA does not work effectively with the DSOs. Key actors in disability sport remain concerned that disabled swimmers at the grass roots level will continue to need the support of DSOs and do not believe that the ASA will meet its mainstreaming promises.

The dominant perception of the key actors toward mainstreaming is that they (disabled people) should be integrated as much as possible. Embedded within this perception is a deeply entrenched socio-cultural belief that affords non-disabled people a higher status in society and consequently mainstream sport is what disabled swimmers and DSOs should aspire to. It is also clear that while there is a general consensus on the belief that disabled people should have access to both mainstream and disability swimming events and opportunities, which is the appropriate agency and whether they are capable of delivering this service is a matter of ongoing conflict.
7.4 TABLE TENNIS

The mainstream governing body and its role in table tennis for disabled people

The English Table Tennis Association (ETTA) as the governing body of table tennis, has 41 county associations, 252 leagues and 7,804 affiliated teams (ETTA Association, 2002:4). ETTA is represented on the British Olympic Table Tennis Federation, the International Table Tennis Federation, the European Table Tennis Federation and the Commonwealth Games Federation.

The Survey (2000) identified that ETTA has 27 full-time and 1 part-time able-bodied officer but no full or part time disabled officers. In 2001/2 Sport England awarded ETTA £435,000 from its exchequer budget and in addition, through its Limited Company, ETTA generates income from player licensing, coaching courses and merchandising. The Sport England Lottery programme, through the Awards for All scheme, has awarded 361 grants to table tennis organisations amounting to a total of £1,244,000. While the maximum grant per application is £5000, some clubs have received more than one grant (ETTA, 2002:4)

Between January 1999 and December 2000, projects to benefit the provision of table tennis for disabled people received from the Lottery a total of £208,763 (UK Sport, 2000) and in 2001/2, £92,000 for its World Class Performance Plans (UK Sport, 2002). The UK Sport Lottery Strategy considers disability table tennis to be a Paralympic priority three sport as ‘athletes have won a medal in the last Paralympic Games and have the potential to achieve a Gold in Athens in 2004’ (UK Sport, 2002:29). ETTA’s Management Committee report expressed concern, however, for its current £49,00 deficit and for UK Sport’s termination of ETTA’s World Class Performance Programmes (ETTA, 2002).

The increase in funding for table tennis has been complemented by a recent boost in media coverage, in particular through the televised Commonwealth Masters Tournament held at Wembley in May 2001 and the inclusion of Table Tennis into the Commonwealth Games in 2002 (ETTA, 2002:6). It is perhaps due to its increased profile that table tennis has been identified by Sport England as an ‘ideal vehicle to deliver the wider government agenda, which tackles the problem of reduced levels of
health and fitness particularly in young people and inclusion in the community’ (ETTA, 2002: 5). However, the inclusion of disabled people is not a new issue for ETTA.

In its 1987 submission to Sports Council for grant aid, ETTA had as one of its objectives, ‘to convince local authorities of the need for their assistance in allowing the ETTA to provide regular competition for the unemployed, disabled, women and the over 50s’ (BSAD, 1987:33). ETTA was identified in 1989 by the Minister for Sport Review Group as one of few ‘governing bodies that are involved in coaching disabled athletes’ (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989: 18) and partly, due to this commitment to disabled people, was selected to take part in the governing body schemes funded by the ‘Minister’s money’ (Sports Council, 1993a). However, similar to the provision of swimming as well as many other sports, it was the disability sport organisations such as BSAD that were the key providers of table tennis competitions and training opportunities and that had the network of disabled table tennis players. For example, in 1988 BSAD held its annual National Table Tennis Championships in Derby, attracting competitors from all ten BSAD regions in England as well as competitors from Wales and Scotland (BSAD, 1989:117).

BSAD were not the only disability sport organisation providing table tennis opportunities for people with physically impairments. The BWSF had its own British Wheelchair Table Tennis Committee which organised competitions and training events specifically for wheelchair users (BWSF, 2003) and CP Sport who ran training camps and national championships for people with cerebral palsy. The United Kingdom Sports Association for People with a Mental Handicap (renamed English Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability in 1995) were also ‘actively involved in developing [table tennis] opportunities at a local level, creating more clubs, and more events’ (ESAPLD, 2003).

Concern for the increasing number of table tennis providers and the resultant lack of coordination, prompted disabled table tennis players such as Phillip Lewis (former President of BSAD) to establish a new sports specific organisation. The British Table Tennis Association for the Disabled (BTTAD) was formed in 1993 (Lewis, Interview, 2000; Rogers, Interview, 2001), after ‘a group of wheelchair players got together’ because they thought that with ‘so many different disability groups it would be
difficult to select a GB squad' for the World Championships (Rogers, ETTA’s National Development Officer for disability table tennis, Interview, 2001).

Rogers claims that BTTAD initially focused its efforts on ‘the elite end’ (Rogers, Interview, 2001). However, shortly after its formation, officers of the BTTAD identified a need for some development work but recognising that they were reliant on membership fees and had limited resources, they put pressure on Sport England to fund a series of initiatives led by ETTA. Mainly due to the pressure that BTTAD exerted, in 1998, ETTA employed a National Development Officer responsible for developing table tennis for disabled people. At that time, according to Rogers ‘there was no policy and there was no plan’ detailing those developments (Rogers, Interview, 2001). To provide a focus for ETTA and in pursuit of its mainstreaming agenda, Sport England encouraged ETTA to coordinate table tennis for disabled people and for BTTAD to disband. However, because ETTA was unsure whether they could access the World Class Performance Plans but knew that BTTAD could, Sport England reversed their earlier decision and recommended that BTTAD should not disband as it could be detrimental to the funding support available to elite disabled table tennis players.

Notwithstanding Sport England’s and EFDS’s continued ambition to mainstream disability sport, BTTAD has continued to develop its role. Indeed, surprisingly, Sport England has recently provided BTTAD with £5,000 of which £2,000 is for operational costs and £3,000 for development work (Rogers, Interview, 2001). Rogers believes that as a result, BTTAD considers itself as the national governing body for disabled table tennis, which is causing Rogers ‘major problems’. Rogers exclaims that ‘they [BTTAD] can’t be the national governing body of the sport [table tennis] they can’t be the ETTA’ (Rogers, Interview, 2001). She insists that ‘everyone has to be able to see that the ETTA is the national governing body for table tennis for everybody’ (Rogers, Interview, 2001). ETTA estimate that there are over 300 disabled table tennis competitors (Survey, 2001) and, as ETTA’s officer responsible for the development of table tennis, it is clear that Rogers does not want the BTTAD interfering, as ‘we [the ETTA] have got plans... we have got strategies’ (Rogers, Interview, 2001).
Key policies: the development of the governing body’s club structure, events and coaching activities

Reflecting Sport England’s policy on equity, Rogers’s role is now a part of a broader focus on equity, and ETTA’s commitment to disabled table tennis players is contained within a more general Equity Action Plan. ETTA’s Equity Action Plan identified targets for the improvement of opportunities for disabled people to play table tennis. To achieve this, ETTA aim to introduce programmes, initiatives and competitions (ETTA, 2000), although according to Rogers there are no resources to support many of these initiatives.

While ETTA’s Equity Action Plan (ETTA, 2000) identifies a series of objectives with timescales and performance indicators that demonstrate a commitment to make all of their activities and processes more inclusive, there is a separate section which states how they intend to ‘raise the profile and promote table tennis for the disabled at all levels’ (ETTA, 2000: 9). ETTA state that they aim to increase the number of disabled people playing table tennis as well as the number of disabled people represented on ETTA Committees (ETTA, 2000). They also aim to ‘ensure that by the end of 2001 no disabled player should have to travel more 30 than miles to access table tennis’ (ETTA, 2000:9). To achieve this, ETTA developed a ‘Premier Club Ability programme’ that, in partnership with EFDS and mainly funded through the Lottery’s Awards for All programme, aims to provide table tennis clubs with training and support to work with disabled people. Rogers states that in the first year of operation 23 clubs had joined the programme and 150 club members had received Disability Awareness Training (tutored by the National Development Officer and a disabled table tennis player). Also, 170 disabled people had come and tried table tennis and, of those, 120 are still playing; many in mainstream clubs. The Premier Club programme is promoted by the West Midlands region of the EFDS which states that ‘all clubs in the programme will receive disability awareness training for their current club members’ (EFDS, West Midlands 2000:4). Patel (EFDS) suggests that using the Premier Club programme and on a ‘shoe string budget of about £5,000 per club’ the ETTA has made ‘effective progress in mainstreaming disability table tennis at the club level’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003).
Rogers states that 'in table tennis we [ETTA] are encouraging disabled people to play mainstream competitions in addition to 'disabled events' (sic), proving that there is not a great difference' (Rogers, Interview, 2001). The ETTA prefer not to run separate events for disabled players, rather they encourage the elite disabled players to compete in the mainstream events and, in addition, promote the events and activities of BTTAD. The ETTA is also developing a league for disabled table tennis players and striving to establish regional focus groups for disabled table tennis. As the development of table tennis for disabled people has permeated much of ETTA's general activities, Rogers claims that ETTA officers answer the general public's queries regarding opportunities and venues to play. That is to say, according to Rogers, ETTA is beginning to embed the needs of disabled people into its everyday activities.

Notwithstanding Patel's earlier comments regarding the success of ETTA's Premier Club programme, he claims that by 'leaving disability table tennis to one officer' does not demonstrate 'sufficient commitment on behalf of the governing body' (Patel, personal communication, 2003). Following what EFDS consider to be a lack of commitment amongst key policy actors within the ETTA, EFDS no longer considers table tennis as a priority sport.

**Decision-making processes: relationships with disabled people and disability sport organisations**

The ETTA has a National Council which has overall responsibility for policy-making and an Equity Committee which oversees the implementation of its Equity Policy and Action plan (Survey, 2001). The role of the Equity Committee is to 'ensure a fairer sporting future for all table tennis players; staff, officials and volunteers regardless of gender, age ability, ethnic background, culture or creed...to provide table tennis for all' (ETTA, 2001:1). The Equity Policy embraces Sport England's equity objectives and suggests that the 'challenge facing clubs, leagues, county, regional and national structures is to reflect the rich diversity of our communities' (ETTA, 1999:1).

As Rogers' role as ETTA's National Development Officer now includes race, gender and social deprivation as well as disability, the management group reflects a wider range of organisations than the disability sport organisations who hitherto dominated
the group. In this regard the terms of reference for the Equity Committee clearly states that the ETTA should liaise with ‘Sport England, Sporting Equals and the EFDS officers through membership of the Equity Committee’ (ETTA, 2001:1). The ETTA also looks to informal contacts and members of the Support Group for advice relating to the development of table tennis for disabled players (Survey, 2001). Moreover the National Development Officer works closely with disabled table tennis players in her development work. However, there appears to be no overt policy to ensure that disabled people are involved in the ETTA’s decision making process and thus, able bodied people tend to dominate. This is a position that Philip Lewis (British Table Tennis Association for the Disabled) thinks is unacceptable and believes that disabled people should be given the opportunity to control the development of table tennis and disability sport generally. Rogers strongly agrees that disabled people should have more control of the developments meant to benefit them.

While Rogers (as ETTA’s National Development Officer) works very closely with the BTTAD and sits on their Executive Committee the relationship between BTTAD and ETTA is strained. Rogers states that there is tremendous animosity toward the ETTA and claims that BTTAD feel ‘hard done by’ (Rogers, Interview, 2001). According to Rogers, this is because their perception is that the BTTAD created the National Development Officer post and ‘see the National Development Officer as their officer’ (Rogers, Interview, 2001). Rogers is clear, however, that her employer is the ETTA. Indeed, according to Patel (National Development Officer for EFDS) who is a member of Rogers’ Support Group, BTTAD and ETTA often had different objectives, making Rogers’ Support Group meetings very difficult.

Rogers believed that officers from the EFDS were very supportive in the first few years but, since then, the relationship between the EFDS and ETTA has deteriorated. She goes to explain that the distant relationship could be either because of the changes to personnel or because the ETTA has been given ‘a clean bill of health’ and thus it is the perception of the EFDS that they [the ETTA] do not need the support of BTTAD or EFDS (Rogers, Interview, 2001).

According to Rogers, the NDSOs have ‘suddenly become stronger in the last few years’ although ETTA’s relationship with some NDSOs (such as the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation) has become more distant. There is evidence, however,
of close cooperation between the ETTA and some DSOs particularly with regard to event development. For example, following a meeting involving the NDSOs and the ETTA it was agreed that the British Wheelchair Table Tennis Association would open their training weekends to the learning disabled athletes. It was also agreed that to prevent any misunderstandings, the BTTAD would hold the only ‘National Championships’ and no other event would have the same title. Moreover, demonstrating the close cooperation between BTTAD and ETTA, Phillip Lewis (Chairman of BTTAD) was recently nominated to become a Vice President of the ETTA. While the ETTA are also working closely with deaf players, Rogers is not working through the British Deaf Sports Council as they have not, she claims, ever responded to her phone calls and letters.

While Rogers is working closely with some EFDS regions, she suggests that others seem to have little interest in table tennis. For example, while table tennis is a priority sport for the Northwest region of EFDS and offers school coaching, squad training, links with mainstream clubs and junior leagues, other regions do not consider table tennis to be a main concern. As far as Patel is concerned, Rogers has ‘done a good job in difficult circumstances’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003). According to Patel, Rogers received little internal support from ETTA which Patel believes (Personal communication), has never been committed to the mainstreaming of disability table tennis. Patel illustrates this lack of commitment by recalling how Rogers was put under pressure by senior officers within the ETTA to leave an ETTA Equity Committee meeting to ‘take the minutes of another ETTA meeting taking place in an adjacent room’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003). For Patel (2003), this illustrated the value that the ETTA attached to equity issues generally, and to Rogers’ role in mainstreaming disability table tennis.

**The mainstream governing body’s values towards mainstreaming**

ETTA recognise that, similar to other mainstream governing bodies, it is not doing enough for disabled people and states that its officers intend to improve the opportunities available ‘through increased competitive opportunities, more accessible clubs and more education for able-bodied people’ (Survey, 2001). Rogers’ view is that the NGBs should ‘operate an inclusive policy and take the responsibility to promote their sport to all’ (Survey, 2001). Moreover, she maintains that the role of the
DSOs, whether sports specific such as BTTAD or the generic DSOs such as EFDS, should be to 'work in partnership with and provide support to the national governing body of sport' but that DSOs should be responsible for the development of specific sports (Survey, 2001). That role she insists should be left to the mainstream governing body (Rogers, Interview, 2001).

Price agrees with Rogers's view of the mainstream governing body's role, stating that 'it should be the table tennis officers that should take the lead' (Price, Interview, 2000). Price recognises that there may be a need 'for 1 member of the team [such as Rogers] to have a greater understanding of disability and all of the sort of networking and the infrastructures of disability sport' but contends that the NGB's disability development officer 'should be a resource for his colleagues, he/she shouldn’t be the dumping ground for everything to do with disability' (Price, Interview, 2000). Price goes to suggests that if the ETTA fully embraced the mainstreaming of disability sport, each of the ETTA's Regional Officers 'should know enough about table tennis in his region to be able to help somebody, [that is disabled] to gain access to a club and opportunity to learn to play table tennis' (Price, Interview, 2000). In addition Price claims that if 'that fellow [the disabled tennis player] 6 months later was obviously coming on so fast and was such a competitive animal then he [the Regional officer] would really need to know where he can go to compete with others [both disabled and no-disabled] (Price, Interview, 2000).

Phillip Lewis (BTTAD) agrees with this principle indicating that 'we [the BTTAD] want to retire from running our own athletes...we want this integration' (Lewis, Interview, 2000). However, Lewis is not keen to relinquish the role played by BTTAD until he is sure that the ETTA has adopted and will effectively carry out its responsibilities to disability sport. He blames Sport England for not encouraging NGBs to take on disability sport and for not providing the resources that they need to do so. As such he wants 'to hold on to our [BTTAD] organisation'. Lewis is also concerned that if BTTAD were to be incorporated into the ETTA, the needs of disabled table tennis players would be neglected. In this regard Lewis wonders 'how a small group that are disabled [BTTAD] are actually going to have some say in that organisation' (Lewis, Interview, 2001).
Rogers does not share this concern and believes a concerted effort is needed in the ‘education of the able bodied, to remove the barriers, to make all areas of sport accessible’ (Rogers, Interview, 2001). Rogers does not appear to share Lewis’s concerns surrounding the loss of identify and control that may be the unintended consequence of the government’s mainstreaming agenda. Notwithstanding the concerns raised by Lewis, Sport England have commended ETTA’s attempts to address the inequitable opportunities within table tennis and cited the ETTA as an example of good practice because it has:

- produced a draft equity action plan;
- introduced a new position within the ETTA management committee with responsibility for this area of work, and created an associated equity committee;
- included an equity fact sheet in the Table Tennis Development Officer Handbook;
- appointed a National Development Officer for disability; and
- ensured that all senior members of the ETTA staff have undergone equity training. (Sport England, 2001:33)

To enable ETTA to implement fully its equity plans and the mainstreaming of table tennis, Rogers maintains that Sport England must help to improve the coordination between the agencies as there are still too many [disability sport] organisations purporting to represent similar interests. Furthermore, she maintains that there is ‘very little support out there for disability officers’ (Rogers, Interview, 2000). As Rogers highlights, not even Sport England has a dedicated disability officer.

Summary

DSOs such as BSAD, BWSF, CP Sport, ESAPLD and BTTAD have been key to the development of table tennis for disabled people. While the ETTA has increased its role in disability table tennis, Sport England and the EFDS have been crucial to this development but dissimilar to the relationships within the coordination and provision of swimming, in BTTAD there is a DSO which has a specific role in developing table
tennis for disabled people. However, the relationship between BTTAD and ETTA is tense and the responsibility for disability table tennis is in a state of transition.

The ETTA has played a supportive role to the DSOs for decades however, the origins of the recent increase in ETTA’s commitment and activity in relation to disability sport lie more with the relationship between key individuals than pressure from Sport England, pressure from DSOs or the internal interests of the governing body.

Similar to the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA), ETTA has made significant steps toward the mainstreaming of table tennis. With regard to the Minister for Sport Review Group’s recommendations for National Governing Bodies, findings indicate that ETTA includes the needs of disabled people in its written policies, and its coaching and player development plans, and has a full time development officer to support the implementation of these policies. However, the officer is solely responsible for the development of disability table tennis, and table tennis for disabled people is not core to the functions and duties of the ETTA.

ETTA’s decision-making processes suggest that power lies with the mainstream governing body and its non-disabled officers, a position that BTTAD and the EFDS find unacceptable. ETTA indicate that the disability sport organisations' continuing events programme is more of a hindrance than a help to ETTA’s plans.

While ETTA is therefore in the process of trying to implement many of the Review Group’s recommendations, progress has been stifled by the poor relationship between the governing body of table tennis and the key DSOs, together with a reticence on the part of both to embrace fully the mainstreaming concept and the changes in function that this necessitates.

Perceptions of mainstreaming held by key actors indicates a lack of consensus on the aim of mainstreaming and the role each agency should play in the process. The ETTA’s view is that the employment of an officer to develop table tennis for disabled people illustrates its commitment. BTTAD do not believe that the ETTA are fully committed to mainstreaming disability sport and in particular to the involvement of disabled people in the decision making process.
7.5 FOOTBALL

The mainstream governing body and its role in football for disabled people

The Football Association is the governing body of football in England. The FA claims that there are approximately 3 million affiliated football players, 43,000 affiliated clubs, 2,200 leagues and 11,500 registered coaches (FA, 2002). The FA’s mission is to ‘use the power of football to build a better future’ and its aim is to ‘lead the successful development of football in England by working in partnership with key agencies to provide quality footballing opportunities for all’ (The FA, 2001:5) The FA generates 100% of its £70 million income from commercial activities (Survey, 2001), although in 2001/2, Sport England awarded £108,000 for football development projects and over £5 million was granted from Community Capital Lottery Awards (Sport England, 2002).

Despite its substantial income, football for disabled has not been a priority for the FA, nor has football been a priority sport for UK Sport and thus, disability football has not benefited from the funding available through the World Class Performance Programme. However, some DSOs such the English Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability, Cerebral Palsy Sport, the British Deaf Sports Council and the British Amputee and Les Autres Sports Association have played a crucial role in the provision and development of football for specific disability groups. More specifically these DSOs have selected and trained national football teams for blind, deaf, cerebral palesed and amputee footballers, without any support or involvement of the FA. For example, CP Sport have been the traditional providers of coaching opportunities for players with cerebral palsy and have been responsible for selecting and training the national CP football team. Also, since 1995 British Blind Sport has run a Partially Sighted Football League (BBS, 2003).

Until 1997 the DSOs developed football related activities almost entirely independent of the FA. That is not to suggest that DSOs did not seek the support of the FA, but it was not until 1998 that the FA demonstrated any real interest or commitment to disability football. Following a period of sustained lobbying by BSAD, UKSAPLD, CP Sport and BALASA, the FA in 1998 agreed to support the production of ‘Coaching Players with Learning Disabilities’ (Football Association, undated). This
publication was the result of a series of meetings between these DSOs and Robin Russell (the FA’s Director of Education). While a welcome contribution to the educational resources available to coaches, the publication of this manual did not lead to the significant shift in interest that some of the BSAD, UKSAPLD, CP Sport and BALASA had hoped for (Davis, Regional Development Officer for the FA, Interview, 2001).

However, Davis maintains that the FA is now fully committed to disability football a change that he believes was due to a range of contributory factors. In support of this assertion Davis referred to a number of recent occasions where the FA has responded positively to various requests for support to the disability football activities. For example, in July 1999 the coaches of the England learning disability football teams asked the FA for support to go to the European Championships. This came about at broadly the same time that a) the EFDS was established, b) that Adam Crozier became Chief Executive of the FA, c) that Davis (who has considerable experience of disability football) joined the FA, and d) that the FA’s Development Committee was established. The FA agreed to support the disability football team and to this end appointed to the team and funded a technical advisor, a manager, a coach and a physiotherapist. Shortly afterwards, the FA agreed to a request from the EFDS to match-fund the One 2 One Ability Counts football development programme. Established in 1999, the One 2 One project was implemented by the FA in partnership with the EFDS.

**Key policies: the development of the governing body’s club structure, events and coaching activities**

While the FA was not instrumental in the development of the Ability Counts programmes, it did, in consultation with the EFDS, produce a Football Development Strategy 2001-2006. The strategy stated that the FA aimed to lead the successful development of football in England, but recognised that not everyone has the opportunity to play, coach, manage, referee and spectate and as result developed a National Equity plan which sought to ‘remove the barriers or discrimination that may prevent opportunities for all’ (The Football Association, 2001:27). The Strategy specified aims and objectives designed to achieve greater equity and social inclusion for ethnic minorities, women and girls and disabled people. The Football Association
aimed to ‘become the world’s leading governing body in the development of Disability Football’ (The Football Association, 2001: 35). The FA outlined a series of objectives which demonstrated a clear commitment to embed the needs of disabled football players into the general duties of the FA. These objectives include a commitment to:

- establish a Football Association Disability Working Party (which includes the EFDS);

- establish County Disability Coaching Centres;

- produce, develop and agree a disability player pathway model / talent identification for males/females;

- work with EFDS and Youth Sports Trust and the Local Education Authorities to ensure every special school or Unit (within mainstream) delivers Soccability; and

- support six national disability squads – provide a technical advisor, kit, and medical support to each squad.

While this section of the Football Development Strategy detailed the FA’s aims and objectives for the development of ‘disability football’, many other sections (e.g. Coach Education, Community Provision and Competitive Structures) also identified objectives that related to the development of disability football. For example, the Coach Education section identified the need to establish ‘Coaching Disabled Footballers’ courses that are recognised by the FA and made available throughout the county Football Associations.

While the FA has concentrated much of its recent disability football development on establishing the national disability teams, One 2 One Ability Counts was initially focussed upon ‘grass roots players’, with a network of county football development officers involved in its implementation. One 2 One Ability Counts provides funding opportunities for professional clubs to offer regular training sessions to disabled
players. At the launch of One 2 One Ability Counts, Crozier (Chief Executive of the FA) stated that ‘football is the national game and should be available to everyone’ but highlighted that at present there was ‘an absence of structured development plans and stressed the need to make use of existing professional league clubs [such as Manchester United]’ (Crozier, 2002:a). By 2001 there were 34 professional clubs involved in the Ability Counts programme providing coaching and competitive match opportunities to disabled players. To support the programme, coaches attended a ‘Coaching Disabled Footballers’ course run by FA and the EFDS.

As indicated earlier, the FA has only recently taken on responsibility for disability football and now supports the national partially sighted, deaf, amputee, cerebral palsy and learning disability football teams. To indicate its commitment, on 29th November 2001, Crozier awarded England ‘caps’ to all players in the disability teams, in honour of their achievements over the previous year. Davis is hopeful that the national media coverage that such events afford, is likely to ‘encourage the young disabled kid to say, why can’t I do that’ (Davis, Interview, 2001). According to Davis the FA is aiming to ensure that if ‘the FA have a disabled player in this country that wants to play football they [the FA] give them the opportunity’ (Davis, Interview, 2001). Davis claims that the FA’s new ‘football for all’ ethic embraces the needs of the whole community. To this end, according to Davis, the FA are ‘trying to get the County Football Associations to take more responsibility for disability football’ initially by establishing ‘some kind of forum or group’ to find out the status of current provision (Davis, Interview, 2001).

Davis anticipates that the FA’s 2002 budget for disability football will exceed £400,000, some of which will fund the national teams, which hitherto was an expense incurred by the DSOs. Not only do the DSOs no longer have to fund these teams but they now enjoy the resources available to the able-bodied national sides and thus do not have to pay for flights, travel or kit bags (Davis, Interview, 2002). However, Davis is aware that some DSOs, such as ESAPLD and CP Sport, are relinquishing their responsibilities reluctantly, perhaps, he suggests, because they do not wish to lose the perks that international travel affords, and because they believe the FA will soon withdraw interest and the concomitant funding. While Davis indicates that he ‘can’t give anybody a guarantee that it [the FA’s commitment] will carry on, he believes that ‘it would not be in the FA’s interest to withdraw’ (Davis, Interview,
2001). He indicates that the ill feeling that would be caused by withdrawing from
disability football outweighs any of the financial benefits. Besides, Davis stresses,
‘disability football is now a part of the FA’s national strategy, and disabled people are
part of the national game’ (Davis, Interview, 2001).

The FA has focused most of its time and money on the development of the national
sides, because according to Davis there needs to be a ‘pinnacle’ for current or
potential players to aim for. Indeed he states if UEFA adopted responsibility for
disability football, its development would be global. In a recent European
Championship, England were the only disability football team to be supported by its
governing body. The FA provided the kit, the personnel and the resources to
demonstrate that this was one of its national sides. Davis states that their aim is to be
recognised by FIFA as ‘the world’s leading football governing body on the issues of
disability’. In this regard it is important to Davis that the national sides represent ‘the
best disabled players’. He recognises that in the short term this may not be the case
and has made it clear to the DSOs that current team players, would not be selected ‘if
they [the FA] do their job properly’ (Davis, Interview, 2001). In this regard the FA
has developed a Disability Player Pathway (see figure 4 overleaf) which provides a
model to identify how each of the FA’s programmes link to others and support the
England disability squads. While there is not a large participation base compared to
other countries, for example, Britain has 6 blind football teams, Spain has 48 and
Brazil 142, Britain is further forward than other countries in its support of the national
disability teams. In the last three years the FA has been applauded by the EFDS for its
commitment to the inclusion of disability football (Sport England, 2000).

**Decision-making processes: relationships with disabled people and disability
sport organisations**

The FA’s policy on disability football is the responsibility of its Disability Football
Working Group. This group reports to the football development committee, which ‘is
where the funding comes from and [it is the body that] makes decisions on policy’
(Davis, Interview, 2001). While the FA has responsibility for implementing the
disability football programme that forms a part of their overall drive for equity and
sport for all, the EFDS has made a significant contribution to the FA’s strategy.
Indeed although, as a result of the Ability Counts programme the relationship that the
FA has with the EFDS was imposed rather than sought, EFDS and members of the Disability Working Group now work closely with one of FA's Regional Managers. It is a concern for Patel (personal communication), however, that the FA still do not have an NDO specific to disability football. In addition, Patel is concerned that while some of the FA's Regional officers work closely with EFDS Regional Managers on matters relating to the Ability Counts programme, other do not.

Figure 4 The Football Association's Disabled Player Pathway

(The Football Association, 2001:7)

The FA indicates that it uses informal contacts to involve disabled people in the decision making process (Survey, 2001). However, there is little evidence to suggest that disabled people have played any part in the decision making process other than
through their relationship with the EFDS. In other words the EFDS provide the FA with ‘disability expertise’ and the FA regard it to be EFDS’s responsibility to ensure that this advice reflects disabled people’s needs. As discussed in Chapter 6, the extent to which EFDS represent disabled peoples’ or DSOs’ views is contentious.

There is a formal relationship between the FA and the EFDS. They meet regularly to discuss the ‘delivery of grass roots programmes’ (Survey, 2001) and work closely in the development and promotion of regional opportunities. For example, the London Sport Forum (London region of EFDS) promote on their website a list of professional football clubs offering monthly coaching sessions specifically designed for people with a physical impairment, a visual impairment, a learning disability and wheelchair users. The list includes Arsenal, Brentford, Fulham, and Queens Park Rangers (London Sports Forum, 2003).

As far as Davis is concerned, prior to the establishment of the EFDS there were too many different groups but now the EFDS has been established, he is clear that it is the lead agency. Davis stresses the importance of the FA’s relationship with the EFDS when he states that ‘he would not do anything to jeopardise that [their relationship with the EFDS] because they are, for us, the lead organisation and the one we would always go to’ (Davis, Interview, 2001). In an article for the EFDS’s Inclusive Sport magazine, Crozier maintains that the importance of the FA’s relationship with EFDS cannot be overemphasised as he believes that the EFDS ‘act as a conduit between the Football Association and the National Disability Sport Organisations’ (Crozier, 2002b: 10). Crozier also contends that the partnership between the FA, EFDS and One 2 One has been ‘a great success’ and ‘promotes a model that could be used by other governing bodies’ (Crozier, 2002b:10).

The FA do work with and through DSOs other than EFDS though, typically, the relationship is based on the DSOs ability to identify disabled football players and disability sport administrators at a regional and local level. However, according to Davis some of these relationships are rather tense, mainly because as Davis (Interview, 2001) suggests, DSOs have traditionally had very different views and rarely work in close cooperation which makes it difficult for the mainstream governing body. For example, at the end of 2002, separate from the coordinating efforts of the FA, CP Sport began to develop a regional network of football coaches. Davis maintains that the FA would like the DSOs to work with them, but ‘the FA do
not need them [DSOs]’, as he insists that the FA will continue to develop its disability football programme whether the DSOs support them or not (Davis, Interview, 2001).

However, Patel (EFDS) is concerned that recent successes may stall if the FA’s commitment is not maintained. According to Patel there are now approximately 40 professional clubs and 2,000 coaches which provide football opportunities for disabled people but the FA has recently taken the decision to take full responsibility without the full cooperation of EFDS. As a result, according to Patel (personal communication, 2003) EFDS has no details of what activities are in progress, which clubs are involved, or how to contact players or coaches (Patel, personal communication, 2003). Patel maintains while the FA are now progressing with some excellent mainstreaming work, the FA only became involved after the Ability Counts programme had been written and the funding from Sports Match and One 2 One had been secured (Patel, personal communication, 2003). According to Patel, Chaytors (Chief Executive of the EFDS) and Crozier (Chief Executive of the FA) were close friends who had worked together when in previous positions. Patel goes on to suggest that this close personal relationship had a profound impact on the emerging relationship between the FA and EFDS.

By the end of 2002 EFDS had developed a close relationship with the FA but key EFDS officers were expressing concern over the FA’s long-term financial commitment to disability football (Patel, personal communication, 2003). Their concern was not ill founded. At an EFDS Board of Directors meeting in June 2002, Chaytors reported that the ‘FA had reluctantly had to terminate the contract of two staff on the [Ability Counts disability football] scheme’ and that EFDS were ‘awaiting from the FA, confirmation of how they [FA] would run the Ability Counts scheme’ (EFDS, 2002, June).

The mainstream governing body’s values towards mainstreaming

Davis claims that ‘DSOs should be a part of the system designed to provide opportunities to their members’ but maintains that the FA as the governing body for football should be the lead agency. While he is confident that the FA has made a major impact on football for disabled people as it now supports six disability football
teams including the blind, amputee, learning disabled, deaf, and cerebral palsy teams, he recognises that 'they [the FA] need to do a lot more work before disability provision becomes part of the normal programme' (Davis, Interview, 2001). This is illustrated by Davis's admission that a query related to disability football is normally answered by himself or it is passed on to the EFDS. The provision and knowledge of football for disabled people is not yet embedded in the general duties of all FA staff indicating that staff in the FA do not consider disability football to be as important or as high a priority as football for non-disabled people.

Ultimately Davis believes that the FA may not need the EFDS but currently the FA 'have the football knowledge' and 'the EFDS the disability expertise', and help 'us [the FA] dealing with the problems there are with disability (Davis, Interview, 2001). This is an important role for the EFDS Davis suggests, as 'many of their officers [the FA's] have never worked with disabled people' (Davis, Interview, 2001). There may always be a role for the DSOs 'checking that we [the FA] are doing it right' but is certain that it should be the FA as the governing body that takes full responsibility (Davis, Interview, 2001). Davis's values toward mainstreaming clearly illustrate a clear commitment to address the inequity in sport. He firmly believes that it is the FA's role to provide similar football opportunities for disabled people as they do non-disabled people. To illustrate his belief in mainstreaming, Davis suggests that he would encourage disabled people to join a mainstream non-disabled team, and claims that the FA should not only support individuals in mainstream teams but also provide a structure in which disabled people can play for teams within leagues dedicated specifically to disabled players.

Similar to the values toward mainstreaming within table tennis there is significant differences between the values of the officers particularly concerned with the development of disability sport ands the values of the general NGB officer. Not only do officers with a specific interest in disability sport such as Davis provide the NGBs such as the FA with a resource to deal with all matters relating to disability but they also highlight the disparity between their values and the values of the rest of the organisation toward mainstreaming.
Summary

Compared to other sports such as swimming and athletics, football has not achieved a high status within the activities of the DSOs. While DSOs such as the ESAPLD, CP Sport and BALASA ran their own national teams, until 2000 the Football Association played almost no part in the development of disability football. Although the DSOs had lobbied the FA in the early nineties, the significant increase in the support to the development of disability football is the result of strong relationships between EFDS and the FA. However, since 2003 the FA has lost its relationship with the EFDS deciding to be the main agency and does not need the support of the EFDS.

The reasons for the shift in policy toward disability football is less to do with a policy commitment instigated by key decision makers with the FA, than it was the result of an opportunity that they were presented with. While previous lobbying efforts by DSOs had been unsuccessful, the significant investment of the FA to mainstream disability sport is the result of a commercial telecommunication company, the personal friendship of key individuals in the EFDS and the FA, and the commitment to disability football on the part of one FA officer.

The FA now includes the needs of disabled football players in its coaching and player development opportunities. The FA has a regional development officer who has taken on responsibility for disability football and in close cooperation with EFDS the FA has begun to establish and support a pathway of opportunity from local to regional and national levels. Moreover while the FA was originally intent on working through the EFDS who instigated what became a national football development programme (Ability Counts), the FA has recently decided to develop and implement its disability football strategy without the the support of the EFDS or other DSOs. Despite its relatively recent involvement the FA has therefore met almost all of the Minister’s recommendations. It should be noted that the FA’s involvement in disability football and the developments that subsequently emerged are the result of a series of opportune events and are based on a set of fragile relationships that may indicate the lack of long term policy commitment

However, the FA’s failure to retain a close relationship with the DSOs and the resignation of Crozier (Chief Executive of the FA) suggest that the future of disability
football is uncertain. Current cost cutting exercises and the personal priorities of a new Chief Executive may prevent the FA from fully achieving its mainstreaming policies. Moreover, given the current uncertainty surrounding the FA’s commitment, the DSOs may regain their previous role as the key providers of disability football at a national level.

The FA has a paternalistic perception of mainstreaming. Similar to the ASA, the FA indicate in their policies that they are the governing body of football and should, therefore, cater for disabled people. The FA do not, however, seem to value the involvement of the DSOs or disabled people in their developments. The assertion that they [the FA] should be the leaders of disability football is one which they will only defend when it is in their interests to do so.
7.6 ATHLETICS

The mainstream governing body and its role in athletics for disabled people

Following what is described by David Moorcroft (Chief Executive of UK Athletics) as many years of uncertainty and dissatisfaction with the organisation of athletics in Britain and the resultant demise of the British Athletic Federation, in October 1997, UK Athletics was formed as the new governing body for athletics (UKA, 2002). He said of its formation ‘here is a unique opportunity for the sport to take an in-depth look at itself...so that we [UKA] emerge stronger...and with a clear strategy’ (Moorcroft, 2001).

In the UKA document ‘Fun to Fulfilment—the Development of Athletics in the UK: 2000-2005’, the sport’s vision for the future and the strategies the UKA intend to employ are set out. The document suggests that there are fewer people joining athletics clubs and lower standards of competition in some events than twenty years ago. UKA recognises that ‘athletics must now survive in a continually changing and increasingly competitive sporting and social context’ (UKA, 2000:5).

‘Fun to Fulfilment’ sets out to raise the profile of athletics and to increase the participation and retention of athletes. It intends to achieve these objectives with the support of local schools and education authorities, local clubs, and the development plans of the four home countries. Thus, while UK Athletics is the umbrella body of athletics in the UK, each of the Home Counties and thus the Amateur Athletic Association of England (AAAE) is, within England, responsible for the implementation of its development strategy. UK Athletics employs 30 full-time and 10 part-time able-bodied officers and 1 part time disabled officer. UKA employs two full-time officers with responsibility for the development and co-ordination of elite disability athletics (Survey, 2001).

The sport of athletics (though not necessarily through UKA) was awarded £293,000 by Sport England and over £3 million pounds by Community Capital Lottery Awards in 2001/2. As a Paralympic priority one sport, UKA received a total of £3,604,467 from April 1998 to December 2000 and, in 2001/2, disability athletics received £986,000 from the Lottery for its UK Sport World Class Performance Plans (UK,
UK Athletics also received funding support from BBC Sport, Norwich Union, Reebok and other sponsors as well as income from its own activities (UKA, 2002).

In the mid 1990s, Paralympic athlete Tanni Grey-Thompson was employed by UKA to work on the development of athletics. However, while athletics has been a popular and high profile disability sport, regional and national competitions have typically been delivered by the Disability Sports Organisations (Price, Interview, 2000; Bright, Interview, 2001; Neale, Interview, 2001). DSOs such as the British Paraplegic Sports Society, British Wheelchair Sports Foundation and the British Sport Association for the Disabled have played a crucial role in the development and delivery of athletics events specifically dedicated to regional and national competition. For example BSAD ran a series of regional and national junior and senior athletics championships (BSAD, 1989; 1995). Indeed DSOs such as BSAD and BWSF established sub-groups or committees of affiliated organisations such as British Wheelchair Sports Foundation’s British Wheelchair Racing Association and the National Wheelchair Tennis Association (BWSF, 2003; McElhatton, personal communication, 2003).

In June 1999, UKA assumed responsibility for the management of disability athletics’ World Class Performance Plans (WCPP), the purpose of which was to provide levels of support for Paralympic athletes similar to those received by able bodied Olympic athletes. In 1999 UKA employed Ken Kelly as a Technical Director to take responsibility for the WCPP and the overall development of elite level disability athletics (Kelly, personal communication, 2002). While the employment of Kelly was welcomed by the DSOs and Sport England, these organisations were concerned that the communication had remained poor between UKA and the DSOs (Neale, Interview, 2001, Nichol, interview, 2001, Chaytors, Interview, 2001).

Key policies: the development of the governing body’s club structure, events and coaching activities

In ‘Fun to Fulfilment’ UKA states that it intends to ‘ensure that strong equity principles permeate all areas of athletics through the production and delivery of a UK Equity Action Plan’ (UKA, 2000: 11). To this end and with the co-operation of the home countries, the UKA aims to ‘break down barriers and assist in the greater
participation and achievement from people with disabilities' (UKA, 2000:14). It also sets out to increase the number of disabled people working in coaching and officiating to a minimum of 15%. The 'Equity Plan' that was to be launched by 2001 was one of 6 strategic documents aimed at improving all of its services to underrepresented groups. For example, the Education and Training manager for the UKA stresses that 'all of the education and training course are athlete-centred...it doesn’t matter about ability or disability of the athlete...we try to meet individual needs' (Stills, UKA National Development Officer, Interview, 2001). UKA also developed a series of programmes designed to improve the access of disabled people to athletics clubs and coaching sessions. For example, Gosford Athletics Club in partnership with local special schools in Oxford, encouraged children to attend extra curricula sports hall athletics sessions. In 2000 Sport England commended UKA for the Sports Hall Athletics and Norwich Shine Awards, which sought to 'adapt activities and equipment for certain impaired groups' (Sport England, 2000:30).

As indicated earlier, while the UKA sets the overall policy direction the Amateur Athletics Association for England (AAAE) implement national policy in conjunction with key partners. Thus, the AAAE’s development plan states that it ‘embraces the policy set out by the UKA’ and ‘identifies clear objectives with prescribed time scales for delivery’ (AAAE, 2001:2). The AAAE details clear objectives relating to the development of athletics in England for disabled people. For example, the AAAE claims it will provide grant aid to clubs and local authorities to develop fact sheets with examples of good practice in athletics for disabled people (AAAE: 2001:11). A further example of the AAAE delivery of the UKA commitment to equity, is reflected in its objective to ‘include 50% of annually held disability events in the annual officiating calendar by 2003...and 100% by 2005’ (AAAE, 2001:16). As well as those objectives that are specific to disability athletics, the AAAE has highlighted objectives that have significance to equity issues more generally. For example the AAAE have highlighted the objective to ‘increase the number of qualified and practising coaches from underrepresented groups’, as this attempts to address inequities and needs the support of key partners (AAAE, 2001:15).

The EFDS are identified as the key partner that the AAAE is working with to develop athletics for disabled people. However according to Stills (UKA’s National Development Officer for Education and Training, Interview, 2001), the UKA do not
have a strong relationship with the EFDS at a national level on matters other than those related to performance. While acknowledging that the UKA ought to be working with the DSOs on the development of education and training, Stills claims she was ‘not sure which one [DSO] to approach’ (Stills, Interview, 2001). Patel, as the EFDS officer responsible for working with UKA, stresses, however, that despite numerous meetings between EFDS and UKA little progress has been made. According to Patel (personal communication, 2003), the UKA has made a ‘policy’ commitment to the development of disability athletics but as yet its senior officers have ‘failed to acknowledge that the responsibility for leading and resourcing coaching development for disability athletics lies with UKA’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003). Patel stresses that, similar to the situation within the ASA, the EFDS has met to agree targets, but there has been little real progress. For example, the Norwich Union Funded Sports Hall Athletics programme had the potential to improve opportunities for disabled children within mainstream athletics clubs, yet this potential has not been realised. Patel claims that ‘email after email has been ignored by UKA’s national officers and EFDS are frustrated and confused, unsure who in the UKA is responsible for the development of disability athletics (Patel, personal communication, 2003). According to Patel ‘at a glance the high profile national and international events such as the 2002 Commonwealth Games or the 2000 Paralympics indicate that mainstreaming has been achieved’ but, in reality the progress made by UKA [and other governing bodies] in taking responsibility for disability athletics has been ‘disappointing’ (Patel, personal communication, 2003).

**Decision-making processes: relationships with disabled people and disability sport organisations**

While UKA’s role as the policy-making body for British Athletics may be clear, according to Stills the policy support teams have tended to ‘build walls between each of the teams’ (Stills, Interview, 2001). She suggests, for example, that Kelly (the Technical Director for Disability Athletics) is a part of the policy support team for ‘Performance Athletes Services’ which is isolated from the Development policy support teams and the World Class Start and Potential Programmes that strive to include disabled athletes (Stills, Interview, 2001). Stills (2001) claims that UKA officers are striving to ‘include the needs of disabled athletes but do not feel they have got enough expertise …and need somebody [within the development section of UKA]
who is doing the same job that the Technical Director is doing within Performance' (Stills, Interview, 2001). Kelly confirms that his role is specifically and exclusively focussed on elite athletes, and despite his knowledge and expertise in disability sport his role is not to the support UKA’s mainstreaming of disability athletics (Kelly, personal communication, 2002).

In this regard, it is interesting to note that despite the intention to be inclusive, queries relating to the participation of disabled people in athletics are generally dealt with by Kelly (UKA’s Technical Director for Disability Athletics) or it is passed on to the EFDS, indicating that disability awareness is still very limited in the organisation (Survey, 2001).

The mainstream governing body’s values towards mainstreaming

Kelly (UKA’s Technical Director responsible for disability athletics) believes that DSOs and governing bodies of disability sport should ‘develop foundation opportunities’ and that NGBs should concentrate specifically on developing ‘performance and excellence’ (Kelly, personal communication, 2002). This perspective is now reflected in the position in which UKA finds itself (Stills, Interview, 2001; Kelly, personal communication, 2002). In other words, despite the UKA’s stated intention to develop athletics equitably, the one employee with a specific remit for disability is focused exclusively on elite performance and the remainder of UKA’s activities seem without commitment to the inclusion of disabled athletes. Moreover, Kelly confirms that despite the intention to launch an Equity Plan in 2001, by September 2002, it had still not been produced (Kelly, personal communication, 2002).

Summary

Athletics is a popular and well-established sport within the portfolio of development activity and events provided by the DSOs. UKA as the mainstream governing body has played a peripheral role in these developments at the local and regional level. However, athletics has embraced the administration of elite level disability athletics within its main duties. While Sport England and the EFDS has encouraged UKA to
make concerted efforts in adopting a strategic long-term approach to disability athletics, the DSOs remain the main providers.

UKA is in a state of organisational transition within which athletics for disabled people is given little attention. The only policy shift toward mainstreaming in athletics is at the elite level. The reason for this interest is most likely derived from the funding opportunities provided by the World Class Performance Planning and the relatively simple set of relationships within disability sport at the elite national levels.

UKA has implemented few of the Minister for Sport Review Group’s recommendations. While UKA has published a policy relating to the mainstreaming of disability athletics, the infrastructure within the governing body lacks commitment and the relationships between the governing body and key disability sport organisations lacks cohesion. UKA has not developed strong links with the EFDS or the DSOs, other than by supporting (rather than leading) the DSOs events and development programmes. Unlike the FA, ETTA or the ASA, UKA do not have officers dedicated to the development of disability athletics (at a national level), nor does it enjoy the significant commitment and interest of senior officers. Consequently, there are no successful development programmes such as Table Tennis’s Premier Club ability or Football’s Ability Counts and the DSOs continue to be lead agencies in the provision and coordination of athletics.

UKA’s values toward mainstream demonstrate the lack of status that it affords disability sport. In addition, the DSOs’ continued delivery of athletics events and activities and their unwillingness to encourage UKA to take on more responsibility for disability sport again illustrates the limited commitment to mainstreaming by both DSOs and NGBs.
The mainstream governing body and its role in wheelchair basketball for disabled people

The examination of wheelchair basketball reveals a very different pattern of roles, policies, relationships and values to the other sports reviewed so far in this case study. The English Basketball Association (EBA) is the mainstream governing body for (ambulant/running) basketball in England. Founded in 1936 the EBA is an organisation of member clubs and players who elect an executive board of directors. The EBA claim that it has 15 members on its Executive Board and employs 23 full-time and 1 part-time able-bodied officer and 2 full-time and 1 part-time disabled officers (Survey, 2001). The mission of the EBA is to 'create and increase access to sustainable, affordable and regular participation in basketball and develop a structure which enables all players to achieve their full potential in basketball and improve international performance' (English Basketball Association, 2001a: 1).

With only 17% of its income from subscriptions and 34% from Sport England the EBA obtains nearly half of its funds from commercial activities (Survey, 2001). The sport of basketball received £473,000 from Sport England and £2.5 million from Community Capital Lottery Awards. While Basketball was not a priority sport of UK Sport, between July 1999 and March 2000 Wheelchair Basketball received £252,426 from the Lottery for its UK Sport World Class Performance Plan and between October 1997 and December 2000 it received a total of £1,231,302 (UK Sport, 2000). In 2001/2 wheelchair basketball received £407,766 for its World Class Performance Plan and £20,000 exchequer funding in support of the women's wheelchair and junior wheelchair programme (UK Sport 2002). Wheelchair Basketball is currently considered as a Paralympic 'priority four' sport as the athletes are considered as 'having the potential to win a medal in Athens 2004' (UK Sport, 2002: 29).

In Strohkendle’s history of wheelchair basketball, he details the significant influence that Guttmann had on both its creation and development. According to Craven (President International Wheelchair Basketball Association and co-founder of the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association), 'Guttmann has his own classification system' and notes that 'the patronising attitude of Guttmann and his
medical staff led to the exclusion of some athletes with disabilities from wheelchair sports programmes' (Craven, Interview, 2001). However, Craven stresses that in spite of Guttmann’s involvement, unlike other sports that were developed in and since the 1940’s, wheelchair basketball ‘was created by disabled people and run by wheelchair basketball players’, a situation he claims that cannot be said to exist in athletics or swimming. Craven states that Guttmann thought this was ‘good for people in wheelchairs to get physically fit’ but he didn’t have ‘a real vision for sport’ (Craven, Interview, 2001). Moreover, according to Craven, when the patients became basketball players, Guttmann ‘didn’t handle it very well’ and the basketball players soon ‘took control of their own affairs’ (Craven, Interview, 2001).

Wheelchair polo was the first sport to be introduced in 1946 at Stoke Mandeville by Sir Ludwig Guttmann (Strohkendle, 1996). In 1947 polo was replaced by netball, which Strohkendle described as a distant cousin of wheelchair basketball. According to Strohkendle, wheelchair basketball was first played in the USA when war injured soldiers adapted the running game to a game on four wheels. While the International Stoke Mandeville Games soon became the ‘Mecca’ for disability sport, in the 1952 Games, according to Strohkendle (1996:17), the highly skilled American side were surprised to have to play what was more like ‘netball in a car park’. Craven recalls a team member from the Pan Am Jets on seeing the netball posts, asking ‘why have you got no back on your nets’ (Craven, Interview, 2001). Craven claims that in Britain between 1948 and 1954 ‘it was netball... and then it became basketball in 1955’ (Craven, Interview, 2001).

The Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball League was formed in the late 1960s, and soon after, the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association was established (Craven, Interview, Interview, 2001; GBWBA, 2002). Similar to other wheelchair sports associations, it was affiliated to the British Paraplegic Sports Society (later to become the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation). GBWBA was established to encourage and promote the sport of wheelchair basketball with the object of improving conditions of life and to assist in their [people with severe permanent disability in one of both of their lower extremities] integration into society (GBWBA, 2002).
The GBWBA states that it has the powers:

1) To act as the sole controller and governing body of the game of wheelchair basketball;
2) To represent the view of The Association [GBWBA] at international wheelchair basketball meetings;
3) To be the sole arbiter of all questions pertaining to wheelchair basketball;
4) To be actively involved in any discussions of laws, rules and notes pertaining to wheelchair basketball by making representation to the International Wheelchair Basketball Federation;
5) To make direct links with the running basketball association [EBA] in the home countries where The Association (GBWBA) is represented;
6) To provide players for the Great Britain representative sides;
7) To organise and govern competitions within the boundaries of The Association;
8) To raise funds and invite contributions from any person or persons whatsoever by way of subscriptions, donations as otherwise provided that The Association shall not undertake any permanent trading activities in raising funds for its charitable objects; and
9) To do all such lawful things as shall further the objects of The Association. (GBWBA, 2002: 1)

GBWBA’s ‘objects’ provide a series of statements detailing its role and function and clearly demonstrate that the Association is the governing body for wheelchair basketball and that the governing body of running basketball (EBA) is just another organisation, like BWSF with which it has a close relationship.

At the time that GBWBA was established, according to Craven ‘there was no movement for us [GBWBA] to join the EBA’ (Craven, Interview, 2001). He stated that the only contact between GBWBA and EBA was through the need to identify referees (who were registered with EBA) for officiating at wheelchair basketball matches. The GBWBA is responsible for administering a national league, cup competitions and tournaments (GBWBA, 2002. While the EBA is beginning to develop opportunities in basketball for people with a learning disability and deaf
people, the sport of wheelchair basketball has its own recognised governing body that is separate from the mainstream governing body of (ambulant) basketball.

**Key policies: the development of the governing body's club structure, events and coaching activities**

As with many sports, DSOs such as BSAD have a long history of providing competitive wheelchair basketball opportunities. For example, in 1988 BSAD hosted its National Junior Championship attracting a team from each of its ten regions (BSAD, 1989:137). Although there are examples of basketball initiatives, events and activities run by DSOs and other voluntary organisations, the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association is the only organisation recognised by Sport England as a governing body of basketball for disabled people. There have been Paralympic events for wheelchair athletes since 1960 and events for athletes with a learning disability since 2000 (British Paralympic Association, 2002). The mens GB wheelchair basketball team finished 4th in the Paralympics 2000 and will receive £420,000 directly from the Lottery for its World Class Performance Plans (UK Sport, 2002). The World Class Performance Plan funds three officers including a Performance Director, a National Coach, and a Sports Science officer. The GBWBA also employ (through the EBA) a full-time National Development Officer working specifically on the development of wheelchair basketball.

While there are examples of the EBA assisting in the development of opportunities for other disability groups through their regional officers and with the support of the DSOs, the EBA’s only commitment to the development of disability sport is in its support of wheelchair basketball through the GBWBA. However, according to Patel (National Development Officer of the EFDS), EBA has recently expressed a commitment to develop basketball for learning disabled people. While the EBA provide support to the GBWBA in their line management of the GBWBA’s National Development Officer, the GBWBA is a separate and discrete body. Jones (Acting Chief Executive of the EBA) suggests that the EBA’s relationship with the GBWBA is an appropriate one, as wheelchair basketball is a separate sport and therefore should have a separate governing body. Jones stresses that their (EBA’s) current priority is wheelchair basketball as players have a ‘pathway’ and an ‘exit route’ in the various teams and structures that are coordinated by the GBWBA (Jones, personal
communication). To this end members of the EBA’s professional staff meet formally every few months with the GBWBA to discuss the ‘wheelchair game’. There are no such exit routes for disabled people who have an interest in ambulant basketball. In this regard Jones claims that while there may be development activities for other disability groups in the regions, such as for the deaf and the learning disabled, there are no such developments at a national level.

Given the lack of attention in the EBA development plan (EBA, 2002) to disabled players who are not eligible or interested in wheelchair basketball, it is worth noting that EBA has an Equal Opportunities policy which claims that as a governing body all potential players should be treated fairly. It states that the EBA is ‘responsible for ensuring that all those who wish to participate in the sport of basketball are treated on an equal basis ...irrespective of age, gender, marital status, ethnic origin, disability or religious persuasion’ (EBA, 2001). The Equal Opportunities statement also insists that there be open access by all providing bodies (i.e. their affiliated associations) to its competitions and schemes’, yet no reference is made to the development of opportunities in basketball for ambulant disabled people (EBA, 2001). The Development Plan focuses on achieving, 1) medal winning success, 2) excellent systems and structures, 3) strong sustainable clubs, and 4) a greater resource base. There is no evidence, however, to indicate implementation of the equal opportunities rhetoric contained within the Plan.

Originally the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball League was not affiliated to the International Stoke Mandeville Games Federation because the League was part of the British Paraplegic Sports Society (which became British Wheelchair Sports Foundation) (Craven, Interview, 2001). The GBWBA is still a member of the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation but Craven thinks that is because ‘they [the BWSF] want us rather than we need them’(Craven, Interview, 2001). As discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, BWSF is the national organisation for wheelchair sport in the UK providing, promoting and developing opportunities for men, women and disabled children to participate in recreational and competitive wheelchair sport. BWSF organises and hosts major sports events at the national wheelchair sport centre in Stoke Mandeville and BWSF also acts as the umbrella body for 17 different wheelchair sports association of which GBWBA is one.
Decision-making: relationships with disabled people and disability sport organisations

Craven insists that even though they developed a strong relationship with the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation and have continued to work with some DSOs on junior events, the GBWBA is recognised as the governing body by Sport England and UK Sport and as such do not need other DSOs. Currently the Executive Committee of the GBWBA, which is made up predominantly of wheelchair basketball players, ‘decides on policy and what is good for the game’ (Craven, Interview, 2001). However, Craven recalls how, in the 1980s, the GBWBA ‘were forced [by UK Sport] to go in with the EBA ‘to access government funding’ (Craven, Interview, 2001).

Similar pressure was exerted by Sport England in 1997 when member organisations of the EBA (including the GBWBA) were invited to a meeting to discuss their development plans. Craven recalls how the Chief Executive of the EBA recognised the benefit of GBWBA submitting their own World Class Performance Plans and recommended that GBWBA continue to develop its relationship with EBA as the EBA ‘might be able to learn something’ (Craven Interview, 2001). The GBWBA were subsequently awarded a World Class Performance grant but for Craven the letter that confirmed the grant was more important than the money awarded. Craven claims that ‘it wasn’t the money for me, it was the second line’ which stated that UK Sport had ‘decided to Award the money to the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association – the governing body of the sport in Great Britain’ (Craven, Interview, 2001).

Notwithstanding what Craven believes to be a positive relationship with EBA, he contends that the GBWBA has often had problems with EBA, the DSOs and the British Paralympic Association. Craven believes this is because ‘we [the GBWBA] are our own masters’ and do not need the structures and support that others sports may need (Craven, Interview, 2001). The EBA’s Executive Board makes the decisions regarding all aspects of the running game, and any matters relating to Wheelchair Basketball are deferred and addressed by the GBWBA. There appears to be no involvement of any other disability organisations in the decision-making processes of the EBA other than through the GBWBA. A clear illustration of the autonomy that GBWBA enjoys is provided by the funding arrangement for wheelchair basketball’s
national teams. The funding from UK Sport for the World Class Performance Plans are administered through the Great Britain Wheelchair Association, rather than the English Basketball Association.

As a result of the autonomous status they enjoy as the recognised governing bodies, the GBWBA and the EBA work together in areas where they feel it is helpful but, according to Craven, are not obliged to do so. Patel (EFDS) concurs with Craven's analysis of the relationship between GBWBA and EBA, claiming that the GBWBA is an extremely well organised governing body and that wheelchair basketball players are unlikely to gain from a closer working relationship with the mainstream governing body. Moreover, in agreement with Craven (GBWBA) and Jones (EBA) and contrary to EFDS's policy on mainstreaming, Patel would not encourage the mainstream governing body to take greater responsibility for wheelchair basketball.

**The mainstream governing body's values towards mainstreaming**

The EBA believes that the responsibility for the development of disabled players' competitions, coaching and international representation lay with both the mainstream governing bodies and disability sport governing bodies (Survey, 2001). The EBA consider the DSOs role as giving 'advice in specialist skills' rather than taking responsibility for development (Survey, 2001).

It is interesting to note that the EBA believes that 'mainstream bodies are not doing enough' and that 'disabled people should be more in control of organisations meant to serve them' (Survey, 2001). However, despite the commitment made in their equal opportunities statement, there is no indication in either their development plan or from the Chief Executive that attempts are being made to, 1) make the running game more accessible to disabled people, and 2), involve disabled people in the decision making process (Jones, personal communication, 2002).

Craven is satisfied that the most appropriate model for wheelchair basketball is to have as they do now, a separate autonomous body recognised as the governing body for that sport. He does not believe that the GBWBA needs an organisation such as the EFDS and, therefore, does not have a relationship with them. However, concurring with Jones (personal communication, 2002), Craven (2001) suggests that DSOs have
a role to play in developing opportunities at the local level. Craven (2001) believes that other sports may not be as advanced as the GBWBA or, due to other differences in circumstances, may gain from a closer relationship with the governing body of an able bodied sport. However, Craven stresses that ‘if they [a specific sport organisation for disabled people] think that by going to another organisation, that organisation is going to do for them what they couldn’t do for themselves, they can forget it’ (Craven Interview, 2001). Craven goes on to suggest that mainstream sports organisations have ‘got enough troubles of their own’ and puts forward the view, that the disability sport organisation or governing body of a disability sport ‘has got to get its own act together first’ (Craven, Interview, 2001). He stresses that there ‘has got to be contributions from both sides’ (Craven Interview, 2001). In Craven’s view however, it may be in the interests of the disability sport organisation to retain control. Reflecting on what Craven perceives as the success of the GBWBA, he postulates that if ‘the GBWBA had been part of the disability organisation...requiring the assistance of the EBA, it would have been an absolute disaster’ (Craven Interview, 2001).

There is certainly a divergence of views between the GBWBA and the EBA on key issues relating to the development of disability sport. For example, while the EBA indicate that the Paralympic events should shift into the Olympics (Survey, 2001), Craven believes that this would be a disaster for disability sport. While he recognises that ‘nearly all of the paralympians would want to play in the Olympics’, Craven claims that they ‘wouldn’t have thought of the consequences’. In Craven’s view wheelchair basketball, similar to the Paralympics, should keep its own identity. Craven now has the opportunity to exert significant influence on the development of wheelchair basketball, and disability sport generally, as he was elected as Chairman of the International Paralympic Committee in 2002.

Summary

The policies, policy-making processes, values and general administrative arrangements within wheelchair basketball are substantially different to those examined in other sports so far. Wheelchair basketball has its own governing body, and while the GBWBA has relationships with DSOs and NGBs it is as autonomous and self reliant as any sports specific governing body. The GBWBA is, however, only concerned with wheelchair players and the mainstream governing body (EBA) is
generally inactive in taking responsibility for the development of basketball for other impairment groups such as the deaf and people with learning disabilities.

During the initial World Class Performance Planning discussions, the GBWBA experienced pressure to work more closely with the English Basketball Association (the mainstream governing body of running basketball). However, in general, Sport England have been supportive of the GBWBA’s administration and have made no further attempts to mainstream wheelchair basketball.

With regard to the Minister for Sport Review Group’s recommendations for mainstreaming, it would be fair to say that none of these have been met, yet Sport England, the EFDS, EBA and GBWBA are all satisfied that roles, responsibilities and organisational relationships are suitable and appropriate for the sport. While key actors in wheelchair basketball have similar values of mainstreaming, these values and beliefs contradict the general principles of mainstreaming as determined by the Minister for Sport Review Group as well as the policies of Sport England and EFDS.

Wheelchair basketball reflects a set of relationships and roles expected in a more tightly organised policy community which is ironic given this coherence is within a segregationist rather than integrationist (mainstreamed) construct. The study of wheelchair basketball and of the other sports examined thus far indicates the diversity in structures, relationships, and values within each sport and the inconsistent approach and involvement of EFDS and Sport England, characteristics which highlight the messiness within the disability sport policy.
The mainstream governing body and its role in boccia for disabled people

Boccia is an aiming game that was based on a 16th Century Greek ball tossing game. It was designed for physically impaired disabled people and specifically people with cerebral palsy. The objective of the game is to throw leather balls (the size of tennis balls) as close to the white target ball (jack) as possible. While it became a Paralympic event in 1982 (open only to people with cerebral palsy who use a wheelchair), it is also played at a local, regional and national level by people with a wide range of impairments. However, despite its increasing popularity particularly amongst young disabled people, there has never been a recognised governing body of boccia (Hughes, CP Sport, 2003, personal communication).

The organisation of boccia in England has a turbulent history. While there have been attempts as recent as in 2001 to establish a national governing body for boccia that is recognised by Sport England, for the most part, responsibility for its development and organisation has remained with Cerebral Palsy Sport. There has not been an officer in any organisation (mainstream or disability sport) with a specific responsibility for boccia, but CP Sport has one full time officer responsible for a range of sports which includes boccia.

The origins of boccia in England lay with the competitions organised on behalf of CP Sport, by volunteers and students from Nonnington Training College. These competitions brought together a number of different groups from establishments run by the Spastics Society and provided sporting activities such as running, throwing, swimming, slalom and tri-cycling. As the range of activities expanded (and included boccia), CP Sport’s competitive programme for people with cerebral palsy began to attract greater interest from around the country as well as abroad (Cerebral Palsy Sport, 2003).

The 1970s saw a significant increase in regional and national events run by CP Sport which encouraged athletes with cerebral palsy to participate and compete. These national developments were mirrored by the emergence of international federations that coordinated events for people with cerebral palsy and other disabilities than those
catered for by the International Stoke Mandeville Games Federation. CP Sport continued to hold its Robin Hood Games in Nottingham and in 1999 organised the first European Championships. CP Sport has also continued to operate a full nationwide menu of regional sports events, a National Games and national training squads in as many as seven different sports including boccia. According to Hodgkins (the EFDS Officer responsible for boccia) CP Sport ‘has established and have controlled boccia’, they have ‘designed the rules, administered the coaching and the competitions’ (Hodgkins, Interview, 2000).

Since its early development, Pearce (Paralympic boccia player and athletes’ representative on the International Boccia Federation) claims that the interest and profile of boccia has changed (Pearce, Interview, 2001). Pearce contends that boccia was ‘originally regarded as a second rate sport’ but has since enjoyed (in some countries at least) an increase in profile, demonstrated by its inclusion in the Paralympic Games. In addition to its increase in international profile, Hughes (Senior Officer for CP Sport) claims that boccia has become extremely popular amongst people with cerebral palsy as well as other impairment groups (Hughes, personal communication, 2003).

In recognition of the growing popularity of boccia and the increased demand by members of CP Sport for better coordination, the National Boccia Federation was formed as a partnership between CP Sport and SCOPE (formerly the Spastics Society). However, the National Boccia Federation was only active for a short period before it ran out of funds (Pearce, Interview, 2001). Pearce describes how CP Sport was the original agency responsible for boccia in England but during the restructuring of the Spastics Society and the establishment of the EFDS, it was decided that the EFDS was in best position to take responsibility for boccia’s development. In Hughes’s view the National Boccia Federation ‘never really got off the ground’ and ‘was never recognised by Sport England as a governing body’ (Hughes, personal communication, 2003).

While boccia suffered a lack of coordination at a national level, this did not prevent UK Sport from supporting boccia at an international level. UK Sport began to fund the BPA’s World Class Performance Plan for boccia in 2000 and in 2001/2 received £64,000. In the UK Sport Lottery Strategy 2002 –2006, boccia is considered as a
Paralympic priority three sport because boccia players won a gold medal at Sydney and ‘have the potential to achieve a Gold in Athens 2004’ (UK Sport, 2002: 29). Sport England’s Annual report suggests that in 2001/2 boccia received no funding from the exchequer nor from the Community Capital Lottery Awards. Although as ‘disability sports’ received from the Lottery a total of over £5 million, it is possible that this funding benefited boccia related activities and initiatives (Sport England, 2002).

**Key policies: the development of the governing body’s club structure, events and coaching activities**

While there is no national policy or development plan for boccia, boccia was one of EFDS’s original priority sports (EFDS, 2000), and thus EFDS and some of its regions such as London and the West Midlands, have been active in promoting the sport. For example, in September 2000, EFDS West Midlands, in partnership with CP Sport, encouraged applications for teams to join the National Boccia League (EFDS, WM, 2000:4).

However, recognising the need for better coordination and development of boccia and in keeping with their mainstreaming agendas, EFDS and Sport England encouraged the governing body of Petanque to take on responsibility for boccia (Nichol, interview, 2001; Patel, personal communication, 2003; Hughes, personal communication, 2003). Petanque was considered by Sport England to be the sport that was most like boccia (Nichol, Interview, 2001). Sport England was particularly keen for boccia to be coordinated by the Petanque Association because this would be consistent with its mainstreaming policy and Sport England was also unwilling to create what it considered to be another governing body of sport (Patel, personal communication, 2003; Hughes, personal communication, 2003). However, according to Patel (personal communication, 2003) neither the Petanque Association nor CP Sport believed this was a suitable partnership. As far as Hughes is concerned, CP Sport have never agreed ‘to the idea of Petanque being the governing body of boccia’ (Hughes, personal communication, 2003). Hughes states that ‘we [CP Sport] have never had a relationship with Petanque...boccia is bigger than Petanque...they couldn’t possibly cope’ and goes on to claim that ‘boccia like wheelchair basketball can stand on its own two feet’ (Hughes, personal communication, 2003).
Cogniscent of the increasing popularity of boccia and the failure to place the coordination of boccia with the Petanque Association, Hodgkins (EFDS's lead officer on Boccia) declared, in August 2001, that 'the 'first steps had been taken on the road to establishing a new governing body to take responsibility for running and developing the sport of Boccia in England' (EFDS WM, 2001:3). In Hodgkins's view 'we [EFDS] looked at the situation and decided that in partnership with CP Sport we would move away from the National Boccia Federation, who are not doing anything, and establish an English Boccia Association' (Hodgkins, Interview, 2000). In an article published in EFDS's West Midlands newsletter, Hodgkins suggested that, while CP Sport would continue to arrange competitions, training and coaching for national performers, a new body needed to be formed to handle the administration and the organisation of competitions and training courses for players and referees (EFDS West Midlands, 2001).

EFDS's attention focused on lobbying Sport England to establish an English Boccia Association, as the English governing body for the sport in partnership with CP Sport (EFDS, WM, 2002). A meeting was held in 2000 at the Sport England offices in London, between Sport England, CP Sport and EFDS, to consider the establishment of a new English Boccia Association. However, according to Patel (EFDS), representatives from CP Sport were reluctant to relinquish their coordination of boccia. Patel suggests that the small but crucial income that CP Sport derived from boccia coaching courses may have been a significant factor in CP Sport's decision to retain responsibility for boccia (Patel, personal communication).

According to Pearce the EFDS wanted to establish an English Boccia Association rather than revitalise the existing but inactive and 'fundless' National Boccia Federation because boccia needed an English focused governing body (Pearce, Interview, 2001). Pearce recalls how, at the National Boccia Championships, Hodgkins (of EFDS) indicated that he was responsible for developing Boccia and was committed to doing so. While supportive of such an initiative, Pearce highlighted to the officer that it would be crucial to involve CP Sport and the boccia players in any discussions. Pearce was asked and agreed to be Chairman of the new English Boccia Association but stressed to the EFDS that he would only do so if they would be 'proactive in the development of boccia in England' (Pearce, Interview, 2001).
However, in October 2001 Pearce resigned from the English Boccia Association because, in his view, there was not the financial and strategic support from EFDS or Sport England needed to carry out the development work that he believed a governing body should be doing (Pearce, Interview, 2001). Pearce recalled how the boccia players were concerned that ‘the EFDS would be just another organisation that did not serve those it was meant to serve’ (Pearce, Interview, 2001). Pearce believes that ‘those concerns have been realised’ (Pearce, Interview, 2001) and goes on to claim that his resignation from the English Boccia Association ‘did not even elicit a response’ from the EFDS, a situation he believes to be illustrative of the status that boccia is afforded in England. Recent communications with CP Sport confirm that due to the failed attempt to establish a new governing body, CP Sport has become the coordinators of boccia in England (Hughes, personal communication, 2003). Pearce believes that EFDS showed ‘no commitment to boccia’ which is why the development of boccia is once again the responsibility of CP Sport whose limited income prevents any real development work (Pearce, Interview, 2001).

Hughes (CP Sport) claims, however, that while there is still no sports specific governing body of boccia, CP Sport has continued to be active in boccia development and remains the de facto coordinator at a national level. Indeed rather than its activities being gradually absorbed by a national governing body of sport and other providers as would be consistent with EFDS’s and Sport England’s mainstreaming policies, CP Sport’s activities in relation to boccia are growing. According to Hughes (personal communication, 2003) at the end of 2002, CP Sport revealed its plans to employ its first Boccia Development Officer (funded through TSB Bank) whose role will be to continue CP Sport’s national development work in boccia for people with and without cerebral palsy.

While there is currently no governing body for boccia in England it is, however, a sport that is central to the work in some of EFDS’s regions, many of which are involved in the development of boccia leagues and competitions. For example, the London Region of the EFDS recently held a Boccia Strategy Group meeting to discuss the structures and pathways that needed developing to cater for the increasing number of players in the region. In the Southwest six boccia sites were identified for development and were funded by Sport England. The development initiatives which were a collaboration with the Youth Sport Trust and Sports Coach UK included a
series of boccia coaching awards and the inclusion of boccia within the mainstream South West Regional 2002 Youth Games (EFDS, 2001: 30).

**Decision-making processes relationships with disabled people and disability sport organisations**

The organisation and responsibility for the development and running of boccia have been in a state of continual flux. While the selection and support for the national team has been through CP Sport, the British Paralympic Association and UK Sport, the development of boccia at a national level has moved from CP Sport, to a National Boccia Federation, and then, after failed attempts to give responsibility to the Petanque Association and a newly formed English Boccia Association, it currently resides again within CP Sport and there is currently no sports specific governing body of boccia.

While the Spastics Society played a crucial early part in the funding of CP Sport (Hughes, personal communication, 2003) and DSOs such as BSAD have organised events, leagues and training opportunities (Neale, Interview, 2001), CP Sport, Sport England, EFDS and the Petanque Association have been key to the decisions relating to the development of boccia. According to Hughes (personal communication, 2003) debates and discussions surrounding the future of Boccia have never reached consensus: Sport England and now EFDS want to mainstream, 'but CP Sport and Petanque do not' (Hughes, personal communication, 2003).

Dissimilar to the sports examined so far, there is only a small and limited number of organisations and individuals involved in boccia's policy network. However, disagreement is typical in these relationships. While CP Sport consult with its membership of people with cerebral palsy as well as its senior boccia players, EFDS’s and Sport England’s decision-making is based on the views of its own officers.

**The mainstream governing body’s values towards mainstreaming**

Pearce believes that there should be no apology for setting up boccia as a sport designed for people with cerebral palsy and other severe disabilities as it has enabled people from special schools, hospitals and residential care homes to engage in a
skilful competitive sport. Indeed Pearce believes that despite what he perceives to be an apparent lack of interest from both the media and the EFDS, the standard of play at the world championships and the Paralympics is ‘breathtaking’ (Pearce, Interview, 2001).

According to Pearce, boccia is being sidelined by the EFDS and Sport England. He claims that high profile Paralympic athletes, at the forefront of elite sport, are doing nothing to prevent the marginalisation of sports such as boccia. Pearce contends that even the British Paralympic Association and UK Sport treat boccia as a second-class sport. He illustrates this by indicating how athletes from sports such as swimming and judo who did not achieve any medals in the Paralympics are given more attention in the British Paralympic Association’s literature than Nigel Murray (who achieved a Gold medal in the individual boccia event).

Pearce is concerned that the concentration on mainstreaming has tended to encourage a preoccupation with comparisons to able-bodied sport. Moreover, in Pearce’s view boccia’s marginal status in sport is partly a result of there being no governing body of boccia for able-bodied people. Pearce states, ‘there has been a preoccupation with integration and mainstreaming at the expense of people like me’ because he suggests ‘sports like boccia and the severely disabled people who play it are not afforded the same status as other athletes playing more commonly accepted sports’ (Pearce, Interview, 2001).

Expressing his concern for the overly simplistic and potentially damaging obsession with mainstreaming, Pearce alleges that if there were to be an organisation responsible for both ‘able bodied and disabled sport’, Pearce is sure that, with the finite resources that such an organisation would have, ‘some sports would do well while others would not’ (Pearce, Interview, 2001). Typically, he says it is those disability sports that are most similar to the able-bodied sports that would be successful.

Of the Sport England equity planning meetings, Pearce claims that they were ‘rubbish...focusing on political correctness...saying the right words, rather than discussing the meaning of those words...and what each agency should be striving for’ (Pearce, Interview, 2001). Moreover, he is anxious that the needs of disabled people may be lost in the broader aim for equity. Indeed, as far as Pearce is concerned,
'people tend to assume that integration with able bodied people is better' (Pearce, Interview, 2001) but stresses that 'it is not about equity...it is about making sure that opportunities are made available'.

While Pearce acknowledges the importance of equity and believes that DSOs such as the EFDS should be assisting governing bodies to provide for all athletes including disabled people, he contends that the EFDS is 'simply not doing it'.

Hodgkin’s is concerned, however, that with boccia being controlled by a disability sport organisation [CP Sport] rather than a sport specific governing body [such as the English Boccia Association], there may be a tension between CP Sports members whose interests are specific to cerebral palsy and those (such as Sport England and EFDS) who have a more general interest in the development of the sport.

Summary

CP Sport, EFDS, Sport England, the Petanque Association and for short period the National Boccia Federation have all been influential in boccia policy but throughout boccia’s fragile development, and, similar to wheelchair basketball, the responsibility for the organisation of boccia has remained with an organisation whose predominant interest is sport for disabled people (CP Sport).

However, unlike wheelchair basketball, boccia does not have the financial or human resources, nor does it enjoy the benefits of having an established and well organised governing body that is recognised and supported by Sport England. Of particular importance is the fact that boccia does not have an obvious mainstream governing body (as is the case in table tennis, basketball and football) to develop a relationship with. Nevertheless, despite there not being an obvious governing body for boccia to be mainstreamed with, Sport England has tried to mainstream boccia with the Petanque Association, as Sport England saw this as the most closely related mainstream organisation. It is interesting to note, however, that despite the regular intervention of Sport England and EFDS, neither has been willing to exercise any power.
Using the Minister for Sport Review Group’s recommendations as a framework, no progress has been made in mainstreaming Boccia. Different to wheelchair basketball and the experiences of the GBWBA, boccia and CP Sport have not enjoyed the same financial or human resources or government interest. While only a few organisations have been key to policy development in boccia, they have been unable to reach consensus and consequently boccia remains on the margins of mainstream sports policy. In addition, the reluctance of CP sport to build bridges with a mainstream governing body smaller and less organised than its own has significantly reduced boccia's capacity to develop.

Boccia provides a useful insight into the values of key actors toward mainstreaming. Despite Sport England and EFDS’s belief in mainstreaming, CP Sport is not willing to relinquish its role as the coordinator of boccia and the most closely linked mainstream governing body is not willing to take responsibility for boccia. This neatly illustrates the gulf between Sports England’s policies and its ability to implement them, Sport England’s reluctance to be forceful and emphasises the diverse views and commitment toward disability sport policy.
7.9 TENNIS

The mainstream governing body and its role in tennis for disabled people

The Lawn Tennis Association is the governing body of tennis in England. Lawn tennis received no funding from the exchequer in 2001/2 but did receive nearly £9 million from Community Capital Lottery Awards. Between July 1999 and March 2000 Wheelchair Tennis received £8,574 and between October 1999 and December 2000 it received a total of £54,921 from the Lottery for its World Class Performance Plans (UK Sport, 2001). In the UK Sport Lottery Strategy 2002-2005, wheelchair tennis, similar to wheelchair basketball, is considered as a Paralympic Priority Four sport as athletes are considered as ‘having the potential to win a medal in Athens 2004’ (UK Sport, 2002: 29). However, in 2001/2 the BTF had to fully fund the World Class Performance Plan for wheelchair tennis at a cost of £162,000.

The Lawn Tennis Association Trust was established in 1988, as a charity to provide and support opportunities for young people and people with disabilities to play tennis. The Lawn Tennis Association Trust changed its name to the British Tennis Foundation in 1997 and focused upon the development of ‘wheelchair tennis’, ‘deaf tennis’ and ‘tennis for people with learning disabilities’. The British Tennis Foundation now ‘manages and organises the programme of tennis for people with disabilities in Great Britain’ (BTF, 2001:1).

During the 1990s the National Wheelchair Tennis Association and the British Deaf Tennis Association were established to take specific responsibility for the development of tennis for wheelchair and deaf athletes respectively, as it was perceived that the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation and British Deaf Sports Council were unable or unwilling to assume the sports development role that was required (Wolstenholme, British Tennis Foundation, Interview, 2001; McCelhatton, National Wheelchair Tennis Foundation, personal communication, 2003). However, although the National Wheelchair Tennis Association and the British Deaf Tennis Association had been running national events and developing opportunities successfully with the cooperation of the Lawn Tennis Association, following the New Start process (between 1995-1997) the British Tennis Foundation took the lead role in the development of tennis for people with disabilities. The National Wheelchair
Tennis Association is one of British Wheelchair Sport Foundation’s affiliated sports specific associations, which takes full responsibility for the running of its sport. However, in the case of tennis, while the NWTA have access to a network of wheelchair sportsmen and sportswomen through its membership network the BTF are the coordinators and providers of opportunities from local club coaching to national and international events (McElhatton, Chair of NWTA, personal communication, 2003).

The British Tennis Foundation (BTF) is currently responsible for the implementation of the World Class Performance Plans for ‘Disability Tennis’. As Performance Director for Disability Tennis, Sue Wolstenholme has £100,000 to support nine wheelchair tennis players in their attempt to improve on the Sydney 2000 Paralympics in which they reached the finals in the ladies singles and the men’s doubles but did not win a single medal (UK Sport, 2002).

The BTF works with the British Deaf Sports Council and the British Deaf Tennis Association on international matters as the British Deaf Sports Council are the only body recognised by the International Body of Deaf Sport. As deaf sport is not included in the Paralympics, there are no World Class Performance Plans available to support deaf tennis in England, thus the BTF funds competitions and development activities. According to Wolstenholme the decision taken by the BTF to focus initially on wheelchair and deaf tennis was because there already existed a) a demand, b) recognised national associations, and c) an international competition structure.

According to Martin McCellhatton (Chairman of the National Wheelchair tennis Association) the BTF have taken full responsibility for Wheelchair tennis. McCellhatton states that he ‘could not be happier with the development activities and coordinating role that BTF are playing’, whose officers he suggest are excellent’ (McCellhatton, personal communication, 2003). Janet McMorran (Paralympic wheelchair tennis player) illustrates the commitment of the BTF to disability tennis by suggesting that any wheelchair tennis players who may be interested, should contact the BTF, as the BTF has overall responsibility for wheelchair tennis (EFDS WM, 2000:2), and is best placed to answer any queries relating to coaching, clubs and events for wheelchair tennis players.
Key policies: the development of the governing body's club structure, events and coaching activities

Wolstenholme claims that, after discussions with Chaytors (Chief Executive of the EFDS), it was agreed that the BTF be left to develop tennis for disabled people (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001). The British Tennis Foundation Report 2000 reflects on the previous year’s activities and summarises the programme of regional and national events as well as the development initiatives and strategic directions for the future. While the BTF is also concerned with coach education, schools tennis, indoor tennis, fundraising and sponsorship, tennis for disabled people forms a major focus of the BTF’s work.

In the report it is claimed that ‘in conjunction with the National Wheelchair Tennis Association, the British Deaf Tennis Association, the British Deaf Sports Council, the British Paralympic Association and the Special Olympics UK, the Foundation has continued its ever-increasing programme of tennis for people with disabilities’ (BTF, 2000:13). That programme includes ‘development through introductory sessions, weekend camps and assessment days, training and coaching, tournament and international team competitions’ (BTF, 2000:13). The competitive national events include the British Open Wheelchair Championships and the Inva Care World Team Cup (the Davis Cup of wheelchair tennis). The BTF have only recently taken a central role in ‘deaf tennis’ and, while they held a National Championships and supported a British team in the European Deaf Championships, the BTF are focusing much of their attention now on ‘attracting new players into the game’ (BTF, 2000:16). The development and provision of tennis opportunities for players with learning disabilities is one of BTF’s most recent commitments. To determine the current status of interest and provision, a survey was undertaken by the BTF to establish which clubs are organising tennis session for players with learning disabilities.

Wolstenholme recalls that the BTF ‘had a couple of meetings with the National Wheelchair Tennis Association, UK Sport and some of the DSOs but there was ‘such a divergence of views’ on who should be the lead agency in tennis for disabled people that ‘we [the BTF] had got to decide what we were going to do... and from then on we worked very closely with the sports specific disability organisations, in particular the National Wheelchair Tennis Association’ (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001).
Concurring with this analysis, Parker (National Development Officer for Disability Tennis the BTF) claims 'there were a plethora of DSO's all vying against each other'. Moreover in Parker's view, 'little has changed' (Parker, Interview, 2001). In January 2001 the BTF published their 'Programme of Tennis for People with Disabilities' (BTF, 2001), which provided an outline of the DSOs that the BTF is working with and the national and regional structures and events in wheelchair, deaf and learning disability tennis. It includes a wide range of BTF organised activities and programmes including assessment weekends, weekend camps for beginners, a festival of tennis for deaf players, LTA Coaching courses for deaf and wheelchair players, and the provision of national championships.

**Decision-making processes: relationships with disability sport organisations and disabled people**

The Lawn Tennis Association does not have a disability committee. The Development Committee of the BTF make the decisions relating to the development of disability tennis in England and Wolstenholme (who represents the Development Committee) reports the activities of this committee and disability tennis work of the BTF tennis to the Lawn Tennis Association. Wolstenholme and Parker both sit on the National Wheelchair Tennis Association and British Deaf Tennis Association committees. Moreover, ensuring that there is a robust relationship between these organisations, the NWTA are members of the LTA Trust, are treated similar to LTA's own regions in that they have full membership and voting rights and, McElhatton as Chair of the NWTA, is member of the BTF.

Wolstenholme claims that all these committees are predominantly made up of disabled tennis players and insists that the BTF must continue to consult and be guided by the wishes and needs of disabled players. Indeed, she contends that 'if we [the BTF] hadn't gone along and consulted with the athletes from the word go, it would have been a very different sport' (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001). However, it is clear that while Wolstenholme is central to the decision making in disability tennis policy and ensures there is regular communication between the LTA, the BTF, the NWTA and the BDTA, she insists that her role is to represent the views of the tennis players. Wolstenholme insists that the decisions on matters relating to disability tennis should lie with the disabled tennis players not the disability sport organisations
that may purport to represent them. As far as McEllhatton (personal communication, 2003) is concerned, wheelchair tennis players have opportunities to affect policy decisions through the NWTA representatives on the BTF committee and believes that the NWTA are very lucky that Wolstenholme and the BTF committee, which she chairs, places such importance on the views of disabled people.

The mainstream governing body’s values towards mainstreaming

As far as Wolstenholme is concerned the main aim of the ‘New Start’ process was to ‘get the sports specific bodies to take on board disability sport’. In this regard she cannot understand why, in the EFDS, there has been created ‘a totally different organisation for disability sport’. She believes that the NGB’s should have been more involved in the ‘New Start’ process and now thinks that it is ‘still unclear what their [the EFDS’s] role really is (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001).

Wolstenholme is clear that the BTF’s role as the governing body is to ensure that disabled people have access to tennis opportunities. She claims that ‘we get clubs ringing up and saying what do we do with this [disabled player]’ and ‘whatever the disability is’ the BTF provide advice on what events and competitions are available (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001). While she recognises the success of some organisations that have existed separately from a mainstream governing body (such as the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association), Wolstenholme contends that disability tennis is part of the mainstream governing body of tennis, and as such, enjoys all the attendant benefits that such a relationship affords. Wolstenholme suggests that ‘we the [BTF] don’t have to worry about employment...or transport... ...it’s all done by the Lawn Tennis Association’ (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001).

She goes on to suggest that the EFDS may have a role but ‘they [the EFDS] should not be delivering activity’ (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001). She goes on, ‘I really thought when the EFDS came on board that this was going to be our answer...they would go around schools, find children with disabilities’ and promote the opportunities that the governing bodies were developing (Wolstenholme, Interview, 2001). In Wolstenholme’s view, EFDS is run primarily by people either ‘who are disabled or who have come from the disability organisation route’ which she
considers to be a mistake – as there is not enough knowledge about, and input from, the sports specific governing body perspective.

As far as Wolstenholme is concerned the governing body should be the lead agency for all matters relating to that sport. For example, she insists that ‘programmes such as ‘Awards for All’ should be signed off by the governing body [because] if they [the EFDS] do not talk to us [the BTF] we might have something going in that area’. Moreover, Wolstenholme is particularly concerned that, despite their attempts to mainstream disability sport, some initiatives might encourage the formation of separate disability tennis activities that lead to ‘the segregation of wheelchair tennis from tennis clubs’. According to Wolstenholme this would be a development that wheelchair tennis players would oppose.

Chaytors (Chief Executive of the EFDS) suggests, however, that the EFDS have limited resources and can only do so much to support the NGBs (Chaytors, Interview, 2001). In any case, according to Patel (National Development Officer of the EFDS) ‘the BTF don’t need the support’ as the BTF have ‘viable, robust structures for deaf, learning and wheelchair users’ and their commitment to disability sport provides an example of how mainstreaming can be realised (Patel, personal communication). In recognition of the role that BTF are playing in disability tennis, Wolstenholme was invited by EFDS to share with other disability sport organisations and governing bodies their experiences of mainstreaming disability sport.

Patel has some minor concerns relating to the BTF’s responsibility for disability tennis. As Patel highlights (personal communication, 2003), despite the excellent activities of the BTF, the BTF itself is not central to the LTA. Thus while the commitment of the BTF is unquestionable the LTA, as the mainstream governing body has, similar to Sport England’s relationship with the EFDS, supported a separate organisation rather than sought to embed these activities within its own duties. While Patel suggests that this indicates a lack of governing body commitment (personal communication, 2003), as far as McEllhatton is concerned BTF’s capacity to focus on disability tennis separate from the wider concerns of the LTA, has facilitated the successful development of wheelchair tennis.
Summary

The BTF is the main policy actor in tennis for disabled people. In the BTF, the mainstream governing body of tennis (LTA) has created a separate organisation within its own structures that has taken a lead in tennis for wheelchair, deaf and learning disabled players. Through the BTF the governing body is building a comprehensive programme of development activities, coaching clinics and events which provide a pathway from beginner to excellence. The relationship between the BTF and the disability tennis organisations is productive and complementary. The interaction between these few organisations appears regular and comprehensive, they reach consensus easily and agree on the roles that each should play. BTF's role with EFDS is almost non-existent.

The reason for the LTA and the BTF's shift toward taking full responsibility for disability tennis is borne out of an organisational internal aspiration to do so, coupled with a strong relationship with a sport specific disability sport organisation (NWTA). There is no evidence to suggest that Sport England or EFDS's mainstreaming policy had any impact on the BTF's development of tennis for disabled people.

Tennis provides what may be the best demonstration of a sport whose governing body has successfully mainstreamed disability sport and in so doing has met all of the recommendations identified by the Minister for Sport Review Groups. It could be argued however, that disability tennis has not been mainstreamed at all, as it is the LTA not BTF that is the mainstream governing body of the sport. Moreover, it is interesting to note that the EFDS and the traditional DSOs are not involved in the decision making processes nor according to the key policy makers in disability tennis, should they be.

The values of key actors in the BTF illustrate a long-term commitment to disability tennis and involve disability tennis organisations and disabled tennis players (but not generic disability sport organisations such as EFDS) in its decision making processes. Thus far the significant achievements of the BTF are highly commended by the National Wheelchair Tennis Association, EFDS and Sport England.
As Chapter six revealed, over the last forty years or so a wide range of disability sport organisations has emerged to develop sport for specific populations and for specific sports. Typically many have offered opportunities in disability sport in isolation from the mainstream sports bodies. However, as a result of government funding and various policy documents and recommendations, such as those provided by the Minister for Sport Review Group (1989), in recent years mainstream governing bodies of sport have begun to consider issues related to its provision of sport for disabled people. This case study revealed that the responses of governing bodies to the mainstreaming agenda has been variable but a number of key themes have emerged that sheds light on the disability sport policy process.

1. Mainstreaming is only a recent area of policy interest for most governing bodies. With the exception of the ASA other mainstream bodies have typically demonstrated limited commitment toward disability sport or have played a supportive but peripheral role to the DSOs.

2. The reasons for the recent interest of mainstream governing bodies in disability sport is more the result of external funding opportunities or the result of strong individual relationships than it is a consequence of continual pressure exerted by the government or the lobbying activities of various disability sport organisations.

3. The examination of relationships in each sport highlight the inconsistent roles played by Sport England and EFDS. While EFDS has been central to the mainstreaming of football it has played no substantive part in the mainstreaming of tennis. Sport England’s role and relationships with governing bodies is equally inconsistent. For example, despite its mainstreaming agenda Sport England is supportive of the GBWBA yet unwilling to support the creation of a similar sport specific disability sport organisation for Boccia. While government rhetoric promotes mainstreaming, its commitment to enforce it is as uncertain as many NGBs and DSOs.

4. Mainstreaming has been a central tenet of disability sport policy within EFDS, the DSOs, NGBs and Sport England. All frequently pronounce their commitment to the principles of mainstreaming. However, DSOs consistently refuse to relinquish their
responsibility for disability sport and most NGBs are reluctant to absorb disability sport into their general duties.

5. In relation to the reticence to mainstreaming described above, the EFDS and Sport England have not shown any interest in coercing or bullying organisations to implement their policies. While encouragement is offered in the form of guidelines and advice, the decision whether and how much to embrace the mainstream agenda rests with the individual organisation.

6. The mainstreaming case study revealed that key actors within NGBs held contrasting views on the role that EFDS should play and the contribution that EFDS made. As far as the FA were concerned the EFDS performed a vital united voice for disability sport, yet the ASA and the BTF believed that EFDS offered little support, indicating the rife inconsistency in the roles played and the variety in values within disability sport.

7. Notwithstanding the rife inconsistencies within the interests, relationships, resources and values of those organisations concerned with disability sport there are a few values which emerge as generally agreed and taken for granted as central to disability sport policy. Typically, disability sport policy is based on the agreement that organisations in sport ought to provide opportunities to disabled people to equal those offered to non-disabled people and that if they had the expertise and resources NGBs would be the most appropriate agency to do so. Not only is there an assumption that disabled people may benefit from equal opportunities but it also suggests that these opportunities may be similar to those typically afforded non-disabled people.

These insights into disability sport policy suggest that disability sport policy is as influenced by opportunity, ideology and individual interest as it is the result of long term lobbying and negotiation. Organisations in the network have diverse and conflicting views, consensus on key issues is not reached easily, and relationships are unstable and inconsistent. Power is widely distributed but the incoherent interests within disability sport ineffectively challenge the dominant non-disabled hegemony in sport.
CHAPTER EIGHT
CONCLUSION

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study was to establish whether there is a policy community for disability sport. To achieve this, the following objectives were identified;

a) to establish the key characteristics of the disability sport policy process, and
b) to establish the interests, power distribution and relationships between organisations involved in disability sport, and determine the ideologies of key actors involved in disability sport policy.

This concluding chapter will provide, first, a summary of the key characteristics of the disability sport policy process, second, an account of the interests, power, and the relationships between and ideologies of organisations involved in disability sport policy. The third section establishes the extent to which disability sport policy meets Marsh and Rhodes’ criteria for a policy community. The fourth section considers whether the advocacy coalition framework and the policy stream approach provide a more adequate explanation of how disability sport policy is made and finally, a summary of the disability sport policy process is provided together with an indication of whether and how it may change in the future.

8.2 KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DISABILITY SPORT POLICY PROCESS

The case studies suggest that the disability sport policy process possesses five key characteristics. The table overleaf provides a brief description and an illustration of each of these characteristics.
Table 20 Characteristics of the disability sport policy process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disparate range of organisations</td>
<td>A key characteristic of the disability sport policy process in England is the involvement of a large number of organisations with different interests, aspirations and varying levels of commitment.</td>
<td>Over 40 sport and disability sport organisations were involved in the New Start process but these organisations had different views on the future of disability sport. There are few common interests and there is no obvious pattern of relationships between mainstream and disability sport organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong influence of sports policy and sports organisations</td>
<td>Disability sport policy is influenced more by sports organisations and sports policies than disability organisations and disability policy.</td>
<td>The British Council of Disabled People was established in 1981 to improve the access of disabled people into mainstream society. However, none of the DSOs or NGBs have developed a relationship with disability organisations such as the British Council of Disabled People.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral interest of central government</td>
<td>Disability sport is of marginal interest to government policy and it is as peripheral to sport policy as it is to disability policy.</td>
<td>While disability sport received some attention in DCMS's Sporting Future for All and in particular Game Plan, and the DDA embraces sporting facilities and services for disabled people, there is no disability policy that specifically addresses disability sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing intervention of Sport England</td>
<td>While the Sports Council originally supported the activities of DSOs such as BSAD, since 1998 Sport England has intervened much more frequently and forcefully in the disability sport policy process.</td>
<td>Sport England substantially determined the outcome of the New Start process and in its equity guidelines has set out how NGBs can mainstream disability sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to personal intervention</td>
<td>Disability sport policy processes lack consistency and organisational 'embeddedness' and organisations lack consensus on key issues. This lack of embeddedness and agreement on values allows for the intervention and influence of individuals. Policy outcomes can be as much due to chance as the careful planning and long-term commitment of key organisations.</td>
<td>The emergence and early development of disability sport was due to the inspiration and leadership of Ludwig Guttmann, not the collective activities of disability or sports organisations. The review of disability sport in 1989 was the inspiration and commitment of the Minister for Sport rather than the long term lobbying efforts of interest groups. The FA's recent commitment to disability football is more due to the funding opportunity provided by EFDS's relationship with One-2-One and the interest of a few key policy actors: not the achievement of a long term policy objective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While these statements provide a brief summary of the key characteristics of the disability sport policy process, a more comprehensive explanation of each is contained within the following sections, which respond to the principal questions in this study.

INTERESTS

A growing number of differing interests

The two case studies revealed that over the last 40 years a growing number and range of organisations have emerged to represent different interests in disability sport. A key reason for this proliferation of disability sport organisations was highlighted within the case study of the formation of the EFDS, which clearly identified BSAD’s irreconcilable dual responsibility for its own membership, as well as the coordination of other interests. In addition to this untenable dual interest, Guttmann’s initial exclusive focus on sport for those with spinal cord injury provided further cause for the emergence of other DSOs whose interest lie in sport for other impairment groups. The organisations that emerged as a result of BSAD’s overambitious and untenable dual interests, focused on specific sports and specific impairment groups that they considered BSAD to be incapable or unwilling to adequately represent.

The first case study also identified that not only did the perceived failure of BSAD to act as a representative of all disability sport interests lead to the emergence of many new organisations but ultimately, BSAD’s perceived failure led to the government review of disability sport in 1989 and to the New Start process between 1995 and 1998. The ‘New Start’ process involved a large number of organisations in both the conferences and the consultation period that prefaces the establishment of the EFDS. The agencies involved in the ‘New Start’ process included British Blind Sport, Cerebral Palsy Sport, the English Sports Association for People with a Learning Disability, the British Amputee and Les Autres Sport Association, the British Deaf Sports Council, the British Wheelchair Sports Foundation, the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association, the Amateur Swimming Association, Sports Coach UK and the Youth Sport Trust. These organisations range from those whose primary interest is to develop opportunities in disability sport to those whose main focus is on non-disabled sport and for whom disability sport is a marginal interest.
Due in part, to this proliferation of organisations each with a different set of often fairly narrow interests, there was disagreement and confusion on the role that disability sport organisations and mainstream sport organisations should play.

**Some common interests**

That said, there was a common interest in the improvement of sporting opportunities for disabled people among the DSOs with many of them taking a prominent role in the redefinition of disability sport away from its origins as therapeutic recreation (Guttmann, 1976), to a concern for the creation of opportunities for disabled people to participate and or compete in sport with other disabled people or with non-disabled people (Sports Council, 1993; EFDS, 2000). In this regard, disability sport policy reflects the broader aims of those concerned with disability policy. In other words, in the aims of DSOs, EFDS and Sport England, we can see that disability sport policy shows a recognition of the shift in theory and policy toward more socially constructed explanations of disability (Oliver 1990; Campbell and Oliver, 1996; Marks, 1997; Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare, 1999) and an acceptance of the need to change sports policies and practices so that people with impairments are not disabled in sport by inadequate or inappropriate provision.

The case study of the EFDS clearly demonstrated that despite the variety of interests among the increasing number of DSOs, a central issue in disability sport policy is the development of sporting opportunities hitherto only available to non-disabled people via the utilisation of resources previously only enjoyed by non-disabled people. While many aspects of disability sport seem to be contested, both case studies indicated a belief that disabled people ought to have the opportunity to compete with and against other disabled people. The comments from key sports policy actors within both case studies indicated that an important objective of disability sport policy was to enable disabled people to have the same level of sporting opportunities as their non-disabled peers. However, the survey and interviews from both case studies illustrated that there is a significant difference in the organisations' specific interests and the perceived roles that each should play in meeting this objective. As the survey clearly highlighted, while some believed that disability sport opportunities should be provided by disability sport organisations, others believed the responsibility should be with mainstream providers. Moreover, during New Start, to protect their own
existence some disability sport organisations such as DSE and BBS began to argue against mainstreaming. This shift in interest was the consequence of some DSOs perceived threat to their survival, demonstrating the lack of robustness in the DSOs policy agenda.

Whilst this description may reflect the core activities of the vast majority of organisations involved in disability sport, it does not adequately illustrate the diversity between them. For example, while some organisations such as British Blind Sport may be specifically dedicated to the development of competitive opportunities between disabled people, others, such as the EFDS (EFDS, 2000), are at least as interested in the creation of opportunities which enable disabled people to participate and or compete with non-disabled people. The second case study in particular suggests that while there has been an overall increase in the involvement of mainstream organisations in disability sport policy, they have very different interests and levels of commitment.

**Limited commitment to policy aims and embedded conflict between DSOs and between DSOs and NGBs**

As indicated earlier, a key characteristic of disability sport policy is the explicit notion that disability sport ought to be embedded into mainstream or ordinary sports provision. However, while it remained a central thrust of most post 1980s disability sport policy, of the sports examined in the case study, few have made much progress in mainstreaming disability sport, and those that have, have done so despite significant involvement or lobbying of BSAD, EFDS or any other DSOs. The examination of mainstreaming revealed that little progress has been made in many sports due to the DSOs’ fear of losing either resources or control, and the mainstream governing bodies’ reticence in relinquishing existing, or accepting new, roles in disability sport. The reticence of mainstream agencies was due to a combination of financial constraints, lack of political will, dissatisfaction with the coordination within disability sport and a lack of knowledge of what and how to progress. Put simply, mainstream governing bodies’ interests lie in non-disabled sport. Disability sport was not a high priority for any of the mainstream governing bodies, and for most it was outside of what they considered to be their core activity. Key policy actors in EFDS suggested that despite the recent development of disability
sport policies by some NGBs (such as the FA and ASA), there was little evidence to demonstrate that these policies reflect a long term organisational aim and a deeply embedded belief in improving opportunities in sport for disabled people. Consequently, disability sport organisations have typically been unwilling to relinquish their role to mainstream governing bodies which they do not believe have the commitment or the resources to adequately cater for disability sport. It is partly due to the perceived lack of commitment to disability sport by mainstream governing bodies that actors within disability sport organisations remain unwilling to give up their own jobs and hobbies, and the attendant benefits these afford.

Coordinating this large number and diverse range of interests within disability sport policy has been a main role for the EFDS. Some organisations such as British Blind Sport indicated that thus far, the EFDS (similar to the BSAD) was failing to represent them. Again similar to BSAD, EFDS found it difficult to reconcile the advocacy role it played for other DSOs with its own development work. While Sport England required the EFDS to be the coordinator of disability sport organisations, Sport England also expected EFDS to implement part of its broader commitment to equity. The EFDS is expected to serve a developmental role for Sport England as well as a membership role for its regions and the National Disability Sport Organisations: a position that for BSAD was untenable and as discussed earlier, led to a growth in the number of organisations and the embedded conflict between them. Given the context within which EFDS was established, it is difficult to envisage how it will not give rise to similar perceptions to those suffered by BSAD and consequently the conflict will continue.

Government’s increased interest in disability sport

While there has been a growth in organisations with a primary interest in the disability sport policy network, since the inception of the Sports Council in 1972 the government has demonstrated an increased interest in the disability sport policy area. However, throughout both case studies, the interests of the Sports Council and Sport England have been confused and inconsistent. For example, as identified in the first case study, even though Sport England’s aim in the ‘New Start’ process was to mainstream disability sport, in 1998 it created another disability sport organisation. And, in the second case study Sport England was unwilling to support the creation of
a new sport specific governing body for boccia yet contrary to its mainstreaming policy believed the Great Wheelchair Basketball Association to be the most suitable agency to lead wheelchair basketball.

However, the Sports Council’s and Sport England’s interests in disability sport have been consistent in at least two aspects. First, similar to the government’s intervention in other areas of sports policy its main interest seems to be in attaining organisational neatness, even if it has been unwilling to exert its authority to achieve this without the support of key stakeholders. Second, since its first involvement with BSAD, the Sports Council has consistently proclaimed its interest in achieving greater equity within sport. The current commitment of the government to disability sport is mainly the result of governments’ long-standing wider interest in ‘Sport For All’. National sport policies such as ‘Sport in the Community: the Next Ten Years’ (Sports Council, 1982), New Horizons (Sports Council, 1993b) and more recently a ‘Sporting Future for All’ (DCMS, 2000) all reflect a broad commitment to addressing inequity in sport.

The case studies suggest that the development of policy by sports organisations has been much more influential in governments’ interest in disability sport policy than the uncoordinated and weak lobbying activities of the disability sport organisations. Moreover, because of a lack of coordination on the part of those organisations with a specific interest in disability sport, successive governments have been able to control disability sport policy processes. In the first case study for example, Sport England was unwilling to force NGBs to take on disability sport and was equally unwilling to encourage DSOs to relinquish their role, but was willing to create the EFDS because, in Sport England’s view, the creation of EFDS provided a more organised, coordinated and coherent structure and at the same time demonstrated government’s commitment to addressing the inequities in sport for disabled people.

While the improvement of opportunities in sport for disadvantaged groups such as disabled people has been a central tenet of Sports Council policy since the 1980s, as Houlihan and White (2002) have discussed, the reasons for government intervention in sport is as much to do with the development of community through sport as it is the development of sport. It is also clear that while Labour’s commitment to tackling social exclusion generally can be evidenced in Sport England’s commitment to tackling inequity in sport (Sport England, 2000), it is the historical commitment to
equity of successive governments that has driven disability sport policy. This commitment to equity reflects government’s quest for coherence in the administration of sport as well as a taken for granted perspective of disability which considers mainstream (non-disabled) sport and its structures to be better able to provide opportunities for disability sport development: an ideological belief that we shall return to later in this chapter.

Summary

In summary, the case studies revealed a variety of interests and systemic conflict within the disability sport network, which is reflective of what pluralists suggest is essential in the articulation of the wide range of organisations that the government is meant to serve (Held, 1989; Dunleavy, 1987; Ball and Milard, 1986). However, the disability sport policy process is not entirely compatible with some pluralist theories, which claim that the state is a neutral agent. In disability sport policy the state is not entirely value free, demonstrating particular bias rather than acting as neutral arbiters, and thus, in this context is more reflective of pluralist theories articulated by Dunleavy and O’Leary (1987). Grant (1989) and Smith’s (1993) concept of insider and outsider groups is helpful here as they suggest that the government typically determines who is allowed to contribute to the policy network, deciding who is in and who is outside of the policy-making process. The case studies indicated, therefore, that disability sport policy-making processes are more compatible with the neo-pluralist analysis of power distribution that is discussed more fully in chapter 3. Consistent with the neo-pluralist perspective, business interests do not enjoy privileged access to decision making and government tends to lay down its own rules for disability sport policy-making processes and has the autonomy to develop its own policy networks (Grant, 1989; Rhodes, 1986; and Smith, 1993). As Sport England is keen to obtain interest group support for its decisions relating to disability sport policy, it has allowed a wide range of stakeholders to remain in the network. This wide range of organisations with diverse and sometimes narrow interests has prevented disability sport policy from identifying easily, areas of common value. More specifically, the narrowness in the interests of some DSOs and the marginal status of disability sport within many NGBs have contributed to the embedded conflict and confusion in the policy network.
The next section provides further analysis of the organisations that have influence in the policy-making process and how power is distributed within this network.

POWER

Wide range of actors with unequal access

The case study of EFDS indicated that a large number of organisations with varying interests are involved in the decision making processes within disability sport. For example, the decisions made during the ‘New Start’ process were made through complex processes of negotiation and interaction, incorporating a wide range of interests and views (Self 1985). There was no one central source of power, and policy actors (such as the disability sport organisations and Sport England) were continually negotiating and often in conflict. Decisions relating to the establishment of the EFDS were the outcome of complex and tense relations between a wide range of organisations. However, the central role of government in the creation of EFDS reflects a neo-pluralist perspective of power distribution. That is not to say, however, that these organisations enjoyed similar access to decision-making processes. The case studies indicated that while some organisations were central to the decision-making process and exercised considerable influence, others occupied a more peripheral role in the network. The first case study revealed that DSOs have been more active in the establishment of EFDS than any other group of organisations such as disability organisations or mainstream governing bodies of sport. The second case study does not provide such a clear picture of power relationships because the role of the DSOs, the mainstream governing bodies, EFDS and even Sport England varied from sport to sport. However, while the nature of key organisations’ involvement in disability sport changed between and within each case study, through Sport England, the government has demonstrated a clear and consistent interest in steering and controlling the development of disability sport. This commitment to control the development of disability sport was illustrated by its own involvement in the establishment of EFDS, its observer status on EFDS’s Board of Directors and its recommendation to mainstream governing bodies to take more responsibility for disability sport (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989; Sport England, 2000). As the conclusion to chapter three highlighted, there has been a steady increase in government intervention in sport policy as well as disability policy and, based on the
findings from these two case studies, government is also increasing its influence over the administration and policy within disability sport. However, ironically the intervention of the government has perpetuated the marginal status of disability sport.

**Limited resources of DSOs and limited influence on policy**

The marginal status of disability sport has meant that DSOs have found significant difficulty in securing funding for their activities. EFDS has become the main beneficiary of exchequer funding, and the remaining DSOs are now more reliant on commercial activity and membership subscriptions. While this may be problematic for some organisations such as CP Sport, the general willingness of the public to support ‘disability charities’ has ensured that some DSOs, such as BBS, have continued to function. Some NGBs have also been heavily dependant on the Sports Council for their disability sport activities, and are unlikely to include these activities within their normal core business without external funding. Governing bodies such as the Football Association and the British Tennis Foundation, however, are able to finance the development and implementation of their disability sport strategies without external funding.

The case study of mainstreaming illustrated the diversity in human and financial resources found in disability sports organisations and the variability in power between those involved in the disability sport policy network. While some sports were run with the support of significant human and financial resources, other sports relied upon a few volunteers, poor office accommodation and little or no funding. Some mainstream sports organisations had an established tradition of working in disability sport (such as the English Table Tennis Association), with a history of supporting disability sport events, officers dedicated to the development of disability sport and, an infrastructure of officers committed to its mainstreaming policies. While wealth and size were not necessarily measures of how involved an organisation was in mainstreaming disability sport, it was clear that some sports were much better resourced than others and enjoyed the attendant benefits of that wealth. For example, while the Football Association did not provide the initial impetus for the development of disability football, its capacity to design and implement a national policy on disability football illustrates the significant impact of resources on an organisation’s ability to mainstream disability sport. The infrastructure of clubs, teams, coaches and the
capacity of the Football Association to provide the human and financial resources to support its policies on disability football have helped the FA to become one of the most successful bodies in meeting the Minister’s recommendations for NGBs on mainstreaming (Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989).

**Government’s distance from disability sport**

Notwithstanding Sport England’s increased interest and intervention in disability sport, there is little clarity in Sport England’s aims and disability sport appears to be a low priority for government. While recent governments have shown an increased interest in elite sport and elite disability sport may have enjoyed some of this reflected attention, disability sport policy at a national level remains a marginal interest area. The attempts by Sport England to improve the provision of opportunities by encouraging governing bodies to do more has not amounted to a substantive shift in responsibility. For example, in supporting BSAD and in facilitating the creation of the EFDS, Sport England has simultaneously demonstrated an interest in disability sport while also confirming its commitment in keeping disability sport policy at arms length. Maintaining a distance between itself and certain policy issues has been a consistent feature of government involvement in social policy. As Houlihan (1991) suggested, government has preferred to establish quangos to develop policy and thus avoid direct criticism if the policies are unsuccessful. Not only has the government distanced itself from possible conflicts by the establishment of quangos (such as Sport England), but in Sport England’s establishment of the EFDS, Sport England has itself retained an arms length relationship with disability sport. As the first case study showed, while Sport England was encouraged by some organisations during the ‘New Start’ process to take greater responsibility for disability sport and diminish the role of DSOs, which would achieve the coherence it was striving for, Sport England preferred to keep disability sport as a peripheral policy issue. The EFDS was established following a long and complex series of negotiations in which Sport England sought to obtain consensus and persuade or coerce key organisations to agree with its recommendations. The second case study showed that while Sport England continued to pledge its commitment to mainstreaming and to this end has published guidelines to help governing bodies include disability sport in their core activities, it has refrained from enforcing these guidelines, allowing NGBs to determine the extent to which they will adhere to these suggestions.
Tense relationships between key policy actors

The earlier sections identified that the key organisations in disability sport policy were the mainstream and disability sport organisations but that the distribution of power between them was complex, varied and confused. While the pattern of relationships was equally confusing, analyses highlighted that despite the changes in the organisations involved in disability sport and the increased intervention of government, the relationship between DSOs was as tense in 2000/2001 as it was during BSAD's era (1961- 1997). The tense, confusing and variable relationships between key organisations within each sport provided a sharp insight into the complex mess of disability sport policy. What follows are examples of the relationships just described and an indication of how these characteristics resemble a loose issue network.

In the first case study it was revealed that while Sport England and the EFDS claimed that organisations involved in the New Start process agreed to the latter's formation, the establishment as well as the role of the EFDS was contested. Dissatisfaction with the coordinating role that the EFDS played resulted in a tense relationship between DSOs and the EFDS. This developing tension between the EFDS and the DSOs was exacerbated by the variable and fragile relationship between the EFDS's head office and its regions. The EFDS finds itself in a similar position to BSAD in the mid 1990s, that is, that is has an 'untenable dual role' with expectations that it can not meet. For example, the regional federations are members of the EFDS but have their own structures and priorities, which significantly affect the capacity of EFDS to implement a national policy and at the same time embrace the wide ranging diversity of its regions. EFDS has been created to perform the role that was expected of BSAD but despite the government's increased commitment to disability sport, the expectation that the EFDS can represent the interests of its regions as well as the NDSOs remains untenable. The first case study suggested, therefore, that the relationship between EFDS and the DSOs is as fractious as that between the DSOs and BSAD in the late 1980s.
The government's relationship with EFDS was much closer than it was with BSAD, with Sport England preferring to control, rather than simply support, the activities of EFDS. The EFDS claimed that it enjoyed better access to key agencies and departments within central government than its forerunners (BSAD) and has clearer opportunities to affect government policy and to ensure that other sectors such as education and health, when collaborating with sport, also consider the needs of disabled people. That said, while aspects of sports development remained on the fringes of sport policy (Houlihan and White, 2002), and sport policy remained a relatively low priority for the government, the EFDS and DSOs generally, continued to find themselves competing for government interest. Moreover, as the earlier section on power emphasised, the close relationship between Sport England and EFDS was one that was controlled by Sport England. The variable and often tense relationship between the wide and changing range of organisations identified by the first case study suggests that disability sport policy processes are not characterised by the frequent, high quality, consensual and stable interaction of a narrow range of actors as is consistent with a policy community. The second case study provided further evidence of the infrequent, inconsistent and unstable inter-organisational relationships within disability sport.

EFDS has enjoyed a degree of success in its relationships with some mainstream governing bodies such as the Football Association. In addition some mainstream organisations such as Sports Coach UK, the English Table Tennis Association and the Football Association, are relieved that they can approach the EFDS in the belief that it is the united voice of disability sport (Davies, 2001; Rogers, 2001; Vernon Way, 2000), demonstrating that for some sports organisations the establishment of the EFDS has improved its relationships with disability sport. However, as the following section identifies, not all NGBs enjoyed such positive relationships with the DSOs.

**Inconsistent and confused relationship between DSOs and NGBs**

Notwithstanding the positive relationships that EFDS has forged with some mainstream governing bodies the case study of seven sports demonstrated the depth of inconsistency in the relationships between organisations involved in the disability
sport policy network and provides an illustration of the general confusion endemic in disability sport policy. While mainstreaming may be a clearly stated policy objective for the EFDS and for Sport England, there is by no means universal acceptance that the mainstream governing body is the most obvious or 'natural' agency to develop and provide opportunities for disabled people. While there was evidence to suggest that some NGBs have taken on the responsibility for disability sport, there were also examples of sport organisations which have managed the provision of sport for disabled people without the involvement of either the mainstream NGB, or other DSOs.

Consequently and as the second case study suggested, the pattern of relationships between key organisations varied across sports. There were no two sports that had a similar pattern of relationships. For example, while governing bodies of table tennis and football enjoyed the belief that they could work with disability sport groups through just one organisation (EFDS), other mainstream governing bodies such as the Amateur Swimming Association had worked largely in isolation from EFDS. The governing bodies of swimming, athletics, tennis and basketball have either preferred to work with other sports specific agencies rather than with the EFDS, or have decided that they do not need the support of any external agencies and are happy to rely on the expertise of individuals within their own organisation. The second case study revealed that the disability sport policy network comprises a complex, idiosyncratic and inconsistent series of relationships.

As figure 5 demonstrates there are a variety of structures and relationships between the mainstream and the disability sport organisations. While some national governing bodies of sport have embraced disabled people's needs within their existing national and regional structures, others have allied themselves to new disability sport-specific governing bodies, and others still have encouraged the traditional generic disability sport organisations to retain responsibility. The pattern of relationships reflects the varying levels of existing provision, expertise, commitment, resources and the diverse range of ideologies in disability sport policy.
Figure 5 Models for Mainstreaming in Disability Sport

Model 1. Impairment specific sport organisation (e.g. Boccia)

Model 2. Autonomous and separate governing body (e.g. wheelchair basketball)

Model 3. Mainstream governing body - inclusion partnership with sports specific disability organisation/s (e.g. wheelchair tennis and deaf tennis)

Model 4. Mainstream governing body - inclusion partnership with single disability sport organisation (e.g. football)

Model 5. Mainstream governing body - inclusion through own internal structures (e.g. swimming)
Boccia provided an illustration of the inconsistent and unstable relationships within disability sport. Despite being a Paralympic sport with a successful national team, there was no governing body of boccia in England. The efforts of the EFDS to establish such a body were unsuccessful possibly because there is no equivalent mainstream governing body and Sport England has been unwilling to create a new disability sport organisation as it will detract from its aim to rationalise the organisational structures. As CP Sport has been left to develop Boccia from within its own resources, the relationship between CP Sport and Sport England is distant and fractious and as CP Sport do not believe that EFDS was supporting their interests, CP Sport’s relationship with EFDS is similarly tense.

The Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association was considered by its own officer, as well as Sport England’s officers, to be the recognised governing body and was given the status that this affords. As discussed more fully in the previous chapter, the English Basketball Association, while a partner of the Great Britain Wheelchair Basketball Association, has not been encouraged to mainstream wheelchair basketball. While this makes sense given the high levels of organisation and expertise within GBWBA’s well-established infrastructures, it illustrated a lack of consistency in the relationship that Sport England has with each sport, and again highlights the incoherence in disability sport policy.

Notwithstanding the (albeit contested) need for the EFDS to improve the coordination of DSOs, it appears that some NGBs have preferred to work with sports specific bodies such as the British Disabled Table Tennis Association and the National
Wheelchair Tennis Association, rather than generic DSOs such as Disability Sport England. The extent to which these sports specific disability agencies are running their activities under the umbrella of the mainstream NGBs or whether the NGB is taking responsibility and simply seeking their advice and support infrastructures is often unclear. The different perception on the roles and function of various organisations involved, was illustrated by responses to the questions in the survey revealing that while some thought that ‘disability sport should be run by the mainstream governing bodies’ others thought that ‘they [the mainstream organisations] should leave it to the experts [disability sport organisations]’ (Survey, 2001). The divergence in the actual roles and relationships of key organisations, as well as the varied perceptions in the role and relationships that these organisations ought to have, provides a rich illustration of the lack of consensus and the embedded conflicts within the disability sport policy network.

Non-existent relationship with disability organisations

It is clear that within the disability sport policy network relationships between key organisations are generally tense and variable, however, it is interesting to note that not one of these organisations had any strong relationship with agencies concerned with disability policy. The range of organisations involved in the disability sport policy network is diverse in both resources and function, but as Nichol (Sport England) and Chaytors (EFDS) acknowledged, these organisations are almost exclusively sport rather than disability focused. That is to say, disability sport policy is shaped by organisations that have a specific interest in one or more sports for one or more impairment groups but disability sport policy is not influenced directly by organisations that are interested in matters other than sport. Organisations concerned with disability policy that are campaigning for better rights to public services are not members of the disability sport policy network.

The British Council of Disabled People and Disabled People International have made significant impacts upon educational and social policies. The Disability Discrimination Act (HMSO, 1995) and the establishment of the Disability Rights Commission Act (Disability Rights Commission, 1999) were developed in part as a result of the lobbying efforts of organisations of disabled people. Despite this, neither the disability sport organisations nor Sports England have encouraged a relationship
with disability organisations, despite their apparent success in shifting central
government policy toward the adoption of policies which place responsibility for
services for disabled people on mainstream providers. With regard to the non-existent
relationship between disability sport policy and disability policy, Humphrey’s (1999)
analysis of organisations working for equal opportunities is useful here, as he suggests
that they typically adopt an isolationist approach and do not always recognise
similarity in their ambitions. In this regard it is certainly true that the disability sport
organisations work in isolation from the disability organisations that strive for the
improvement in opportunities broader than just sport.

Summary

In summary, this analysis of the organisational links within disability sport policy
shows that relationships between DSOs are tense and between DSOs and mainstream
NGBs the relationships are tense and also variable. It is also clear that Sport England
has a closer and more directive relationship with EFDS than it had with any other
DSO and there is no relationship between disability organisations and any agencies in
the disability sport policy network.

The relationships between key organisations in the two case studies suggested,
therefore, that disability sport as a policy area reflects most of the characteristics of a
loose issue network (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992). The lack of consistency in the
interactions of key agencies, the imbalance in their resources, the lack of agreement in
exchanges and the variability in who has access to decision making, all point toward a
network of loosely bound organisations that is characterised by fluctuation and
conflict.
Chapter three identified that Marsh and Rhodes' (1992) study of policy networks was likely to provide the most useful of the three frameworks for the analysis of disability sport policy. This was considered to be a particularly useful tool for the explanation of the disability sport policy process as it accommodates the significant involvement of interest group intermediation and accounts for the distribution and exchange of resources and the use of power between a wide range of agencies.

Marsh and Rhodes' policy network model is concerned with the relationship between organisations and the policy outcomes which they contribute to. The policy network model identified a series of dimensions, which distinguish issue networks from policy communities, namely; membership, integration, resources and power. It is to these criteria that we will now turn to establish the extent to which disability sport policy resembles a policy community or an issue network.

**MEMBERSHIP**

**Large number of organisations**

Using Marsh and Rhodes' (1999) typology of membership within policy networks, disability sport reflects characteristics that are consistent with an issue network rather than a policy community. As highlighted in the previous sections, the disability sport policy network has a large and diverse membership encompassing a wide range of interest groups none of which directly impact on government policy-making.

As the first case study indicated, with the support of Sport England, and coordinated by BSAD and the EFDS, the DSOs have remained as a relatively stable configuration of actors. However, while the current board of EFDS incorporates this stable network of DSOs, disability sport policy also includes the activities of other national organisations such as some NGBs, thus the network of organisations that influence disability sport policy extends beyond the EFDS Board. So, while the establishment of the EFDS and its Board of Directors has consciously included and excluded organisations from key decision making processes, the failure of the EFDS to secure a dominant role has allowed the diverse range of organisations to continue their
involvement in disability sport policy. This suggests that there has been an attempt by EFDS and Sport England to regulate the number of organisations in the disability sport policy network so that it is more reflective of Marsh and Rhodes' (1992) description of a policy community with a smaller, tighter, hierarchical structure. However, as the government's commitment to regulating access to policymaking has been rather weak, the wide and diverse membership has continued and a loose network has remained. This growth of interest groups accurately reflects Richardson and Jordan's (1979) assertion that a policy network without a dominant interest group, will continue to produce other interest groups which seek access to policy-making.

**Membership has no professional or economic interest**

In addition to the large size and ranging interests of its membership, it is clear from the two case studies that disability sport policy is not influenced by professional or economic interests and, therefore, does not resemble the characteristics of a policy community. Dissimilar to Marsh and Rhodes' (1992) case study of agriculture and nuclear power, in this study of disability sport there was an absence of economic and professional interests within the policy network. While the second case study of mainstreaming indicated that the EFDS was able to further its development of football for disabled people as a result of the significant financial and promotional interests of the phone company One-2-One, it is difficult to find other examples of disability sport policy being significantly influenced by commercial interests. Disability sport policy is influenced by a wide range of organisations none of which have economic or professional interests as central. Nor is there a professional or governing body for disability sport. Therefore, while no policy area conforms exactly to Marsh and Rhodes' criteria for an issue network or a policy community (1992), the evidence clearly demonstrates that using the 'membership' criterion disability sport policy reflects an issue network.

**INTEGRATION**

*Interaction between organisations is variable, inconsistent and lacks continuity and consensus*

As the earlier section clearly highlights, the relationships between key organisations in the two case studies suggest that disability sport as a policy area reflects the
characteristics of a loose issue network (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992). The interactions between key agencies such as the DSOs, Sport England and the mainstream governing bodies, lack consistency and vary in quality. The interactions between these agencies is characterised by fluctuation and conflict.

Some policy actors and groups of actors have been consistently involved over the last 30 years, but have more recently been joined by other organisations and perhaps more importantly their roles in the network has changed. For example, DSE no longer endeavours to play the coordinating role it once did, and EFDS has usurped ESAPLD’s role as the main DSO responsible for learning disability. Moreover, the roles of some key organisations change according to the policy issue or context within a particular policy issue. As highlighted in the previous section Sport England has adopted different roles and demonstrated different values across the range of sports. Its different approaches to the development of boccia and to the development of wheelchair basketball, provide perhaps the most revealing example of Sport England’s differing roles and values.

While there has been a consistent and long-standing agreement that disability sport policy should shift away from therapeutic medical to social explanations of disability, this shift in values has had only limited impact. Beyond the general agreement on the improvement of opportunities for disabled people in sport, the policy agenda is blurred, with little agreement on key policy issues. For example, the lack of consensus on the interpretation and implementation of mainstreaming policy led to a mixed response to Sport England’s decision to create the EFDS. According to Marsh and Smith’s (2000) and Perl’s (1999) perspective on policy networks the legitimacy of the policy outcome (that is the creation of EFDS) was bound to be threatened given the significant disagreement on core issues that was identified by Collins (1997). In addition, using Marsh and Smith (2000) and Perl’s (1999) perspective, conflict is likely to be ever-present in a network which had embedded difference. According to Richardson and Jordan (1979) and Marsh and Rhodes (1992) the significant role of individuals and the impact of their ideologies on the policy-making process is often underestimated. It was clear that the lack of consensus on key issues relating to disability sport had a significant impact on the development of disability sport policy.
The lack of consensus is illustrated by the results of the consultation process prior to the establishment of the EFDS, which demonstrated the diversity in the perceptions of the roles that organisations should play. The lack of consensus and coherence in the policy area has allowed the government to control the disability sport network. Sport England found it relatively easy to coerce the DSOs to support the establishment of the EFDS because of what Perl (1999) would refer to as a significant disagreement. Not surprisingly, the EFDS found it extremely difficult to win a broad base of support for its objectives among the traditional NDSOs. Organisations such as DSE and BBS considered themselves and their aims to have been sidelined thus resulting in them developing and expanding their own activities rather than supporting what the EFDS had hoped would be the gradual devolution of activities to the EFDS and the mainstream governing bodies. While some mainstream governing bodies were delighted with the unifying role that they perceived EFDS to play providing the ETFA, for example, with a single point of contact for advice and collaboration, many others had little respect for EFDS. This embedded conflict in disability sport is a result in part of the disagreement that Marsh and Rhodes (2000) suggest is typical of an unstable and fragile policy network. However, the case studies indicated that the lack of consensus on key issues is a reflection of more deeply rooted disagreements on core values. What follows is an analysis of the agreement and disagreement on core values within disability sport.

Diverse values

As Chapter two describes, the 1980s saw a shift of emphasis toward an appreciation that people were disabled from participation in society by environmental and social restrictions more than by their own individual impairment. This perspective on disability began to pervade social policy during the late 1980s when disabled people began to reject the medical definition that hitherto considered them as the problem and professionals as the problem solvers (Campbell and Oliver, 1996). This shift of understanding is evident in sport policy and reflects some basic consensus in core values. For example, the BSAD Think Tank in 1985, the Minister's Review in 1989, Sports Council's policy in 1993, the 'New Start' process and EFDS's development plan in 2000, all recognised the significance of the social and environmental restrictions that prevented disabled people from enjoying similar opportunities in sport to those enjoyed by their non-disabled peers. While it appears that disability
organisations have not contributed directly to the development of disability sport policy, their emergence and contribution to wider social policy in the UK has helped to shape indirectly disability sport policy. Recent disability sport policies reflect a belief that it is social and environmental factors rather than individual factors that constrain disabled people's participation in sport, thus suggesting that there might exist a set of beliefs that one would expect to find in a policy community.

However, despite recent policy documents and conference reports reflecting a social construct of disability, a number of key policy actors in disability sport still retain differing ideologies of disability and of disability sport. Specifically, many actors still subscribe to a medicalised understanding of disability, locating the cause of the disablement more with the individual than with society, with only a minority accepting the socially constructed model of disability and that their provision has typically been discriminatory and that it is their responsibility to make whatever changes are necessary to ensure that disabled people can access all of those services hitherto only enjoyed by non-disabled people. As indicated in the literature review, an officer from a mainstream or disability sport organisation, who believes that disabled people are best served by discrete and separate organisations, may do so because they consider disabled people to be significantly different from the biomedical norm and cannot expect to be catered for by the ordinary or normal providers. Others subscribe to a similar medical ideology of disability, but consider themselves as benevolent helpers, providing opportunities for participation wherever and whenever feasible. The Football Association for example, despite the continued efforts of disability sport organisations, have only demonstrated a genuine commitment since the recent involvement of one key individual. Adam Crozier, during his time as Chief Executive of the FA, was committed to the development of football for disabled people, indicating the important confluence of resources, political ideology and individual intervention.

Although there was clear evidence of a diversity of views on disability sport, the public policy debate was remarkably narrow. In general, government, through Sport England tightly controlled the policy agenda. This 'mobilisation of bias' has determined, in part at least, which issues have been organised into or out of the observable political discussions and conflicts within disability sport (Lukes, 1974). This mobilisation of bias in the decision making process is reflective of the two-
dimensional face of power as promulgated by Bachrach and Baratz (1962), as it has been both visible and invisible in setting the policy agenda. For example, it seems that any ideological position that did not support the mainstreaming policy would be suppressed or marginalised in discussion. Thus, during the ‘New Start’ process, while there were clearly different perspectives on how disability sport should develop, discussions surrounding the continued segregation of disability sport were kept off the list of viable options. This was indicative of the dominant assumption that disability sport was best served by its integration into ordinary provision (Steadward, 1996; Hahn, 1984). The mainstreaming agenda, proffered by some DSOs and NGBs but particularly by the government, was certainly visible in the form of public statements and policy documents.

To some extent, and in the absence of consensus on policy among the disability sport network, the government used persuasive and coercive tactics in both its creation of the EFDS and its development of the mainstreaming agenda. To a limited degree this is reflective of the Lukes’ (1974) third dimension, in which power is invisible in shaping the preferences of key actors. The compatibility is only partial however, as the attempt to shape key actors’ preferences was limited. As the case study of EFDS revealed, some organisations, such as British Blind Sport (Bright, Interview, 2001) were aware of the coercive role played by Sport England in shaping the preferences of organisations during the New Start process, yet few DSOs or NGBs were convinced that these preferences represented a ‘good deal’ (Hay, 2002: 178). The compatibility is also partial because disentangling the real interests and the perceived interests of those actors is problematic (Lukes, 1974; Hay; 2002).

Hahn’s (1984) analysis is interesting here, as his contention that sport for disabled people focuses upon the attempts to adapt able-bodied activities is also pertinent to the aims of some organisations and the ideologies of some key policy actors. While it may make sense to use the expertise and resources already available within non-disabled sports organisations as was recommended by the Minister for Sport Review Group (1989), an unintended consequence of recommendations such as these, may have been what Hahn (1984) perceived as an encouragement for disabled athletes to aspire to non-disabled standards and values, and consequently reinforced the able-bodied hegemony in sport.
In summary, competing values and beliefs are evident at a number of levels within disability sport. The first is the tension between those who hold medical as opposed to social explanations of disability. The second level of disagreement is between those key actors who believe that disability sport should be provided by separate disability sport organisations and those who believe that mainstream agencies should be the lead agency. Finally, there was a lack of consensus in relation to the role of disabled people in the decision making process with some arguing that disabled people should have a central role and others arguing that knowledge of sport is more important than the experience of impairment. These diverse ideologies are clearly evident in both the complex decision making processes and are manifest in a range of organisational structures and relationships.

Therefore, this study argues that disability sport policy is not characterised by high quality and frequent interaction of key organisations, that there is a lack of continuity and consistency in relationships, and that key organisations do not always share the same values or accept the legitimacy of policy outcomes. Again, while there are some aspects of the disability sport policy-making process, which demonstrate a superficial resemblance to a policy community, in general the inconsistency and variability in the interaction between key organisations and the embedded conflict on key issues suggest that disability sport policy is much more indicative of Marsh and Rhodes’ (1992) loose issue network.

RESOURCES

Varied, limited and inefficient exchange of resources

Marsh and Rhodes (1992) suggest that the amount and consistency of resource distribution provides a third criterion which distinguishes a policy community from an issue network. As the cases studies demonstrated and the earlier section in this conclusion have discussed, there is a wide variety in the resources that organisations have available to spend on disability sport. While some established disability sport organisations such as CP Sport relied on volunteers and had no budget for development, others such as the Football Association were able to support a Disability Football policy with extensive financial and human resources.
The use and exchange of resources between the organisations involved in disability sport is inefficient as there are many organisations that are striving toward similar aims and receive funding from Sport England to do so. For example, in the 1980s while BSAD was being funded by the Sports Council to coordinate the activities of DSOs, it also used this funding to develop opportunities for its own members. The development activities and opportunities that BSAD provided were often similar to those offered by other DSOs. It was the lack of coordination, duplication of opportunities and inefficient use of resources that was highlighted in the Minister for Sport Review Group report in 1989 and that consequently led to the establishment of the English Coordinating Committee in 1995 and the joint calendar of events in 1997. The joint calendar, which was funded partly by the BPA and partly by equal contributions from each of the NDSOs, offers an example of an attempt to improve the resource distribution and exchange. However, although there are other examples of relationships in disability sport where resources are exchanged efficiently, this is not the dominant characteristic within the network. It is much more typical to find that organisations are in conflict over the resources available particularly from Sport England. For example Sports England’s funding support for EFDS angered DSOs such as DSE and BBS who believed that they were achieving EFDS’s and Sport England’s aims and should, therefore, have received resources from the government.

**Increasing government control of resources**

This distribution and exchange of resources is central to Marsh and Rhodes’ policy network approach and while the pattern in disability sport is complex and confused, there are some key patterns that emerge from this analysis of resource distribution and exchange. The EFDS as the dominant DSO was clearly regarded as key in the allocation of funding, but some mainstream NGBs were identifying the funding opportunities available through greater involvement with disability sport. However, the lack of commitment by NGBs to disability sport has led DSOs such as BBS, CP Sport, DSE as well as the EFDS to be continually cautious and sometimes opposed to NGBs who they fear may drain the disability sport network of the limited fund it has access to.

As these and previous examples demonstrate, the government has had a substantive influence on the organisations that have and have not had access to resources. Similar
to mainstream sport, Sport England has been a major influence in the funding of
disability sport. Not only has the government funded disability sport organisations and
activities related to the development of disability sport, through the Sports Council
and Sport England, but the government has also exerted a major influence on the
policies and guidelines of other funding sources such as the national lottery. Thus,
despite the lack of a coherent government policy on disability sport the government
has considerable control of the funding made available to disability sport. There has
emerged therefore, in the last 8 years (since the emergence of 'New Start'), a
hierarchy of resource relationships, which is controlled by government.

POWER IN THE POLICY PROCESS

No organisation dominates the policy process

Using Marsh and Rhodes' (1992) fourth dimension in their policy network model,
power is widely distributed but there is not equal access to policymaking. Some
organisations have more power or exert more influence in the disability sport policy
process than others and government uses its influence to retain its insider status and
determine insider status for other organisations.

While neo-Marxism certainly offers a useful insight, the analysis of both case studies
suggests that power distribution in the disability sport policy process can be best
explained by neo-pluralist theories with the state controlling the development of
disability sport policy, through complex process of coercion and consensus with key
stakeholders. This analysis of disability sport policy indicates that while there is
limited interest from business, the state have actively intervened in policy
development, although the only coherent government position on disability sport is in
the context of its wider interest in equity. While policy, which aims to improve
opportunities in sport for disabled people enjoys wide consensus, the government
drive to mainstream disability sport represents its response to the longstanding
conflict and disagreement between key organisations within disability sport and lacks
coherence, consistency and support from key stakeholders.

Consistent with Schmitter and Lembruch's (1979) view of neo-pluralism, the New
Start process involved an unspecified number of non-hierarchically related
organisations, which were voluntarily and competitively involved. However, not all organisations had balanced and equitable access to decision making (Dahl, 1961). For example, Sport England played a dominant role in the decisions surrounding the creation of the EFDS. Consequently, disability sport policy processes are not reflective of the classical pluralist perspective. In keeping with Bachrach and Baratz’s (1962) criticism of the pluralist perspective of power distribution disability sport organisations such as British Blind Sport did not believe they had the same access to decision making as BSAD and, in the second case study, the British Table Tennis Association for the Disabled and CP Sport believed that their views and interests had been sidelined and did not consider themselves as having had equal access to decision making processes.

While no one organisation dominated disability sport it was clear that some, such as the DSOs on the EFDS board, enjoy privileged positions relative to other DSOs which Marsh and Rhodes suggest ‘together with the government’ typically ‘dominate the policy networks’ (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992:264). However, Marsh and Rhodes conclude that organisations or interest groups only have truly privileged positions in government policy when they have economical or informational advantage. In the 1980s Sports Council supported BSAD in part due to a lack of knowledge of disability sport and a recognition that BSAD provided the most economic solution to this problem. However, this provides one of few examples of DSOs having better access to policy making because of informational or economic advantage.

**Government has used power to retain its insider status**

Disability sport policy also reflects Marsh and Rhodes’ assertion that governments typically strive to retain insider status so that they can control and determine the policy outcomes. The embedded conflict between key organisations and the lack of coherent policy has enabled the government to gain and retain its insider status in disability sport.

Based on the two case studies disability sport policy is most compatible with Lindblom’s (1977) neo-pluralist perspective of power distribution as there is a wide range of interests but an unequal distribution of resources, with a few (non-business)
organisations (and in particular Sport England and EFDS) often having the most dominant position.

However, EFDS and Sport England were not always consistently influential. For example, in the second case study Sport England was dominant in the decisions relating to Boccia, but marginal to the decisions surrounding the development and governing body status enjoyed by the Great British Wheelchair Basketball Association. Moreover, and again reflective of the neo-pluralist view that the dominance of one group over others is not a static situation and always in flux (Lindblom, 1977), the organisations that have had the most dominant role in disability sport have changed slowly over time. For example, BSAD has had to give way to EFDS as the dominant disability sport organisation.

Using Lukes' (1974) discussion on the three dimensions or faces of power, Sport England’s use of power is not reflective of the first dimension put forward by Dahl (1961), as the use of power in disability sport could not be easily measured and was not always visible (Hay, 2002: 180). Based on the case studies and the earlier discussion, the second dimension has more to offer to this analysis as it accounts for the power exercised by Sport England in making policy decisions and setting policy agendas and, including and excluding issues as well as organisations from the decision making process (Lukes, 1974).

**Disabled people lack power in the policy-making process**

The case studies reveal that disabled people do not play a significant role in the development of disability sport policy. While a few disability sport organisations claim to be run and controlled by disabled people, most rarely employ, or even consult with, disabled people. Unlike the development of disability policy through the work of organisations such as the BCODP, disabled people do not play a significant role in disability sport policy. Consistent with Drake’s (1994; 1996) and Ducket’s (1998) studies of voluntarily organisations, disabled people appear to enjoy only token involvement in the decision making processes within disability sport. In this regard it is interesting to note that while Barnes, Mercer and Shakespeare suggest there has been a ‘world wide political mobilisation of disabled people’ (1999:4), this political empowerment has not impacted upon sport. Indeed if Morris (1997) and Oliver (1996) are correct in their assertion that disabled people are only independent
and empowered when they are in control of the help that is provided, then it seems that in sport disabled people are not able to assert their status as full citizens. The work of Lukes (1974) and Foucault (Foucault, 1974) are both instructive here in helping to establish how power is distributed in disability sport policy and in particular the extent to which key actors have the capacity to exert power in decision making processes. In relation to the influence of non-disabled people in disability sport policy, Lukes’ (1974) third dimension of power, which is discussed more fully in chapter 3, is particularly helpful as it considers that power can be exercised even if is not observable or is unrealised and in this regard the case studies suggest that key actors have used their power to create and perpetuate the dominant non-disabled hegemony. According to Lukes’ (1974) third dimension of power the role of Ludwig Guttmann and the non-disabled dominant policy committees within most disability sport organisations are indicative of an exercising of invisible power, in which those in positions of power and the (medical) institutions they represent use this power to serve their own interest through the shaping of preferences of other key actors. As discussed more fully in Chapter 3, Foucault’s perspective on the role of the expert is useful here in explaining the dominant influence of the medical profession in the lives of disabled people (Simon, 1995; Ransom, 1997; Scott, 2001). Foucault’s theorising of the role of the medical expert and their influence on the segregation of disabled people from ordinary life sheds light on, and is also reflected in, the emergence and development of disability sport. In this regard, it is fair to suggest that the character and emergence of disability sport was strongly influenced by what Foucault described as the professional expert.

Use of power is complex and difficult to establish

As discussed more fully in chapter three, Foucault rejects the assertion that individuals can possess power and thus would not accept that decisions in disability sport policy are the outcome of power relationships between non-disabled people who have power and disabled people who do not have power. Foucault’s perspective suggests that disability sport policy is the outcome of the interactions between key individuals during which power is exercised. Key decision makers, whether disabled or not, do not possess power but these individuals may deploy power in their interactions with others. For example, Foucauldian theory would suggest that the power exercised by Guttmann during his establishment of BSAD and his
concentration on those with spinal cord injury was specific to that particular situation and not tied to Guttmann personally. It was a product of the interaction between Guttmann and other ‘experts’ (Scott, 2001: 92). In addition, the perception of BSAD held by some key policy actors, which led to the establishment of other organisations, was also situationally specific. Similarly, in the case study of mainstreaming, the pattern of power distribution differed from sport to sport, with some organisations exercising power in one relationship but not in another. For example, while Sport England asserted considerable power in deciding not to support a new governing body of boccia, it decided not to assert this authority over GBWBA, preferring to allow GBWBA to be maintained as a non-integrated NGB. This inconsistency in the implementation of Sport England’s mainstreaming policy highlights the variable and complex power relationships within the disability sport policy network and is consistent with Foucault’s belief that people do not possess a ‘real’ identity and that interactions have a temporary construction. The identity of Guttmann for example was communicated in his interactions with others and this interaction was temporary, shifting according to what and who he was surrounded by.

The case studies indicated that power is widely distributed between disability sport organisations, disability sport specific organisations and mainstream sport organisations. They also suggested that disability sport policy is a complex environment in which it is not always easy to distinguish between those individuals who do and those who do not exercise power. However, despite this wide and complex distribution of power, through Sport England the government has adopted a dominant position in disability sport policy making.

While recognising the complexity which surrounds the distribution of power in disability sport, the government has increased its use of power over both mainstream and disability sport organisations; illustrated by its forceful intervention in the ‘New Start’ process. It is partly due to the lack of cohesion between DSOs, NGBs and other key agencies, that Sport England has become much more conspicuous as the dominant decision maker and has exercised this power to maintain the marginal status of disability sport. However, as the case study of mainstreaming indicated, government use of power has varied over time and across sports, having significant influence in one sport yet none in another. In this regard the neo pluralist perspective of power
distribution helps to explain disability sport policy as it is the result of a multitude of complex processes and converging variables.

Summary

Disability sport policy has generally been developed without the significant influence of disabled people and whilst Lukes’ (1974) may suggest that non-disabled people are more powerful than non-disabled people, this is an overly simplistic analysis that does not account for the complex situational context in which decisions are made. Foucault’s theory provides a more useful contribution to this analysis as it acknowledges the complexity of decision-making processes and recognises how power is located in specific interactions and not particular individuals. Foucault’s theory, therefore, accounts for the multifarious and disorderly series of processes within which power is exercised.

Using Marsh and Rhodes’ (1992) model, organisations concerned with disability sport policy in England, do not form a policy community as it does not: have a limited membership, which has high quality, frequent and consistent interaction; reach consensus easily; have a binding system of values; a common set of goals; a professional body; and the capacity to resist government and individual intervention. Organisations form an issue network in which there are occasional subsystems of coalitions working on policies relating to one sport or a discrete project. Unlike Marsh and Rhodes’ case studies of agriculture and nuclear power this examination shows that disability sport policy in the UK has the characteristics of a loose network of organisations rather than a tightly bound policy community. Table 21 (overleaf) identifies characteristics of stable policy communities and loose issue networks and provides examples to illustrate how disability sport policy most readily reflects the latter.
Table 21 The disability sport policy network (adapted from Marsh and Rhodes, 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Policy Community</th>
<th>Issue Network</th>
<th>Disability sport policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of participants</td>
<td>Very limited number, some groups consciously excluded</td>
<td>Large number</td>
<td>Large number of disability sport and mainstream sports organisations involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of interest</td>
<td>Economic and / or professional interests dominate</td>
<td>Diverse range of interests</td>
<td>Interests vary - impairment specific, sports specific – providers, coordinators -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of interaction</td>
<td>Frequent, high quality interaction of all groups</td>
<td>Contact fluctuates in intensity and frequency</td>
<td>Contact between key organisations ranges in frequency and intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>Membership, values and outcomes consistent over time</td>
<td>Access fluctuates significantly</td>
<td>Variety of organisations and interest has grown. Access now government sanctioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>All participants share basic values, agreement exists and accept the legitimacy of the outcome</td>
<td>A measure of conflict is ever present</td>
<td>Different ideologies of disability and disability sport. Little consensus on roles of organisations. Conflict is typical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of resources (within network)</td>
<td>All participant have resources, relationships is about exchange</td>
<td>Some have resources but limited, basic relationship is consultative</td>
<td>Varied resources. Distribution (and policy network) controlled by Sport England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of resources (within participating organisations)</td>
<td>Hierarchical members can deliver</td>
<td>Varied and variable resources and capacity to regulate members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a balance of power among members, although one group may dominate</td>
<td>Unequal power and unequal resources reflecting unequal access</td>
<td>Sport England and EFDS dominate as the sanctioned lead bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the Policy Network model is instructive, it fails to provide much more than a tool for describing the policy environment. Dowding criticised the policy network approach for being ‘hopelessly vague’ (Dowding, 2001: 102) in that it does not, he suggested, utilise quantifiable and measurable criteria. His point has some salience here, because while the case studies and the triangulation of data collected, provided a sharp insight into the disability sport policy environment, the policy network model
fails to provide an adequate means of establishing who is close to policy-making and who is not. Certainly the findings have revealed that not all actors have equal access to decision making and the model helps to establish who is included and excluded from the policy network process but fails to explain adequately which stakeholder has most influence and why and how policy is changed. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the policy network model has provided a valuable framework on which to generate knowledge and examine the disability sport policy process.

8.4 DISABILITY SPORT POLICY: ANALYSIS USING THE STAGES APPROACH, THE ADVOCACY COALITION FRAMEWORK AND THE POLICY STREAMS MODEL

Jenkins' (1993) claimed that policy-making is not a technical and controlled process and the two case studies have provided a clear illustration of the complex and confused process that Jenkins alluded to. As he indicates disability sport policy is affected by a wide range of factors including the values and interactions of key individuals which have been central to policy-making processes in disability sport. Minogue also offered a view on the policy-making process, which is particularly salient. Minogue (1993: 11) stressed that policies need to be considered in the context of the ‘policy network, organisations, actors and events’ and, the case studies have shown that organisation’s policies such as EFDS’s ‘A Fairer Sporting Society’, are best understood in the context of the events and individuals that led to its publication. To attempt to examine the emergence of EFDS or its policies without this wider context, as Minogue suggests, would ignore the complexity of decision making processes and play down the significant role of individual ideology. What follows is a discussion of the utility of the stages approach, the advocacy coalition framework and the policy stream model in this analysis of disability sport policy, in order to determine whether one of them might provide a more accurate conceptualisation of the disability sport policy process.

The stages approach has traditionally been considered as useful in providing a series of logical steps to guide the analysis of the process of policy-making and, despite the concerns expressed by Sabatier (1999), the stages approach has the potential to provide a relatively useful framework for the analysis of disability sport policy. For example, in the analysis of mainstreaming, it provides a useful framework to establish
when disability sport became a policy issue for each mainstream governing body. Moreover, the stages approach is helpful in establishing the extent to which sports have achieved the recommendations of the Minister’s review. For example, using Lasswell’s (1950) stages, in some sports such as athletics disability sport has hardly moved onto the ‘intelligence’ stage as there is little knowledge or interest in disability sport from the governing body. In swimming, however, it can be argued that disability sport has moved to the ‘implementation’ stage.

However, as John (1998) indicated, the stages approach while easy to apply is vague and lacks depth. For example, using the stages approach in the analysis of the first case study it is not possible to identify easily a specific beginning, middle and end to the process that resulted in the formation of the EFDS. It would be fair to say that the ‘New Start’ process was a significant period in which the decision to form a new agency was discussed, but it is very difficult to establish when this issue first appeared on any organisation’s agenda. Notwithstanding its usefulness in creating policy by providing discrete and neatly organised series of steps to follow (John 1998), the stagist model does not make a significant contribution to the analysis of disability sport policy. Disability sport policy is influenced by a wide range of organisations with varying interests and is a much more chaotic and disorganised process than the stages approach can easily account for. However, the advocacy framework coalition (ACF) provides a more useful tool for this analysis.

The ACF offers a method of analysing policy that recognises that policy can be affected by a diverse range of groups with varying degrees of influence. In this regard and similar to Marsh and Rhodes’ (1992) Policy Network approach, it provides an interesting insight into policy-making in disability sport. According to Sabatier’s (1999) ACF approach there are both stable as well as unstable variables, which impact upon policy outcomes. Disability sport policy has a number of stable parameters which have not changed substantively over the last 40 years or so. The relatively subordinate status of disabled people together with the activity of interest groups in disability sport, and the limited government interest in disability sport have all been stable and consistent features of the disability sport policy process. As indicated in both case studies, and exogenous to disability sport, some factors have changed. Shifts in explanations of disability and consequently a policy shift toward equity have clearly impacted upon disability sport policy. Government interest in mainstreaming
is more a consequence of its struggle for organisational neatness and for addressing inequities in sport generally, rather than a specific interest in disability sport. Nevertheless, and reflective of the ACF model, the broader change in societal understanding of disability and the resultant shift in social policy have impacted upon disability sport policy. According to Sabatier (1999) changes in society impact upon public opinion which when substantive enough affects the values of key government officials and consequently their department policies. Sabatier's (1999) theory helps to explain how the shifts in social policy that was brought about by disabled people has influenced disability sport policy.

However, while wider government policy has impacted upon disability sport policy, key actors in disability sport policy have not significantly influenced government policy. The ACF models suggested that the lack of government influence is due to the lack of resources, lack of consensus, and the limited government and public interest in disability sport. Consequently, and in keeping with the ACF model, the impact of actors within disability sport on government policy is negligible. As John (1998) indicates in his critique, the ACF recognises that policy-making processes in disability sport are not based upon consent and negotiation, and reflects the complex and multiple factors that determine policy. Furthermore the focus of the ACF is on individuals’ ‘ideas and interests’ (John, 1998:170) and does not readily account for the significant impact of embedded institutional ideologies.

The ACF differs from the Policy Network approach as it places organisations into ‘alliances’ or ‘coalitions’ which compete for influence and are often in conflict. While there may be better examples of this perspective at the international level of disability a few sports such as wheelchair basketball and tennis have developed robust infrastructures and relationships with partners who have clearly defined responsibilities. They share the deep core belief that disabled people should have access to the same high quality opportunities in sport as non-disabled people
However, they do not share a core belief on which agency should lead the development and have the responsibility for disability sport as basketball has policy beliefs that are firmly rooted in the maintenance of its status as the governing body of sport and rejects any suggestion that it should be embraced by EBA (the mainstream governing body of ambulant basketball). Whereas the actors in tennis agree that
despite the existence of a disability sport specific body (NWTA) that the British Tennis Foundation is the most suitable agency to have responsibility for disability tennis.

While tennis and wheelchair basketball may provide an example of effective coalitions, it would be erroneous to suggest that this is consistent with the ACF view, as they are not in conflict with one another and are both rather too narrowly based to qualify as coalitions in Sabatier's terms. It seems therefore what while the ACF provides an interesting insight into the disability sport policy network it is unclear whether the coalitions or subsystems that exist in disability sport policy are consistent with the descriptions offered by Sabatier.

Kingdon's Policy Streams offers a useful if limited contribution to this analysis. Kingdon suggested that the policy-making process is the result of continually shifting relationships between the range of individual, institutional and external agents. Kingdon's belief that policy is formed as a consequence of 1) problem streams, 2) policy streams, and 3) political streams, is not easily applied to disability sport policy. First disability sport is not a 'problem stream' that has gained wide political and public attention. Second, with the possible exception of Guttmann, there has been no individual entrepreneur inside or outside of the disability sport 'policy stream' that has been able to inspire and motivate others to change policy. Guttmann could see the rehabilitative potential of sport and provided the leadership and inspiration for what has evolved into an international phenomenon. The shifting perceptions of disabled people as passive recipients of care allowed Guttmann to exploit this window of opportunity and further his own ideas. To a lesser extent, it could be argued that the Chief Executive of the ASA (David Sparkes) recognised, in the mid 1990s, that there was a lack of clear direction in disability sport policy, and saw the potential for the ASA to take responsibility for disability swimming and to achieve the funds to do so. However, disability sport policy has not enjoyed the benefits of significant or sustained ministerial intervention or entrepreneurial zeal, such as in education or health policy.

However Kingdon's third 'political' stream offers a more useful analysis as it helps to account for how the changing institutional, academic and public perceptions have contributed to the development of mainstreaming policy in disability sport. As
Kingdon suggests, it is not easy to trace policy outcomes in disability sport back to the original concept or starting point (Zaharidis, 1999). However, and consistent with Zaharidis' view of Kingdon's policy streams approach, it is clear that certain activities or trends outside as well as inside the sports policy area have contributed to disability sport policy. For example, while the Minister for Sport's review in 1989 may have heralded disability sport's early shift toward mainstreaming, this development is best attributed to the changing definitions of disability emerging from wider social policy in the 1980s.

Kingdon's approach provides a perspective which helps to explain why disability sport policy like many other policy arenas is complex and messy. It is difficult to establish who is involved, how policy is developed and what influences its development. Kingdon's model encourages the belief that disability sport policy can be influenced and even inspired by individual entrepreneurs. It also suggests that it is the circumstances of 'problems, policies and politics' that have prevented disability sport from gaining wider political and public attention and not the ineffective and uncoordinated lobbying efforts of disability sport organisations (Zaharidis, 1999: 76). The policy stream approach, therefore, suggests that disability sport policy originates from a series of related and confusing processes (John, 1998: 175) and recognises the capacity of individuals to influence policy. The theory provides, therefore, a relatively useful if limited tool for explaining why disability sport policy has not achieved significant recognition. As Schlager (1999) claimed, the analysis is limited as it is vague and provides a 'one analysis fits all' approach, failing to explain who contributes to disability sport policy and how it is formed.

While the Multiple Streams approach and the ACF offer some insights into the analysis of disability sport policy, their weaknesses outweigh their strengths. It is consequently argued that Marsh and Rhodes' policy network model (1992) remains the most useful analytical framework.

8.5 A SUMMARY OF THE DISABILITY SPORT POLICY PROCESS

Disability sport policy process is characterised by a wide range of disparate organisations that have variable and often tense relationships and lack consensus on key policy issues. Disability sport policy is influenced much more by sport rather than
by disability policy, and while a peripheral area of government interest, since 1989
government has become much more conspicuous in the disability sport policy
process.

The implications of these findings are fourfold. First, the lack of consensus on policy
issues among key DSOs, together with society’s marginal interest in disability sport
indicates that DSOs will continue to be ineffective in lobbying government for better
access to decision making. Second, and as a consequence of the lack of consensus on
the part of DSOs and their inability to lobby for better access to decision making,
government is likely to continue to keep disability sport as a peripheral area of policy
interest. Third, while DSOs adopt the more conservative approach of organisations in
sports policy rather than the more radical campaigning and lobbying approach of
disability organisations, DSOs will continue to negotiate ineffectively for government
support. Fourthly, DSOs’ ineffective lobbying activity combined with the marginal
interest in disability sport by governing bodies and the government, suggest that
mainstream sports policy will remain unaffected by disability sport policy.

There is little evidence to indicate there will be a substantive shift in disability sport
policy or disability sport policy processes in the near future. In relation to Marsh and
Rhodes’ policy network model there is little to suggest that it will soon display all the
characteristics of a policy community, however, a number of shifts in the network
may occur. For example, Sport England’s increasing intervention in the disability
sport policy network may lead to a more regulated and smaller membership of
organisations. The values, interests and interaction of this smaller membership may be
heavily influenced by Sport England’s capacity to direct policy and resources. As
such it may have some of the characteristics of a policy community. However, in
keeping with the neo-pluralist perspective, if this were the case, other organisations
may form to represent those interests Sport England had marginalised.

In relation to the future of disability sport policy and the ACF, there is an emerging
growth of small coalitions within subsystems of the policy network. Findings indicate
that coalitions may develop in areas of disability sport policy where the main interest
is in elite competition within a single sport. These coalitions are beginning to develop
in pockets of disability sport policy where there are fewer actors, the policy agenda is
tighter, consensus on aims and, and where there is a single organisation (BPA) to act as the dominant and respected policy coordinator.

The policy streams approach while not offering a particularly useful analysis for this study offers a perspective on the future possibilities of disability sport policy. The second case study suggests that mainstreaming is a key policy issue that despite its relevance to wider social policy does not enjoy the commitment of key actors. However, a policy entrepreneur with influence in sport policy or disability policy and vision and commitment in disability sport, could exploit a ‘window of opportunity’ if circumstances led disability sport to be considered as a ‘problem stream’ and thus a political problem in need of a solution.

It is not the purpose of this study to provide a series of recommendations, as this ‘policy advocacy’ approach is best left to those with vested interests in the disability sport policy area. However, these findings have a number of practical applications that may be of interest to those in the disability sport network. First, the disability sport organisations could be more effective in the network and more influential in government policy if they establish some common values on which they could develop a coordinated policy. Second, assuming that a key element within the core values of DSOs reflects a belief in accessing resources and opportunities in mainstream sport to disabled people, then developing relationships within organisations and departments in the disability policy network such as the British Council of Disabled People and the Disability Rights Commissions, may provide the DSOs with the prospect of gaining wider political and public support. Third, the second case study highlighted diverse views and varied commitment to mainstreaming. If Sport England and the DSOs were able to establish an agreed commitment to mainstreaming, to meet this aim, there is a need to provide recommendations, which articulate the requirements of key organisations and a process by which these recommendations could be enforced.
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**APPENDIX 1. List of Interviewees**

### Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernhard Atha</td>
<td>Member of the Ministers Review Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of EFDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Bright</td>
<td>Chief Executive of the BBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Casey</td>
<td>Chief Executive of Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin Chaytors</td>
<td>Chief Executive of EFDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Craven</td>
<td>President of the GBWBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Hodgkins</td>
<td>Regional Development Manager for the EFDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Vernon James</td>
<td>National Development Officer - Sports Coach UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Lewis</td>
<td>Ex – president of BSAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of BTTAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Marshall</td>
<td>Member of the Minister for Sport Review Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Nicholl</td>
<td>National Officer – Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Neale</td>
<td>Chief Executive of Disability Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Price</td>
<td>Ex Chief Executive and President of BSAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Chaytors</td>
<td>Chief Executive of EFDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Craven</td>
<td>President of the GBWBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Davies</td>
<td>National Development Officer for the FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Rogers</td>
<td>National Disability Development Officer for the ETTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Parker</td>
<td>National Disability Development Officer for the BTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Pearse</td>
<td>Chairman of the English Boccia association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sparkes</td>
<td>Chief Executive of the ASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Stills</td>
<td>National Officer for UKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Wolstenholme</td>
<td>Director of the BTF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 2. Interview Diary Worksheet

#### 1. Interview Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of interviewee</th>
<th>Dr. Bob Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of organisation</td>
<td>British Sports Association for the Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of organisation</td>
<td>Disability sport organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>June 10th 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue of interview</td>
<td>Chester College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>KEY RESPONSES TAKEN FROM TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEW</th>
<th>KEY QUOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What are the key developments or landmarks in the political history of disability sport?</td>
<td>BPSS/BSAD 1961 (p.1) Isle of Man Think Tank (p.27) Ministers Review 1989 (p.19) BPA role (p.32) Lottery/ WC Perf Plans (p.18)</td>
<td>'BSAD's responsibility is not just to 'do' in its own name but to enable others to do likewise ...and as such has a responsibility to a much broader public than its constitutional membership'. (Price, BSAD, 1985:11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Which are the key organisations /individuals that have shaped disability sport?</td>
<td>BPSS/BSAD (p.6-7) Guttmann (p.1.6) Sports Council support (p.6) CCPR did not (p.8)</td>
<td>On Guttmann 'he was the right man for his day because there was nothing until he came along and when he left there was something' (Price, Interview, 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What is the relationship between the organisations that have been or are still key to disability sport?</td>
<td>BSAD – membership &amp; coordination (p.3-5) BSAD a SC resource (p.9) MS NGBs should be responsible (p.11) No need for two structures (p.27-28) DSOs do not want to give up their role (p.29) No real gov responsibility for dis sport (p.34-36)</td>
<td>BSAD was almost 'schizophrenic when one half existed for one reason and the other half existed for a completely different reason'. The SC would never ‘accept the argument by me or anybody else that the healthier or positive way forward if you really believe sport for all and an integrated society, would be for them (the Sports Council) to make sure that all of its mainstream services reached disabled people as well as non-disabled people'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 What are the key aspects of the policy process in disability sport?</td>
<td>Arms length from gov (p.10-11) Shift to mainstream</td>
<td>‘disability sport is a long way down the list of government priorities’ (Price, Interview, 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. What are the current issues in disability sport?</td>
<td>Developing / mainstreaming (p.22-24) More accessible (p.21)</td>
<td>On the DSOs ‘they would not argue against mainstreaming as a positive force and a sensible development, but if you say right translate that into practice, give up your job on the assurance that the non-disabled body would do it for you... they all said no, everyone one them’ Sports Council ‘would love to put all of its disability headaches into one basket’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Commentary

Extremely informative interview. We spent over 2 hours discussing the history and development of disability sport. Bob's involvement as President and Chief Executive of BSAD and the current Chairman of the BPA meant that he was able to provide the full picture (from his perspective) of all the key landmarks, issues and personalities that have shaped disability sport. It was an excellent interview - filling in many of the gaps in the existing knowledge and providing a fascinating insight into the government's relationship with disability sport. Bob also alluded to some documents that I need to investigate. In particular the Conference report from an Isle of Man Think Tank held in 1985.

I often engaged in the discussion more than perhaps I intended by offering my own perceptions and opinions - using more of a 'conversational analysis' technique which was not strictly in accordance with the technique I intended as I wanted to be as detached as possible and did not want my own views to impact on Bob's responses. However the 'conversational' style allowed the discussion to flow and I believe as a result I extracted richer data as a result. It was friendly and enjoyable interview.
NT: I have been going through various documents, policy documents or government resourced reviews, and trying to establish the history of the organisational development. Can you start off by telling me why BSAD was created in the first place in 1961 assuming that was its..

BP: 61, 62 yeah, I wasn't involved, then but I have always assumed and understood that BSAD was created largely at the instigation of some of the government panel who had already created the BPSS, Sir Ludwig of it being based at Stoke Mandeville working with spinal cord injured whatever in the main had developed sporting competitions for the spinal cord injured group and that had become formalised in BPSS. People about that time started suggesting to Sir Ludwig If it works for the Paras then surely it should work for others shouldn't there be a similar in BPSS for people with other forms of disability and BSAD was created in that way to deal with other disabilities, and I think that was the first mistake

NT: Why a mistake?

BP: Because with the wisdom of hindsight I think even Sir Ludwig might have recognised later on that that immediately created problems for BSAD which grew into something that was supposed to be pan disability but it was always pan disability but not the spinal cord injured, cause BPSS already existed, and it wasn't BSAD for all disabilities it was, there was already BPSS for the spinal cord injured and BSAD was for the rest, it was almost like the original .......... (21) laughter and there was an international equivalent a very precise equivalent as well ISM WSM as in now is ISMGF as in then was the international umbrella of spinal cord injured

NT: which started before BPSS didn't it

BP: Yes, you had the international body and then the British version of it?

NT: So Ludwig was level with you also, lets go BSAD to cover other disabilities

BP: and the effect it would have on ISOD

NT: International Component
BP: ISOD never had any authority over spinal cord injured sport, just as BASD never had any authority domestically over spinal cord injured because ISMGF and BPSS already existed when ISOD and BSAD were formed.

NT: Yet the ministers fought the review group, seemed to indicate the reasons for BSAD's reason to be established was to co-ordinate those existing DSO's of which it seems to suggest there was more than a few, cos I can't work out who other than ISMGF and BPSS the only other two...... what by 1960?

BP: All been a bit of tangent, most people think that disability sport started with a wheelchair sport about 1 or 2 and tend to have it altogether. The fact is that there was organised sport for deaf people and blind people long before that.

NT: BDSC yeah

BP: But they were never in the frame,

NT: Once the other (034) were around

BP: Even if they existed, yeah, they were so far away from his consciousness that somebody stood as a neurosurgeon in physical disability, but they may well have existed, but they wouldn't have been NDSO's of the sport, Sport council, we would have expected BSAD to ..

NT: So do you think there were other DSO's around at the time and prior to BSAD?

BP: Well the Spastics Society as it then was, erm ... had for some time been promoting sport and recreation of people with cerebral palsy but there wasn't an NDSO, you see the sport game, (040)

NT: 81, I think?

BP: Yeah, but Arthur Edwards was at the Spastics Society a full time staff member whose responsibility was sort of promoting physical activity

NT When they were established, organisations like CP Sport like British Blind Sport, though sport for those groups had been you know, for many years prior their organisations were asked to be co-ordinated by BSAD

BP: I have never seen anything that would suggest they would asked to be co-ordinated by BSAD. BSAD's early membership was a bit of high brid it was over time the NDSO's they were part of BSAD's board or whatever they were called in those days and the other part
was their regions, for a number of years through the 1970's and into the early 1980's. BSAD's policy future and election were determined by a board of trustees who fell very neatly into two camps, which had quite different ambitions and expectations of BSAD, the regional representatives on the board were all BSAD and identified with BSAD and ..........to the BSAD in their name and title and everything. The other half of the board were the NDSO's who used the BSAD whenever they had to use BSAD for co-ordinating purposes for access to funds for, you know, access to sports council, erm ... but everything that they did other than in a BSAD forum was done in the name of another organisation, so the BSAD board at that time was a lot more schizophrenic.

NT: Is that why it then became 87 then instead of ...

BP: Yeah, because throughout the 1980's that situation existed and there were a number of occasions I can't remember the detail now but I can remember the situation in board meetings at BSAD where the officers of the day and the regional membership were actually unwilling to share with their other board member colleagues from the NDSO's everything that they wanted to say because they felt that it would then be poached and developed somewhere other than in BSAD and you had this peculiar I mean almost a form of schizophrenia when half of the BSAD existed for one reason and the other half existed for a completely different reason and it was neither fish nor foul.

NT: Can you summarise for me what those two different reasons were?

BP: The regional representatives on BSAD's National Executive believed the main reason for BSAD to exist was to promote opportunities for the participation in sport for anybody with a disability and over the late 60's and through the 1970's and into the early 1980's an awful lot of activity had occurred under the umbrella and in the name of BSAD to develop the network about 5 or 6 hundred local sports clubs for disabled people organised in regions of BSAD who sent representatives to the national executive to determine the organisations future policies direction. They were convinced that that was what BSAD was all about, the NDSO members of BSAD.

NT: So you are talking about the ones established if you go back to the 60's?

BP: They weren't all NDSO's constitutional at that time, disability sports organisation whether it was RNIB before BBS or whether it was the spastics society before CP Sport, you know there was somebody from each of the main disability groups sitting on the board erm ... because, as you suggested already, they had been encouraged by the Sport Council to do so if you don't do so then you don't do so then you won't get anything from us or anywhere else.
NT: and they were hoping, I take it that, if Officers in Regions came up with numerous blind children they would refer them to their respective organisations and that is where the difficulties are raised, is that what...

BP: Yep, Yes  In the mid 1980's, I mean it all came into a much clearer focus, what is this organisation suppose to be doing, it can't be both things, so where does it future lie? and the reconstitution of BSAD 1987 was suppose to be a clear and unequivocal indication to everybody that was interested in its future was at a developmental organisation through regional or networks of clients.

NT: Yes, yes, so should it be the case that events and membership, national events and regional events, members would be encouraged to go to other organisations?

BP: I think at the time...

NT: who was developing a participation base, rather than members to BSAD soley,

BP: I don't know whether this term would have been used then, but certainly one of the flavours that was running through the whole debate was that of market forces, and far enough blind people interested in a blind competition just for the blind then good luck to them, if there are enough amputees to make an athletics competition just for amputees viable good luck to them, none of that should take away from BSAD the opportunity that it had and the reputation that it had has been an organisation which really didn't care less about the differences between disability groups, its main mission was to provide opportunities for anybody with any disability to take part in any sort of sport, and one can't have both, it has to be one or the other.

NT: Ok, you mention reputation, from working for them and different committees and particularly through mixed reviews comments, reputation seem to be something that these had a poor reputation it has been (100) possibly amongst the other DSO's as much as anything and I read in something historical accounts of CP Sport for example, they are happy to talk about their own history and go onto their recent work with the Sports Council and the English Federation even, but do not refer to the BSAD. Why is it that they had (if you believe that they did) have a poor reputation?

BP: I think that as a single answer first of all, I think BSAD's reputation erm ... would have varied according to who it was you were asking, erm ... but no doubt at all that many of the smaller NDSO's of the day were envious of BSAD's positions, they didn't have then and then haven't developed since a network of grass roots clubs and a regional organisation even getting close to the BSAD. So grass roots activity regional base national organisation annual calendar of national championships. So I think there was for many of them, you know envy and jealousy made even more sort of sharp or bitter if that is the
right adjective by the realisation, that rightly or wrongly, for better or for worse, BSAD also had the ear of the Sports Council

NT: and the purse strings?

BP: and the funding from the Sports Council went to them first

NT: and then BSAD, on BSAD's say so, they were given ...

BP: Yes, Yes

NT: Funds or not?

BP: Yes so in many respects erm .. it was an organisation which was not backed by its peers because of the advantages that it had, because of its quite deep roots and a very extensive participation network. The dissatisfaction with it the negative reputation and I am trying now to find legitimate cause for complaint against BSAD, I think most of that stems from the days of Sir Ludwig leadership for example, Sir Ludwig being the person that he was, speak to neurosurgery and physical disability with his first lot being paras and spinal cord injury, erm ... had never really felt any great affection for non physical disability groups or any great inclination to open the doors of BPSS or BSAD to those other groups. There wouldn't, there probably wouldn't have been any need for CP Sport for UKSA or for what was then just for (129) Sports Association , Sir Ludwig and the BSAD of his day had been more open and more welcoming in making what they did available to people of other disability groups.

NT: I have had an interview with a Senior Administrator I suppose you could call him, saying that he remembers him as somebody, who was very patronising in fact.....

BP: Obviouslyý I can't really comment on that.

NT: Possibly, I don't know it was a personal comment made at the time which was quite intriguing rather than a depiction of him being what, a hero of his recognition of what sport can do in a rehab type process. I wouldn't want to cast aspersions but.........

BP: He was obviously the right man for his day, because there was nothing until he came along and when he left there was something. Any of us with the wisdom of hindsight can look back and say well you should have done it differently sort of thing, you know, but he did what he did, and erm ... with tremendous energy and with tremendous conviction, that yeah, he knew what he wanted to do and nobody was going to get in the way of him doing it. I mean I can remember from my own experience of him this is, this isn't hearsay, this is from my own memory. A discussion within BSAD touching on badminton as a possibility
and Sir Ludwig was in the chair refused to allow the discussion to go any further. He said
"I am not prepared to talk about this, badminton is not a sport for disabled sport for
disabled people" and we were (147)

NT: Why did he?

BP: Well, he wouldn't give one, and I use that simply as an illustration of a sort of man that he
was. He had his vies, he knew what he thought was appropriate, he knew where he wanted
to go and he would go there and if other people came along with other ideas erm... but
obviously if he let them he would complicate them but if he didn't he wasn't even prepared
to discuss them let alone concede that yes there may well be a place for them, hadn't
thought about that.

NT: Fascinating. Just keeping in touch with key agencies if you like in terms of DSO's. Wasn't till
erm... I think it was 1980 that the UKSAMPFI and BSAD at that time were giving some form of
title as being returned in development agencies, why was it do you think that one agency which
had many different disability groups if you like, one for purely learning disability, why was
UKSA giving such a significant role, given it was just looking after one group.

BP: Probably because despite its constitution the perception of the day was that BSA didn't do
anything for people with (162) or learning disability or mental handicap (162)
Institutionally, different types of disability didn't matter with the BSAD, but in practice
there was very little evidence of anybody within BSAD ever having tried genuinely to
provide opportunities for people with learning disabilities and erm... If BSAD had been
more energetic in that direction, probably there wouldn't be any need for UKSA in the
first place. Given that perception by those within the Sports Council BSAD looks after
those with physical disabilities UKSA looks after those with a mental handicaps, we have
actually cracked it

NT: BSAD supports the other the two organisations that have cropped up in the meantime?

NT:BP: BPSS and whatever else.

BP: and those other organisations were all on BSAD's executive anyhow, so if you actually help
BSAD in theory you should be helping them because they were part of BSAD.

NT: Right I am with you

NT: you have mentioned Sports Council, we haven't talked about them much at the moment, am I
right in thinking that the BSAD was the first organisation that they tried to influence had a
significant hand in their establishment
BP: Erm... kind of had a hand in their establishment, because BSAD existed before the Sports Council did.

NT: 65 wasn't it? Sports council

BP: Sports Council was 71, BSAD was 61 or 62

NT: Silly question!

BP: No, No

NT: it seems to me the organisation that they have had most dealings with in terms of a policy steer.

BP: I think that is the case if you had said development rather than establishment I wouldn't have picked you up on the dates

NT: No, that is important

BP: But the Sports Council having been created in the early 1970's, there was already a BSAD and yes, the Sports Council from the very beginning saw BSAD as a very convenient vehicle through which to do all those things it really didn't have a background in disability or integration or mainstreaming or any other things which are common practice nowadays, and it was very easy for it to honour its remit to sport for all through an external agency as long as we fund BSAD then we can say we are doing that.

NT: Do you think, I will just leap forward to the present, do you think that things have changed much since then?

BP: No

NT: Given the arms length in which the EFDs are now?

BP: No not a lot, I don't think, I think they have changed, they have improved, the relationship between the Sports Councils plural as they now are, and the whole sort of family of disability sports organisations has improved through the passage of time, through greater understanding through greater awareness, through more years of talking to each other, but fundamentally we still have a Sports Council acting at arms length from behalf of a central government department, which would love to be able to put all of its disability headaches into a single basket wouldn't it?

NT: Which is being done, I guess, to a point?
BP: It would never except the argument whether by me or by anybody else that the healthier or positive way forward if you really believe it, for sport for all and an integrated society would be for them to make sure that all of the mainstream Sports Councils services reached disabled people as well as non disabled people.

NT: You mentioned sport for all, if that is what sports councils believe in, lots of documentation on the reason for Sport Council intervening in any way, even though perhaps they say they ought not to, they do is for sort of the (209) simplicity meaning international prestige and maybe sort of social order welfare, why are they intervening in disability sport?

BP: Erm .... You are right, there isn't a single answer and I think it would be uncharitable to suggest there is nobody in the Sports Council who is generally interested in disabled people and giving no access to sport, I think that would be a nonsense. Erm.... Over the last 10 or 15 years there has been a much greater effort made by people in the Sports Council to understand the problem and to actually make sure that at least some of the money, some of the effort would go in the direction of people with disabilities. We have always stopped short of actually rubbing out the lines that separate disabled people from the rest of the community and offering a fully integrated service.

NT: What is that then? What would be the ideal module, if you like, there's, you say things are moving, things have changed ..

BP: and it goes (221) again which may give you a social aptitude erm... Sports Council Regional Officer responsible for development in his region of table tennis, yeas, I once asked that person hypothetically, if tomorrow morning a letter landed on your desk, saying “ I live in your region, I am 23 years old, male, who would just love to start playing table tennis, but I happen to have a sort of right sided hemiplegia because of I was born with cerebral palsy erm... and I don't know really where to start can you help me?” His answer was, I wouldn’t even answer it, I would pass it straight on to the guy down the corridor with views with disabled people, who happens to know nothing at all about table tennis, doesn’t have any contact within the table tennis world, laughter

NT: So really, I suppose you are looking for that notion that everybody has disability written into every role they have in sport, its for every man to have disability as an integral part of that.

BP: Yes.

NT: Even if, are we still suggesting though, even if, say its table tennis that that might involve erm..... competition, education, opportunities, that are for a specific group of disabled people......
BP: I still think it should be the table tennis officer that is in the lead, I am not saying there has never been and even now there is not a need for 1 member of the team to have a greater understanding of disability and all of the sort of networking, the infrastructures of disability sport, but he should be a resource for his colleagues he shouldn’t be the dumping ground for everything to do with disability, so the table tennis guy should know enough about table tennis in his region to be able to help somebody, ambulant cerebral palsy lets say who’s you know not strong on one side, to gain access to a club and opportunity to learn to play table tennis but if that fellow, you know 6 months later was obviously coming on so fast and was such a competitive animal then he would really need to know where can I go as somebody with cerebral palsy could actually getting to be quite good at table tennis, then you go down the corridor to ask your disability expert, you don’t just dump everything on him from day one

NT: I spoke to a disability table tennis officer last week, pure coincidence, Judy Rogers I think, and she came out with very similar views to yours and do you think there is a point in which officers in sport are able to recite this type of political rhetoric about where we should be going and yet, because it doesn’t seem to be changing much, you see it is a bit like people what’s equal opps now we can tell you we are working to equal opps.....

BP: Well the example I have just given you was a real one but it was 15 years ago

NT: Right ok

BP: And you say that you have a similar conversation this week?

NT: Well, similar, I suppose, the officer who is responsible for table tennis for disabled people saying all the things that they are working towards were that ........ I am just becoming increasingly aware that the colour brochures and the examples are, negligible compared to what it could be, and we are using them sort of overplaying that card if you like.

BP: when I came back from America 1983 long time ago now, (262) but I was interviewed for the BSAD’s job and the Sports Council was represented on the interview panel because the funded BSAD basically, one of the questions put to me by the Sports Council representative was “ no denying your background, experience, qualifications, but you have been out of the country for 5 years, isn’t’ there a danger if we offer you this job that we would be appointing somebody who doesn’t know how much has changed since”

NT: and your response was?

BP: My response was, “that had occurred to me too, which is why I came to London yesterday not today I spent the whole of yesterday morning in the Sports Council’s own library and
read every one of your annual reports for each of the last 5 years and you haven't mentioned disability once" so I doubt very much that that much had changed"

NT: and that was 83.

BP: that was 83.

NT: If you did that now, do you think it would work?

BP: Almost certainly there would be at least one photograph!

NT: But that is my point, I am making points, and I learn (277) it seems to me that it is becoming increasingly easy to tick that box and not being able to be accused of what you accuse the Sports Council of because there will be a statement, yes, if you look at how many children are benefiting from this new venture, opportunity, difficult to quantify, they will say, oh we can't tell you how many, so you get away with it because of the way it's monitored. What I would like sort of, move on that is, you suggested lots have happened and there has been a number of improvements but fundamentally not many changes to if you like policy direction and not necessarily performance or organisation but perhaps lifting the way of working towards what you have suggested or your ideal model. What would you say are, have been landmarks from perhaps 1950'2 to now so those landmarks might be significant developments, policies, people, whether they are positive impacts or ones which you think have been a nail in the coffin of development, that's a difficult one I know that

BP: Well it is, because the, actually there aren't that many if you are really trying to look at the political, (296) over the last 30 years, I would love to be able to look back on somewhere between the 1960'2 and now and say that's step now, that decision to bring disability sport into the mainstream of government funding or national governing body provision or whatever, but it hasn't happened even now

NT: I am sure other people will argue that things like, erm ... setting up a BPA is a very positive initiative in the co-ordination of international opportunities in 89

BP: Sorry in that case I have misunderstood your question, I thought you were inviting me to look at significant achievements in the direction that I had already started to go down which was an integrated service.

NT: you have answered one question

BP: Because the BPA would do it ...
NT: You were given a model of your idea, we have done nothing to get that or it is a landmark, significant things, if we have moved anywhere it has been more by chance if anything else.

BP: There have been some landmarks, it depends on whether you look at this is perhaps an artificial distinction, but if we think about grass roots development, encouraging people to take part in this sport, then the, the very fact that over the last 20 years more money has gone in the direction of BSAD, UKSA, the creation of the English Federation and a result of a ministerial review and all of those things have to be seen to be positive steps, moving towards greater participation by disabled people in sport at the elite level the increase in funding, the increased involvement of sport scientists and governing bodies has been huge and has made vast differences to the abilities of elite competitors with disabilities to perform in (322) arena.

NT: Given that why does the political shift matter, or lack of political shift?

BP: Because if you could actually get them to take the next step, then even that would pale into insignificance because there is so much more that could be achieved if you went the whole hog, erm .... and I know that mine is a biased view that isn't shared by everybody but it seems to me that even though the progress over the last 15 years in particular has been enormous in many different ways it could have been so much greater and could be so much more efficient if you actually took those next remaining few steps. Even if we think about Sydney as an example, erm ... and the fact that in September the British Olympic Association takes a team of olympians and in October the British Paralympic Association take a team of Paralympians for most of the last 4 years both organisations have been engaged in the same tax deductions, working side by side doing exactly the same thing. Positive reflection is that the co-operation between the two is greater than it has ever been and that has been the case for each of the last paralympic (342) erm.. and there is much, much closer collaboration in all areas between the BLA and BPA to ensure that you know both teams travel as well prepared as possible. Its still seems in many respects non sensical that we have to create a paralympic infrastructure totally separate from the olympic one when they are actually doing all of the same things, dealing with all the same people, going to the same people for uniforms, going to the same airlines for tickets, going to the same paths of Australia for their preparation camps, it just doesn't make sense to me .

NT: If you'd, what would you want to safe guard using the term (353) you would want to retain the paralympics as an event?

BP: Oh definitely as an event, but if you could make a distinction between the paralympic and the olympic games and the paralympic and the olympic movements then I would see no reason at all that the movement to be separate.
NT: All right, if it could help you see a change in their objectives along these lines, because I know that I have said for a long time safeguard, what is it, to retain, moving towards integration, yes, safeguarding and retaining the identity of disabled athletes, so virtually increasing the demonstration and I am going off at a tangent here but I am intrigued on what your views on whether those type of developments, demonstrations, events, are positive in a way in which they have been conducted or demonstrated.

BP: I think my views there are relatively simple erm ... possibly too simple to be of any real currency to other people like, Tanni Grey or whoever, who is actually caught up in the middle of it, erm .... I believe in equality of opportunity, I feel the olympic games is the pinnacle for anybody in a sport, olympic archery, then I would not want to see any barriers put in the way of a disabled archer who is good enough to compete in the olympics.

NT: Yes I can understand that

BP: But that is not to say that there should not be an equally legitimate competition in paralympic terms for the very best disabled archers but if any one of those disabled archers is also good enough when challenged to pick his or her skills against those who aren't disabled then they should be given access to that higher level of competition because they learnt it

NT: I understand, for this right I will tend to agree, but do you think the way in which the RDC seems to be promoting the stuff in the paralympic movement seems to be picking on a few events, I have got to printing visuals undermined the paralympic movement or paralympics; within the olympic movement, or however you want to phrase that, they even do so within their advertising blurb on the internet I believe

BP: I have not seen it yet

NT: Any comparison to that able bodied norm, so and so is one second less than 100 metres, so and so is immediately is something that otherwise many people could latch on to, you see (390) may want that, right, so there is an argument I guess, that sort of undermining power, but, important I don't think that I gives me an illustration of your views of the integration process. Just go back to landmarks then, what then might be landmarks?

BP: A landmark for me is .. I mean there are landmarks, but isn't a positive landmark, this is a positive landmark, but it was an agreement which was reached between disability sport and non disability sport at an elite level, 1988, the British Olympic Association allowed the Paralympic team got to Seoul to where disabled (401)
BP: That was a landmark, both good and bad, it was good, in it was the first time our competitors in paralympics had ever won the same track suit, you know the same you know uniform as their olympic peers it was bad in that it was only the competitors, the BOA wouldn’t let any of the staff wear it, but it was a step, foot was in the door, 1992 Barcelona, the paralympics athlete and their staff had the same uniform and again in 1996 and that will be the same again in 2000.

NT: Going on that seems elite and that is important because information that has grass roots developments at an organisational level, you are suggestion that not much has changed, you are moving closer to what you consider the way things should be structured, so, where are the missed opportunities?

BP: I think there was a missed opportunity, missed by the Sports Council probably erm ... when I first and this was probably in the 1980’s because sort of PC, you know the Sports Council became conscious of its role in a politically complex world. The Sports Council always given (425) to governing bodies and it started to say to those governing bodies if you don’t make sure that your stall is accessible to women then your funding might suffer. Some of us at that time said wonderful idea - why don’t you tack disability on to that as well...

NT: What year - 80’s?

BP: I can’t remember precisely, but it was during the 1980’s when they started to stay we are going to tighten the screw in giving financial support to governing bodies. Sport for All is important and if that the national governing body of swimming and half of the population are women and they are not making their facilities as accessible to women as they are the men, then we going to be saying to them you won’t get your money any more.

NT: Didn’t happen to disabled people - still not the case? Not something that is lottery funded?

BP: Well that is right, that has come about more recently through world class performance planning and a requirement that governing bodies seek their world class performance funds through a development plan which has an element of ..... 

NT: Well why has Sports England changed its tack on that - has it been through recommendation of others Central Government or is that something from the Sports Disability Lobby, if there is such a thing?

BP: I don’t know there was one or the other, there may well be the passage of time and pressure from all sides, and it brings your awareness, (449) Dick Casey is far more aware than his predecessor’s were, and more active on our behalf than his predecessors were.
NT: An aloof question that springs to mind, is, is there such a thing as disability sport policy? And I guess what I am asking now is ‘characteristics’ that are central, so central and fundamental that you could and say there is nothing there with sports policy, (464) sports and disability policy?

BP: there could be something that is as discreet as disability sport policy I don’t know if I have ever seen it, other than perhaps you know, the Moynihan Review which close to being embodiment of that working party’s view of what the government of the day should do about disability sport.

NT: Do you think that disability sport is as peripheral to Sports Council, Sport England as sport is to the government in that way - so we are sliding further and further away from anything that is central to the line of thinking (480)

BP: Is that (480) I can’t find it discreet - I think sport Is a long way down the governments’ protocol of priorities and I think disability sport is a long way down the sporting protocol of priorities.

BP: 1988, as you may recall, I had this mid life crisis and joined the civil service,

NT: I would be interested to know the date, the mid life crisis.

BP: Those of us who were successful in that competition were sent something like 25-30 pages of A4 on which some civil servant described the activities of all of the governments departments, couple of pages off, Dept of Health, Dept of Education, Dept of Environment, Dept of Transport and so on and so forth, reading through that and looking at my own sort of peculiar interest. I was interested to see that the Dept of Environment Sport and Recreation Directorate merited a passing reference, the fact that the Dept of Health and Social Security as it then was had administered the disabled people, didn’t get a mention at all, so in, I maybe totally wrong in this but that has always been to me to be a reasonably accurate reflection of how Whitehall sees sport and disability. Sport, a very small mention in passing, disability didn’t even get a mention. You put the two together............

NT: One of the things I should have asked from the start was to save your time more than mine is if there is that if there, answer these questions that can be found in documentation, and you are saying you should have read that before you came to this interview then I should have asked you, but I will ask you now to say that’s where it is so I will pass the comment erm ....

BP: Just while I think on that, I didn’t notice where you are doing a (521) but I mean it sparked another thought really that erm .... I suppose any ministerial interest is better than no ministerial interest, but over the last 10 or 12 years of the paralympic enjoying ministerial interest it must say something about the attitude of the government that 9 times
out of 10 its been a minister with a disability brief who has been sent to see us not a minister with a sports brief.

NT: To see paralympics?

BP: Yes

NT: Well as you say, it says something.

BP: Well if we can go back Seoul

SIDE 2

BP: Yes, but now we hope that there will a minister with a sports brief going to Sydney.

NT: Right, That will be the first, one of

BP: since 88 yes, I don’t know what that says, but there is

NT: Reason for that could be, understood that giving that the olympic team may not do so well. Roles of organisations, we have talked mainly about DSO’s coming onto the Sports Council’s more recently and if (007) simplistic and say certain key organisations have played a crucial role in a way in which sport is, has developed and has provided this country, so local authorities might tend to provide more, but localised opportunity (009) would you say provision, those organisations provide a similar role for disabled people at all or do they, or do they not enter the frame, do they provide very little. If Sports Council as they do will suggest in a range of agencies, and they find this that and the other, can you simply say that is what the clients say that people probably not, how does their role differ.

BP: You can say uniformly, I mean local authority, sort of sport and leisure for example erm .... the local leisure centre, the local sports centre in theory is open to anybody who sort of what you only happen to live there, you know go in, but it comes In half of council taxes, so those who do live there should all have some kind of access erm ... and I think there has probably been a lot of progress in the last 10 or 15 years part of local authorities making sure that their facilities are accessible to disabled people, I mean the creation of sound the land of, by all sorts of different names but recreational officers with a disability in (brackets) I think has been a reflection of a perceived need and a recognition of the fact that that’s important, we must make our facilities accessible, you know we are going to create a job to help us do that.
NT: So if that is the case, which I think would be my understanding, hoping for some facilities and - a knock on the door, we want to come in and use this place. (023) but NGB’s have not made such advances.

BP: Some have, some haven’t and again I think they have all been encouraged to do so with some sort of lottery money that is out there erm... and I hope that if they want some of that lottery money, some governing bodies again it is more black and white, some governing bodies have been ahead of the game all along.

NT: Like?

BP: Like the Royal Yachting Association, and you know, erm...

NT: They developed initiatives without any DSO?

BP: Well they create their own disability, again that could be good or bad you could say, well why do they need to do that, saleability

NT: and (029) do the same thing:

BP: Erm... but certainly sailing if you consider saleability to be under / within or under the umbrella of the LYA there are, you know, they have done a pretty good job of making sure that sailing has been made available to people with or without disabilities and even at the elite level as well

NT: Does that matter, if we are talking about the governing body, and there being a unit within, a separate organisation , whatever, a group of people, does that matter, are we ideally looking for them not to exist?

BP: I don’t think that it does matter so long as it is within the governing body

NT: Because if seems there isn’t any that are attached to, good connections, bad connections, that they are at arms length, from the sports sense.

BP: As soon as the link becomes so tenuous that the governing body is perceived to be responsible for those who are disabled, and this other body who is responsible for those who are, you have failed. If this disability specialist unit is actually within the governing body so that not just in words but in reality the governing body is exercising its proper responsibility for all people including those who are disabled it just happens that those with disabilities are handled through this sort of satellite bar, or whatever then the governing body is honouring its commitment, and there are other governing bodies that are doing that very well and there are some that are still a long way away
NT: Governing body in terms of running a Sports Council, every organisation, key agencies, organisations, that could be, should be playing a more central part on the provision of opportunities. It seems fairly heavily laden with Schools, local authority, recreational departments, disability sport organisations............

BP: But what about all of the other vehicles for sport? (50) foundations, Sport Trusts, CCPR, all you know, national coaches I mean there is a plethora of professional sporting organisations of a variety of different kinds and again perhaps naively and over simplistically has always been my belief that if they actually widened their own unit so that the activities of the national coaching foundation were and again I am not picking on them because they haven’t, to an extent they have, if those organisations provide their services and do whatever they can to make their services and facilities accessible to the whole population and not just a part of the population then it must lessen the need for other people to set up and get a (058) governing bodies for the disabled or a coaching foundation for the disabled or a whatever for the disabled

NT: Which they have, and increasingly have, in 98 EFDS, of those then CCPR and NCF are you pinpointed to be examples if not good, then improving in practice perhaps,

BP: I think NCF have tried over the years, yes, erm ... and

NT: are we struggling for the others

BP: Are we struggling for others? Well CCPR are an odd one I think and yet it could have been a very obvious one.

NT: Because of this embracing of governing bodies, I guess

NT: But it hasn’t has it?

BP: No it hasn’t it, No it hasn’t

NT: I was wondering, you think the Youth Sport Trust was the obvious one for me of recent years and lets embrace the whole idea within this organisation.

BP: You would be better asking that and similar questions of somebody else because I am involved in the last 5-10 years, well it hasn’t been there. I hear of modern day NCF and Youth Trusts through other people I have no direct experience of whether they are doing it well, badly or otherwise
NT: Not seen to be able to show that they are doing it, its the what they are doing, and how its been done and what has resulted, its more difficult to uncover and that (071) trying to investigate I think

BP: You were talking about documents the other day and think, I go on about this particular document too often erm... especially as the Sports Council didn't like it, but that Isle of Man think tank document ..... 

NT: You did, but I don't know about it?

BP: Led to a set of conclusions.

NT: Before you go on, are we talking about, because one I have got gaps in this history and if anyone has got one partly written already, great, but I am trying to piece something here and trying to make sense of it. One big gap I have got is that Ministry of Sport (077) Group not too happy about BSAD’s coordination, we will set up a standing conference chaired by yourself I believe, 1990

BP: No

NT: Well that is what Minister of (079) Group

BP: Not chaired by me.

BP: 1987, BSAD was being restructured, and the Sports Council .... The Sports Council agreed to pay my salary for an extra year even though by agreement I would no longer actually be running BSAD in its new guise as BSAD 1987 that responsibility went across to Graham Hiscock, but my salary would continued to be paid so that on their behalf on BSAD’s I could conduct an enquiry into sporting opportunities for people with disabilities, who does what and who should do what.

NT: Right, but I misunderstood, I think as a result BSAD sent in a sports team for its development and membership role, a working party and a chairmanship of Dr (087) was set up as soon as possible establishing a new umbrella body

BP: Yes, well no.

NT: That doesn’t make sense.

BP: It wasn't that was never the remit to establish a new umbrella body, the remit was to consider opportunities, which existed and to make recommendations as to whether they needed a new one yes.
NT: Because this goes from, interestingly, this goes from, its almost the working document, because it starts with the idea of what BSAD can do? And set up a working party and then at the same time it says that BSAD should relinquish its role as a co-ordinator so what was the result then of that working party, even though there was a standing conference formed in 1990?

BP: By then I was in the Civil Service

NT: What was the result of your working party then, what was your recommendation?

BP: The result, I can give you copies.

NT: That would be great.

BP: In 86 Isle of Man and the 1988 enquiry by whatever working party I have copies of both of those two. If I can take them in that order and then we can go to what happened as a consequence. 1986 in a sense you don't want whatever bandwagon was going past,

NT: (102) Europe

BP: No, it was the Isle of Man year of sport, and the people on the Isle of Man wanted to do various things during the year to say to their (104) we are interested in sport, I was brought into that discussion and said well what about them, disabled people do sport, there are a lot of people doing a lot of things now in Britain but nobody has taken the time to bring them all together and give them a chance to share with each other what they are doing so that collectively they can see how it all settles and maybe even see how we might all go forward together. Isle of Man said what a wonderful idea, why don't you identify them all and bring them over the Island for 4 days and lets see what emerges. So I invited representative of all of the NDSO's of all of the major sort of, quasi governmental bodies, the Sports Council's the CCPR's the British Olympic Association's the Association of National Coaches, NCF, all of those erm .... NGB's a selection, obviously we couldn't invite the whole lot but if they were significant NGB's players as well erm .... and we spent a couple of days on the Isle of Man, comparing notes on who did what and who should do what, the conclusion to that meeting and I hesitate hear and you best read the document because it is 15 years ago now, but certainly the conclusion that I formed even if they were not the conclusions that everybody there formed was that if what brought us all together was an interesting sport, and an ambition to make sport available to anybody who was interested in sport, then there was absolutely no need at all to have two totally separate structures, one for non disabled and the other for disabled, and if you start with that as you premise then you can go in any one of a number of directions. Now let's go down the NGB road, if there is already a perfectly competent governing body for every
sport that everybody wanted to play, then why do we need governing bodies for the
disabled, why do we need BTTAD if that is the right ...

NT: It is

BP: Why do we need, you know an RDA, there is a governing body for horse riding, why isn’t
it doing it’s stuff for those who are disabled as well. Go down another road, erm .... Sports
Council, if the Sports Council, and at the time it was very committed to Sport for All the
community based you know, involvement, if it’s got a whole army of so called sports
development officers, some nationally employed a lot of others regionally employed, and
their brief is to encourage people to take part in the sports that are their responsibility and
I go back to the table tennis guy again. Why should anybody else in BSAD or in an NDSO
or anywhere else need a whole separate army for sports development officers for disabled
people, it doesn’t make sense and you can play that game, again, again and again , and we
did, you can then go down the BOA road, if there is a British Olympic Association, staff to
prepare for Britain’s involvement every 4 years in olympic games, then what difference
does it make, in any quadrennial if there is also another competition a month later, why do
you need two separate organisations that have separate armies of staff to do the same job.

NT; Would you then simply scrap a separate organisation?

BP: I don’t think then or no there do we need to scrap them, I think it is much more a case of a
sensible and maybe gradual amalgamation and incorporation.

NT: Isn’t that what they would say they are doing now, were doing then?

BP: No, I don’t think so, I think they, then again, its all anecdote, but there are so many
memories that I could share with you but people who said that there is one thing but the
practice will be over my dead body, I don’t trust them.

NT: By who NDSO’s as much as...........?

BP: Those on the disability side I wouldn’t say specifically NDSO’s but those who had invested
their time and energy in developing services for people with disabilities. You can sit them
down formally or informally and they would not argue against integration as a positive
force, mainstreaming as a sensible development, but If you then say right, translate that
into practice, would you be ready to give up your job in your organisation next , on an
assurance for the non disabled swimming body or whatever body that they would do it
for you? They all said no, every one of them.

NT: And would you say they would now?
BP: And they still say no

NT: Was it professional self interest in some cases?

BP: In some cases, I have no doubt at all

NT: now there is going to be genuine don’t believe they can take it on that level

BP: Yes, I am not saying that everybody is bad and I am not saying that everybody is good and quite possible even in the same person there would be a combination of those motives and those feelings.

NT: So in a way the reticence of the Sports Council, the governing body erm ... combined with the DSO’s reticence has created this continuing self perpetuating divide?

BP: Yes, I think so.

NT: You seem to be certain about that, you have reason to believe that its not going to?

BP: There are signs that is it beginning to change, yes, erm... the extent to which the UK should, for example, has actually or is trying to take on board the needs of disabled people in swimming as a governing body at an elite level, as well as anywhere else, erm ... the LYA for example, the very fact that at least at an officer level, the British Olympic Association is already not only willing to talk but talking to the British Paralympic Association about the possibility of that one day they might merge. At the moment it is only dialogue and who knows where it will go but at least it is being discussed now. 10 years ago it wouldn’t even be given time of day.

NT: Things move in the fast lane, then they need to be.............

BP: Oh yes, yes I went to a meeting in Poland in 1984 and I presented a typical Bob Price (174) disability sport (175) but one guy from the other end of the world came up afterwards and said please don’t despair, 15 years from now or thereabouts we are likely to wake up and say isn’t that what you told us to in 1984, and the sadness was, that those 15 years were up last year. (Laughter)

NT: I just want to, some of the things you answered there, many of them you answered, and

BP: Sorry while you are thinking of themes
NT: I mean the other organisations, we only touched on, but skipped straight across was the CCPR, which I have always felt had a tremendous opportunity and never really understood why they didn’t grasp it.

BP: They could’ve easily, I mean the, if they are still as structured as they used to be, the CCPR has all the governing bodies in membership and they are organised in 6 division, sort of outdoor recreation and water based recreation, games division, and so on and so forth, you could either make sure that disability interest are represented in each of those division through the governing body. To me that is the ideal way forward, but even if you needed a half way house then all they needed to do was create a seventh division of disability interests and then you can actually bring the NDSO into membership and CCPR as well. Then you have got opportunities across fertilisation and they didn’t do any of it.

NT: I am just sitting here, I suppose the answer to that would be the similar answer to one and within the culture of the organisation and then more specific to disability sport, I’m not sure.

One of the main reasons for this interview is trying to gain enough knowledge and information to be able to at some point make a reasonable, account and reflection of what has happened since 1948 in this area because I haven’t seen it written, that tries to reflect it from different angles and yes there will perceptions and only as accurate as that

BP: There are a couple that I can give you that will help throughout the picture.

NT: Because I think for anything I go on to ask about Policy Development it hasn’t had this reasonably accurate picture yet.

BP: Historical base

NT: Yes, and

BP: I published in journal the history of the international disability sports movement and I can given you copies of that. Er...

NT: That will be very helpful..

BP: and those to sort of 1986 and 1988 documents which focus on Britain rather than the world

NT: That would be helpful ... thanks if I can have them at some stage
I would imagine that key individuals, seem to maybe to have had an impact and I was wondering, again........

BP: Not individuals, but there would be, what has caused people to change tact perhaps, I mean the existence of BPA, over the last 10 years combined with the greater involvement of some if not all of the governing bodies in contributing to the development of elite performance with disabilities, those two things together must have called NDSO's to think about their future, where do we fit? I say must because I'm putting words into their mouths, but what it is for example, as the Chairman of British Blind Sport, if you haven't seen it a couple of months ago British Blind Sport have their own monthly magazine, he does a Chairman's report on the inside front cover every time and what he has set out for the membership of British Blind Sport erm... We are having to decide what our future is, in the past we have been all things to all blind sportsmen from grass roots development up through elite competitions. Most of our elite competitors are now turning to governing bodies rather than to us and most of the logistical support that they require at the top end, they are getting from BPA rather than from us. We either get left behind or we must find a new role which is useful and complimentary. I mean it was the clear position of an NDSO dilemma but a willingness on the part of the chairman to recognise what was happening and try and play a useful part on the future that I have seen anywhere.

NT: It was actually, for me that's exactly what we did do, (242) BSAD I can't remember the date.

BP: I remember ...

NT: Mid 90's early 90's maybe and we came back with an answer from BSAD, we didn't do that, as it turned out for whatever reason. Do you know if they have come to a conclusion on that?

BP: Well it will be interesting, I mean you might want to pursue it

NT: I would, I will.

BP: Well it would, the article that I have just referred to, you know will stand the test of time and if you find it you can then refer to it.

NT: It will be very useful.

BP: What is more difficult to substantiate is the rumour that I heard subsequently that half of his members got onto the phone and said "you keep you mouth shut Wally, you are not doing BPSS out of its traditional role, chairman or not" and I think you will find in the next issue some sort of retraction from Wally, I may have suggested to you in the last issue.
NT: That will give you a really lovely anecdote to pursue because this summary is to establish a reasonable accurate picture and next round is that what organisations are doing what they say they are doing and whatever they need to do and perceptions of what it should be about.

BP: Just have a look over the last couple of months, of British Blind Sports magazine

NT: I will suggest, and it will be interesting, that of course that everything has an impact on policy so it is impossible to say that anything can happens sort of social construction respective. I would imagine that able bodied people and non-disabled views of sport have had a significant impact on the way it has gone and what is provided. Not a valued judgement, just necessary must have.

BP: It has but it's been all so much sort of ad hoc really, I mean you touched on something earlier that I think is unfortunate but almost certainly true, it is very difficult to identify a body of disability sport policy. It wouldn’t matter who you asked, you could go to the Sports Council, you could go to DCMS, you could go anywhere, so what is the official line on disability sport at the moment. What's this country trying to achieve, and it hasn’t been sort of stated or consolidated into a single policy document anywhere, ever.

NT: The only thing from what I have read that I could pick out has been two consistent aspects that have been mentioned in all of the documents I have read so far, would be the improvement of opportunity to all levels, and the second one would be something different terminology but working towards the response of moving to others, to provide that, so a facilitator type, and there are the only two things I could pick out.

BP: And the greater involvement of mainstream

NT: that would be a particular shift and everyone's role is an enabling and empowering role, but that is where the political rhetoric comes in because that hasn't been what's happened.

BP: It has to be said, but lets hope that nobody bothers.

NT: I think it is that I want to investigate further, which is something I am really pleased you have said, because I haven’t been sure if that the dilemma between, the reason why it hasn't happened and the mix between government and DSO’s and other interested bodies going we don’t want it.

BP: When we met with Barry, we were still trying to get you really, to determine whether or not your policy focus was going to be at a national governmental level or at a regional level or even at a local level

NT: Its national ..
BP: and it is a national and governmental one, then you know especially given what we had been saying in the last half an hour or so, I think it is essential that by whatever means we come to grips with how government forms policy on any thing because it is only by understanding that, that you can begin to assess why it has or has not done anything in disability sport.

NT: Ok that is important.

NT: My last question then, a visual task, diagrams so you can look at something, and then if you would. I think I can answer this for you, with what you have said, but then it would be very presumptuous

BP: Oh yes, it would probably be a better answer.

NT: If there was something you could change through the current organisational structure, at a stroke, in Derek Casey's position, what would it be?

BP: ......... If I were in Derek Casey's position

NT: I think, I understand what it is you like to move to, its almost what would that structure that we sort of have an idea of the EFDS, the Region the NDSO's the Assembly or whatever they are out here, what would that be? Or is it nothing organisational you would change?

BP: No I think there are, if I were in Derek Casey's shoes then there are several changes that I think I would want to make and that may well be, because I don't know enough about Derek Casey's the constraints upon him, and the way I think he might be judged on (326) I don't know. I would very much want some internal restructuring, I would like the Sports Council Officer themselves to have a much greater and much broader responsibility across the board for the population as a whole and to move beyond this incredible positions which they still haven't now of vesting responsibility to disabled people and disability sports policy in anybody, and it seems its (334) at the moment, you know I find it bazaar.

NT: and given what you know that I don't know yet about government policy and how things are shaped or formed, you see no reason why that can't happen.

BP: No reason at all why it couldn't happen, it would simply mean somebody within the Sports Council to be convinced that it needed to happen and unfortunately all of the other pressures of all of the government even at arms length from government and leading in the other direction, disability is complicated there is all those NDSO's and there are all sorts of other disabilities that don't even have NDSO's, you know, if we were even to begin to try to understand that ourselves we would probably drown. Isn't it much, much easier,
every year to ringfence a little bit of exchequer funding and to give it to somebody, you know would be SAD one year, it might be BSAD next year, it might be DSO you know, and that solves our conscience, that enables us to demonstrate to those that need to know that we haven't forgotten them, we are doing something about them but it avoids altogether the fundamental problem within the Sports Councils of them not getting to grips with development.

NT: and this is, the DSO's whilst going through new start process, would you say that they actually perpetuated or contributed to that.

BP: I think that they contributed to it, but I think the NDSO position was always difficult, complicated again, by Sports Councils, who give rationally adopted this sort of attitude of you know favoured son to BSAD and UKSA and then slightly work through BPS but the others CP Sport

NT: didn't want to know

BP: BALASA, even BPSS and I never really understood that, because they were the biggest and the strongest and yet they got another help from the Sports Council

NT: Even when they took on, because they went from being a Spinal Cord Injury to Wheelchair users and being a c-coordinator,

BP: Didn't matter, they only even got what they got through BSAD

NT: I know I haven't asked loads I should have asked, there might be come a process of coming back, and you might be the last person interviewed.

BP: It doesn't matter

BP: its 6.15, I am more than happy to have a second round with you that would be useful

NT: Can I leave something with you that might be something to absorb, I am trying to see if I can work out organisational structures if that is (371) that has often been drawn as a picture of what it was in 89 is that how it was and if not, probably easier to leave it with you, if there are places where I can get hold of it, then great, if you describe something then I will have a reasonable drawing off, it will help me understand and I think, there are a lot of explanations that we need to explain why they have cropped up. I think the diagramatic structuralism will be helpful in any account would you?

BP: I will do indeed. I enjoyed that!
NT: You enjoyed that, I mean it maybe for all you know it might be your perception, if it hasn’t been drawn its going to be your perception of it, which I haven’t seen any diagrams of those 60's era of which organisation's linked to who.

BP: No I can’t remember from then and again if you want, this is a really rough academic exercise, you would need them to have been published somewhere

NT: Yes, Yes maybe and am I right in Sports Council archives is where I am likely to find some of these

BP: Not a lot, I would be very surprised but, I hope pleasantly surprised.

NT: But so you think documentation and memorandums articles BSE 1961 exist for example

BP: They must exist somewhere, interesting point now it is DSE and not BSAD, have they kept those.

NT: In a way BSE organisations will have so much more to share in what has happened and why it is happened.

BP: But the perspectives even on that, you know are fascinating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 What are the key developments or landmarks in the political history of disability sport?</td>
<td>Stoke Mandeville</td>
<td>The activities of 'Guttmann: a single minded autocrat and a maverick'</td>
<td>(Atha, Interview 2000)</td>
<td>Roots in medical/therapeutic recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSAD's Dual role</td>
<td>'BSAD's responsibility is not just to 'do' in its own name ...much broader public than its constitutional membership'</td>
<td>(BSAD, 1985:11).</td>
<td>Conflict/no coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discontent/growth in no. of organisations</td>
<td>BSAD failed initially to represent the breadth of disability sport interests</td>
<td>(Casey, Interview 2000)</td>
<td>Large number of organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSAD 1985</td>
<td>'it was not appropriate (indeed not possible) for BSAD to do either job effectively, let alone attempt to do both'</td>
<td>(BSAD, 1985:20).</td>
<td>Tension and discontent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minister's Review 1989</td>
<td>'Governing bodies should accept in principal that they will ultimately assume responsibility for disabled people in their sport'</td>
<td>(Minister for Sport Review Group, 1989:21)</td>
<td>Pressure to mainstream/increased government involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports Council's 1993 Policy on Disability</td>
<td>to 'ensure equality of opportunity for people with a disability to take part in sport and recreation at the level</td>
<td>(Sports Council, 1993: 7)</td>
<td>Encouragement to mainstream government involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995 New Start Conferences</td>
<td>'driven by Sport England to 'sort out the mess' within disability sport</td>
<td>(Hodgkins, Interview, 2000).</td>
<td>Government intervention/continuing conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5: Phase 2 Questionnaires (DSOs)
A QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE POLICY PROCESS IN SPORT FOR DISABLED PEOPLE: DSOs

Organisation ............................................................................................................................

Name of Respondent ..............................................................................................................

Job Title .................................................................................................................................

SECTION (A) DETAILS OF YOUR ORGANISATION

Question 1. In your organisation how many of the following do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Able-bodied</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Full time staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Part time Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Participants/athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2. How many clubs are members of your organisation? (If none please circle ‘none’)

No. of clubs: 

Question 3. Which description best fits your organisation?

Disability Sport Organisation (predominantly for disabled people in a range of sports)

Disability Sport Organisation (predominantly for disabled people in one specific sport)

Governing Body (predominantly for disabled people in one specific sport)

If none of the above fits your organisation, please provide your own description below.

...........................................................................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................
Question 4. Please indicate below the total income, and the funding sources, for your organisation.

a) total income

b) funding sources
   - membership subscriptions (please give approximate figures or percentages of the total income)
   - commercial activities
   - grant from Sport England
   - grants from other agencies
   - donations
   - other (please name)

SECTION (B) DECISION MAKING PROCESS

Question 5. What body (e.g. annual conference, working group or committee) in your organisation has overall responsibility for policy formulation?

Question 6. Approximately what percentage of your policy formulating body is disabled?

0 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Question 7. Does your organisation involve disabled people (not counting its own staff) in policy discussions? Yes No

Question 8. If you answered 'yes' to question 7, are disabled people involved as:

   a) Board Members Yes No
   b) Members of an advisory committee Yes No
   d) consultees Yes No
e) informal contacts Yes No
   f) other (please give brief details) Yes No
**Question 9.** Do you have any plans to alter the nature or extent of involvement by disabled people in your policy making in the next 12 months? (If yes, please give brief details below)

**SECTION (C) LINKS WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS**

**Question 10.** In relation to disability sport issues, do you have contact, whether formal (e.g. through committee membership) or informal (e.g. conference attendance or regular telephone communication), with any of the following agencies:

- a) Mainstream governing body(ies) (please give title below)  
  - Formal
  - Informal
  - No contact

- b) English Federation of Disability Sport
  - Formal
  - Informal
  - No contact

- c) National Disability Sport Organisations (please give titles below)
  - Formal
  - Informal
  - No contact

- d) Sport England/Sports Councils
  - Formal
  - Informal
  - No contact

- e) National Coaching Foundation
  - Formal
  - Informal
  - No contact

**Question 11.** Which other national agencies are important for your organisation’s policy development and implementation?

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)

**Question 12.** Please indicate below the frequency of contact with the organisations named in questions 10 and 11. If you answered ‘no contact’ please go to question 14.

- a) Mainstream governing body(ies)  
  - once a year
  - 2-5 times a year
  - 6 times or more a year

- b) English Federation of Disability Sport  
  - once a year
  - 2-5 times a year
  - 6 times or more a year

- c) National Disability Sports Organisations (e.g. Disability Sport England)  
  - once a year
  - 2-5 times a year
  - 6 times or more a year

- d) Sport England/Sports Councils  
  - once a year
  - 2-5 times a year
  - 6 times or more a year

- e) National Coaching Foundation  
  - once a year
  - 2-5 times a year
  - 6 times or more a year

- f) other (please give title below)  
  - once a year
  - 2-5 times a year
  - 6 times or more a year
Question 13. Please provide brief details to indicate the main type of issues (e.g. special projects, advice on opportunities to participate, policy development) about which you have contact with the organisations named in Questions 10 and 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Issues / Reasons for Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Mainstream governing body (ies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) English Federation of Disability Sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) National Disability Sports Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Sport England/Sports Councils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) National Coaching Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION (D) POLICY

Question 14. Which of the following definitions best fits your understanding of disability?

a) Disability is a form of discrimination that is faced by people who are in some way impaired. □

b) Disability refers to the physical and/or mental handicap which prevents an individual’s full participation in society. □

If you consider neither a) nor b) to be appropriate, can you please suggest an alternative.

Question 15. The development and co-ordination of competitive disability sport (i.e.: disabled people competing against each other) should be the responsibility of:

(circle one of the following; 'SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = no opinion, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree)

mainstream governing bodies such the Football Association and UK Athletics. SA A N D SD
disability sport organisations such as the English Federation of Disability Sport or British Blind Sport. SA A N D SD
governing bodies of disability sport such as The GB Wheelchair Basketball Association SA A N D SD

Other (please name) ...........................................................
**Question 16.** What role should the following organisations play in the development, coaching, organisation and competitive structure of sport for disabled people?

Disability Sport Organisations’ (e.g. British Blind Sport) role should be to:

..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................

Governing Bodies of Sport’s (predominantly for disabled people, e.g. GB Wheelchair Basketball Association) role should be to:

..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................

Governing Bodies of Sport’s (predominantly for able-bodied people e.g. The Football Association) role should be to:

..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................

Sport England/ Sports Council’s role should be to:

..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................

Other (please name) ................................................................. role should be to:

..........................................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................................

**Question 17.** To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

(circle one of the following; ‘SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = no opinion, D= disagree, SD = strongly disagree)

a) Mainstream National Governing Bodies are not doing enough for disabled people?  
SA  A  N  D  SD

b) Disabled people should have more control over the way that sport for disabled people is developed.
SA  A  N  D  SD

c) All sports coaching courses should include issues related to coaching disabled people.
SA  A  N  D  SD

d) Sports organisations should only be funded if disabled people benefit equally.
SA  A  N  D  SD
Question 18. Should the comparison of a disabled and an able-bodied athlete's achievement in sport (e.g. the small time difference in a 100 metre sprint time) be encouraged as a positive promotion of disability sport.

If you would like to comment on your answer, please do so below.

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................

Question 19. Does your organisation have any plans to increase its contribution to the development of disability sport in the next 5 years? (if 'yes' please give brief details below)

........................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................

Question 20. What do you think have been the most important positive and negative developments within disability sport during the last 15 years?

Positive
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Negative
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Question 21. What do you consider to be the most significant challenges facing the development of disability sport in the next 5 years?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
That is the end of the questionnaire. The researchers would like to thank you for taking the time and effort to complete it. Your contribution has been invaluable to this project. If you wish to make any further comments, please do so below.

Please send to:
Nigel Thomas Senior Lecturer
Sport, Health and Exercise
Staffordshire University
Stoke on Trent
ST4 2DF

Tel: 01782 294019
Direct Line: 01782 294181
Fax: 01782 294321
Email: n.b.thomas@staffs.ac.uk
APPENDIX 5: Phase 2 Questionnaires (NGBs)
A QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE POLICY PROCESS IN SPORT FOR DISABLED PEOPLE: NGBs

Organisation ..............................................................................................................
Name of Respondent .................................................................................................
Job Title .....................................................................................................................

SECTION (A) DETAILS OF YOUR ORGANISATION

Question 1. In your organisation how many of the following do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Able-bodied</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Full time staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Part time Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Participants/athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2. How many clubs are members of your organisation? (if none please circle 'none')

No. of clubs  

Question 3. Please indicate below the total income, and the funding sources, for your organisation.

a) total income

b) funding sources
- membership subscriptions  
- commercial activities  
- grant from Sport England  
- grants from other agencies  
- donations  
- other (please state below)  

(please give approximate figures or percentages of the total income)
SECTION (B) DECISION MAKING PROCESS

Question 4. What body in your organisation (e.g. annual conference, working group or committee) has overall responsibility for policy formulation?

Question 5. Has the body mentioned in Question 4 discussed issues relating to disabled people's participation in sport(s) in the last 5 years?

Question 6. Does your organisation have a policy relating to the participation of disabled people in your sport?

If yes, please could you enclose a copy.

Question 7. Does your organisation have:

a) a specific committee responsible for the participation of disabled people in your sport?

b) a designated officer responsible for the participation of disabled people in your sport?

c) another means of addressing issues relating to the participation of disabled people in your sport (e.g. a working group or consultation forum)?

Please give brief details below.

Question 8. If you answered 'yes' to question 7a, 7b or 7c, does your organisation involve disabled people in policy discussions?

Question 9. If you answered 'yes' to question 8, are disabled people involved as:

a) Board Members

b) Members of an advisory committee

c) consultees

d) informal contacts

e) other (please give brief details)
**Question 10.** Do you have any plans to alter the nature or extent of involvement by disabled people, in your policy making in the next 12 months? If yes, please give brief details below.

**Question 11.** Have any of your officers undertaken training or staff development courses, related to the needs of disabled participants in the last three years?

**SECTION (C) LINKS WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS**

**Question 12.** In relation to disability sport issues, do you have contact, whether formal (e.g. through committee membership) or informal (e.g. conference attendance or regular personal communication), with any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Disability sport organisation or governing body (please give title below)</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>No contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Sport England/Sports Councils</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>No contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other (please give title below)</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>No contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 13.** Please indicate below, the frequency of contact with the organisations named in question 12 (if you answered 'no contact' please go to question 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Disability sport organisation or governing body</th>
<th>once a year</th>
<th>2-5 times a year</th>
<th>6 times or more a year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Sport England/Sports Councils</td>
<td>once a year</td>
<td>2-5 times a year</td>
<td>6 times or more a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other (please give title below)</td>
<td>once a year</td>
<td>2-5 times a year</td>
<td>6 times or more a year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 14.** Please provide brief details to indicate the main types of issues (e.g. special projects, advice on opportunities to participate, policy development), about which you have contact with the organisations named in Question 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Issues / Reasons for Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Disability sport organisation or governing body</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Sport England/Sports Councils</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Other (please give title below)</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 15. How does your organisation respond to requests from disabled people who are interested in participating in sport? Please tick the box that best represents your organisation's experience.

We do not receive such queries

Our officers provide advice

The officer with a remit for disability provides advice

The query is passed on to another organisation. (please name below)

Other (please give details)

SECTION (D) POLICIES

Question 16. Which of the following definitions best fits your understanding of disability?

a) Disability is a form of discrimination that is faced by people who are in some way impaired

b) Disability refers to the physical and/or mental handicap which prevents an individual's full participation in society

If you consider neither a) nor b) to be appropriate can you please suggest an alternative.

Question 17. The development and co-ordination of competitive disability sport (i.e.: disabled people competing against each other) should be the responsibility of:

(circle one of the following: 'SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = no opinion, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree)

mainstream governing bodies such the Football Association and UK Athletics.

disability sport organisations such as the English Federation of Disability Sport or British Blind Sport.

governing bodies of disability sport such as The GB Wheelchair Basketball Association

Other (please name)
**Question 18.** What role should the following organisations play in the development, coaching, organisation and competitive structure, of sport for disabled people.

Disability Sport Organisations' (e.g. British Blind Sport) role should be to:

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Governing Bodies of Sport's (predominantly for disabled people, e.g. GB Wheelchair Basketball Association) role should be to:

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Governing Bodies of Sport's (predominantly for able-bodied people e.g. The Football Association) role should be to:

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Sport England/ Sports Council's role should be to:

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Other (please name) ............................................................... role should be to:

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

**Question 19.** To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

(circle one of the following; 'SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = no opinion, D= disagree, SD = strongly disagree)

a) Mainstream National Governing Bodies are not doing enough for disabled people?  
SA   A   N   D   SD

b) Disabled people should have more control over the way that sport for disabled people is developed.  
SA   A   N   D   SD

c) The events within the paralympic games should be integrated into the Olympic Programme.  
SA   A   N   D   SD

g) All sports coaching courses should include issues related to coaching disabled people.  
SA   A   N   D   SD

h) Sports organisations should only be funded if disabled people benefit equally.  
SA   A   N   D   SD
**Question 20.** Should the comparison of a disabled and an able-bodied athlete's achievement in sport (e.g. the small time difference in a 100 metre sprint time) be encouraged as a positive promotion of disability sport.

If you would like to comment on your answer, please do so below.

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

**Question 21.** Does your organisation have any plans to increase its contribution to the development of disability sport? (If you answered 'yes', please give brief details below)

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

**Question 22.** What do you think have been the most important, positive and negative, developments within disability sport during the last 15 years?

Positive
....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

Negative
....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

**Question 23.** What do you consider to be the most significant challenges facing the development of disability sport over the next 5 years?

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................

....................................................................................................................
That is the end of the questionnaire. The researchers would like to thank you for taking the time and effort to complete it. Your contribution has been invaluable to this project. If you wish to make any further comments please do so below.

Please send to:

Nigel Thomas (Senior Lecturer)  
Sport, Health and Exercise  
Staffordshire University  
Stoke on Trent  
ST4 2DF

Tel: 01782 294019  
Direct Line: 01782 294181  
Fax: 01782 294321  
Email: n.b.thomas@staffs.ac.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>ILLUSTRATIVE QUOTE</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who do NGBs and DSOs believe should be responsible for disability sport?</td>
<td>DSOs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 DSOs responded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 agreed or strongly agreed that mainstream providers should be responsible</td>
<td>NGBs should 'support all activities for disabled people fully and without exception'</td>
<td>ESAPLD, Survey, Role of Orgs, 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 that DSOs should</td>
<td>‘Mainstream bodies should leave it to the experts [the DSOs]’</td>
<td>BWBA, Survey, Role of Orgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstream NGBs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66 mainstream organisations responded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 agreed or strongly agreed that mainstream providers should be responsible</td>
<td>NGBs should 'operate an inclusive policy and take the responsibility to promote their sport to all'</td>
<td>ETTA Survey Role of orgs 38 UKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 that DSOs should be and 38 that GBs disability sport should.</td>
<td>NGBs role is to 'develop Perf and Ex' (UKA)</td>
<td>Survey, Role of Orgs, 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>