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**Abstract**

This paper outlines doctoral research into the new approach by the English Football League (‘EFL’) to increase the representation of coaches from a Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (‘BAME’) background, by introducing an equivalent to the ‘Rooney Rule’ used within the American National Football League (‘NFL’). At 25%, the proportion of professional footballers from a BAME background is significantly higher than the general population (14%); however, the proportion of BAME managers and coaches is much lower: only 4.1% of senior coaches are from a BAME background, with 80% of clubs not employing any BAME coaches in senior positions (Bradbury, 2016). This discrepancy suggests that the previous focus on increasing the number of BAME coaches on coaching courses has been unsuccessful in addressing key systematic barriers to BAME coaching career progression (Bradbury, 2015). In June 2016, the EFL introduced new regulations requiring clubs to interview at least one BAME applicant for academy positions and enabling them to commit to the same for first team positions. This doctoral research considers these regulations from an anti-discrimination law perspective, an area which is still “largely unexplored” in the context of racial inequalities within football (Veuthey, 2013). This paper will provide an outline of the doctoral research to date, firstly by providing context to the research, with reference to key literature in the area. It will then consider the theoretical aspects to the research, namely whether the regulations in question can be considered a form of positive action, and if so, how they fit within the UK legislative framework under the Equality Act 2010. The paper will then outline the methodology behind the research into key stake holders’ views of the regulations and will provide a discussion on preliminary findings and the intended original contribution of the research.
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1. **Introduction**

This paper will outline a doctoral project, the key aim of which is to consider the use of positive action by the English Football League (‘EFL’) to increase the representation of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (‘BAME’) football managers and coaches. The paper will firstly address the issue of terminology and will then provide context to the research with reference to key literature in the area. It will consider the theoretical aspects to the research, namely whether the regulations in question can be considered a form of positive action, and if so, how they fit within the UK legislative positive action framework under the Equality Act 2010. The paper will then outline the methodology behind the practical aspects to the research, and will provide a discussion on preliminary findings and the intended original contribution.

1. **Terminology**

It should be noted that this paper will use the term ‘Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic’ throughout. Aspinall’s arguments that homogeneous terms can conceal “substantial diversity” (2011, p. 33) and that any official category will conceal some heterogeneity (2009, p. 1425) are acknowledged, and it is agreed that ideally imposed categorisation should be avoided; therefore within the research itself, individuals are given the opportunity to self-define. However, a theoretical analysis requires a consistent approach and so it is necessary to adopt the terminology used by the key researchers, practitioners and policy developers in this area. The EFL regulations that provide the focus of the research use the term ‘Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic’. This terminology is also adopted by key stakeholders in this area, (see inter alia League Managers Association, 2015 and Kick It Out, 2016), therefore it is felt that ‘Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic’, or ‘BAME’, is the appropriate term to use within this paper.

1. **Context**

As outlined above, the doctoral project that is the focus of this paper considers the use of positive action to increase the representation of BAME football managers and coaches, in particular the EFL’s (the three professional leagues below the Premier League) regulations that guarantee an interview to at least one suitably qualified BAME candidate, similar to the ‘Rooney Rule’ used within the National Football League (‘NFL’) in the USA. These regulations will be explained in detail further on, as it is important firstly to understand the context behind their introduction.

Oliver and Lusted (2015, p. 429) argue that sport reflects wider social contexts and therefore discriminatory practices seen within society will frequently be reflected within sport. Beloff (2012, p. 97) however, argues that sport has “specificity”, and consequently its rules are distinct to societal norms and equality law and principles. He argues that this can be illustrated by the fact that Section 195 of the Equality Act 2010 institutionalises gender discrimination in competitive sport, by allowing separate competitions where there are no obvious physiological reasons to do so, such as in snooker (p. 102). This then has further implications for equal treatment as it means that the question of equal pay will not arise (Beloff, 2012, p. 103). Beloff argues that the specificity exists for protected characteristics other than gender too, highlighting the key exceptions for age and selection on the basis of nationality.

Despite this specificity, Sport England (2000, p. 3) argue that sport promotes inclusivity within society. Professional football provides a good example of on-the-field racial diversity: whilst high profile racism cases suggest an underlying problem in implementing equality, Beloff argues that is generally accepted that both “home-bred and imported products are of all races and colours” (Beloff, 2012, p.1). The statistics certainly appear to support this assertion: research by the Sports People’s Think Tank (‘SPTT’) has identified that approximately 25% of all professional footballers are from a BAME background (Bradbury, 2016, p. 10). This is much higher than the proportion of BAME individuals within the general population, which is approximately 14% (Bradbury, 2015, p. 10).

Despite English football’s success in on-the-field racial diversity, this does not follow through to management and coaching level. At present, only two out of 92 first team managers are BAME (BBC, 2017), only 20 out of 493 senior coaches are BAME (4.1%) (Bradbury, 2016, p. 9) and 80% of clubs employ no BAME coaches at all (Bradbury, 2015, p. 2). The SPTT report highlights how, when compared to the numbers of BAME professional players, the general population, and even the number of high level qualified BAME coaches (8.3%), this is a significant underrepresentation. The SPTT argue that this underrepresentation points to a failure to address the “key systematic barriers to BAME coach career progression”, which they identified as: access to and negative experiences of high level coach education courses; over-reliance on networks based methods of recruitment; conscious and unconscious racial bias and stereotypes; consequent lack of BAME role models at all levels (Bradbury, 2015, p. 4). The SPTT argue that these four barriers constitute institutional discrimination and therefore limits the potential equality of opportunities and outcomes for BAME coaches (2015, p. 4).

The lack of BAME managers and coaches has led many to believe that such managers and coaches are not suitably qualified. Notably, research by Cashmore and Cleland (2011) into the views of 1,000 football fans found that many participants believed this to be the case. This has led to calls for action to be taken to address the disadvantage in this way. In particular, Peters (2014, p. 3) argues that the positive action provisions of the Equality Act 2010 should be utilised “by encouraging such underrepresented groups to undergo training courses and gain relevant qualifications”. Currently there are positive action provisions in place that aim to do this, such as the Football Association’s COACH Bursary Programme, which funds coaching qualifications for BAME coaches (The Football Association, 2016).

It is contended within this paper, however, that these measures are not sufficient to address the fundamental systematic barriers identified by the SPTT. Whilst they may increase the number of BAME coaches on coaching courses, they do not sufficiently address the racial stereotyping and/or reliance on non-transparent network-based methods of recruitment that perpetuate inequality and a lack of BAME role models within football coaching. Further, the SPTT’s statistical evidence suggests that a lack of qualified BAME coaches is not the full story. As stated, the proportion of qualified BAME coaches (i.e. having achieved the required coaching licence) is 8.3% (Bradbury, 2015, p. 2), and whilst this is lower than the proportion of BAME professional players and the general population, it is almost double the number of BAME coaches that are actually employed (4.2%). This suggests that whilst more may need to be done to increase the number of qualified BAME coaches, a fundamental problem for these coaches is actually accessing employment opportunities.

The prevailing inequality of opportunities for BAME coaches and the apparent failure of existing positive action measures in making any real breakthrough led to calls by key stakeholders such as Kick It Out and the Professional Football Association (2012) for football authorities to look to the USA, in particular the National Football League (‘NFL’), where the so-called ‘Rooney Rule’ has been in place since 2003. The Rooney Rule - named after former owner of the Pittsburgh Steelers Dan Rooney - requires all NFL teams to interview at least one ‘minority’ candidate for all head coaching and senior football operations jobs (Proxmire, 2008).

Prior to the Rule’s introduction, 70% of NFL players, but only two head coaches (out of 32), were minority ethnic (Cashmore and Cleland, 2011). Since its introduction, 17 out of 87 coach vacancies – roughly 20% - have been filled by minority ethnic candidates (Fox, 2015). Recent research by DuBois (2015, p. 208) has found that the Rooney Rule has had a “significant, positive impact on the likelihood that a minority candidate would fill an NFL head coaching vacancy”, with data from 1992 to 2014 suggesting that a minority ethnic candidate is a “statistically significant 19-21% more likely, depending on the comparison group, to fill an NFL head coaching vacancy in the post-Rooney era than the pre-Rooney era” (p. 210). An in-depth exploration of the workings of the Rooney Rule is beyond the scope of this paper. However to briefly summarise, Collins (2007) argues that the Rooney Rule in the USA essentially works in three inter-linked ways: by countering the “unconscious bias” associated with BAME coaches; reducing the reliance on “Old Boy” Networks; and resolving the previous catch-22 situation whereby BAME candidates were not being given opportunities to break into these already established networks. The Rooney Rule’s apparent success in overcoming barriers that are very similar to those identified in English football by the SPTT clearly illustrates why there have been widespread calls for its introduction within English football by the organisations outlined above, in addition to BAME players and coaches (see inter alia: Ince, 2014, Campbell, 2015, Powell, 2014).

Debate regarding the introduction of the Rule in English football gained steam in 2014, when the EFL chairman (at that time) Greg Clarke was heavily criticised for failing to raise the issue at the 2013 Annual General Meeting, despite assurances that he would do so (Ornstein, 2014). This led to claims by the PFA Chief Executive Gordon Taylor that the EFL had failed to fulfil its promise (Conway, 2014), and Garth Crooks, a long-term campaigner for the introduction of the Rule, called on Clarke to resign (Ornstein, 2014). This mounting pressure on the EFL, and Greg Clarke personally, in addition to the SPTT report, arguably led to the issue being raised at the 2015 AGM, where clubs agreed that formal action should be taken (The English Football League, 2015). At the 2016 AGM, the clubs gave their formal support to the measures to be introduced in the 2016-17 season. The EFL’s measures (below) consist of a Mandatory Recruitment Code for academy football, and Voluntary Recruitment Code for first team football, (English Football League, 2016).

The Mandatory Recruitment Code for academy football provides that clubs must:

* Advertise any position within the club’s Academy that requires the individual to hold a UEFA A or UEFA B coaching badge on the club’s website and the EFL website for a minimum of 7 days;
* Include at least one suitably qualified BAME candidate (where an application has been received) on the interview shortlist for that position;
* Appoint the successful candidate on the basis of merit alone;
* Provide details of the recruitment process to the EFL, including the number of BAME applicants and the number of BAME candidates interviewed.

Notably, clubs will be permitted to fill a position by promoting an internal candidate (from a position requiring a UEFA A or B coaching badge only) without applying the above process. However, the position vacated by that individual must be filled in accordance with the new regulations.

The Voluntary Recruitment Code for first team football provides:

* During the season, clubs will be expected to interview one or more BAME candidate for any First Team managerial/coaching role (where an application has been received) in instances where they run a full recruitment process.
* During the close season, clubs will be expected to run a full recruitment process for any First Team managerial/coaching role during which they must interview one or more BAME candidates (where an application has been received).

**4. The Doctoral Research**

**4. 1. Method and Sampling**

The overall aim of the doctoral research is to consider the use of positive action in light of its application within the EFL, considering how positive action is received and what can be done to make it more successful. The research has therefore developed into two areas: the theoretical consideration of the EFL’s rules as a form of positive action, and the consideration of the views of key stakeholders in football on the EFL’s regulations and the use of positive action in general. In order to achieve these aims, this research uses a multi-method approach, consisting of desk-based research for the theoretical aspects, and narrative inquiry through the use of semi-structured interviews and focus groups for the qualitative aspects.

After an initial consideration of the literature, a pilot focus group was conducted to collect the views of undergraduate Sport and Exercise Sciences students. The emerging ideas from the literature and focus group were then used to develop themes for discussion within semi-structured interviews with a variety of stakeholders from within football, including coaches, administrators, and individuals from football authorities. The data collection process is still on-going: it is intended that 25 interviews will be carried out in total, and eight have been conducted to date.

This research will use purposive sampling. Although this will mean that the findings cannot be generalised to a population, it will ensure that the participants are relevant to the research questions, and that a wide range of participants can be considered (Bryman, 2014, p. 418). This will enable the research to consider whether participants’ opinions may be affected by their level of involvement with the game, and what impact this might have on how the regulations will be received.

1. **2. Methodology**

This is a piece of qualitative research drawing on various methodologies including narrative inquiry, applying a bricolage approach. A bricolage approach is “a multi-perspectival, multi-theoretical and multi-methodological approach to inquiry” that enables researchers to utilise a number of empistemological and policial dimensions through their inquiry (Rogers, 2012, p. 1). Denzin and Lincoln (1999) have identified five forms of bricolage research, and as this research largely concerns opinion, an interpretive bricolage approach will be adopted, acknowledging the fact that “Each telling…. reflects a different perspective” and as such, the decisions regarding “which interpretive practice to employ are not necessarily made in advance” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1999, p. 4). It is argued that the bricolage approach will enable this research to meet the objectives most effectively, as the combination of methodological practices adds rigour, “breadth, complexity, richness and depth” to the enquiry (Denzin and Lincoln, 1999, p. 6).

In addition to the increased rigour and depth, the interpretative bricolage approach is also effective at dealing with the issue of positionality. As a white, female, researcher researching issues faced by BAME individuals in a male-dominated sport, there may be issues regarding positionality: the researcher may have objectivity but not empathy, and this could impact the research. The interpretive bricolage approach can help to overcome this, as Denzin and Lincoln argue that an interpretive bricoleur is a researcher who “understands that research is an interactive process, shaped by his or her own personal history, biography, gender, social class, race and ethnicity” (1999, p. 6). Because of this, interpretive bricoleurs are required to look at their research reflexively, considering “how their positioning affects their research processes” (Rogers, 2012, p. 4). Bourke argues that although the identity of the researcher can impact the research process, positionality is not a limitation if reflexivity is employed (2014, p. 7), and so the interpretive bricolage approach, which focuses on reflexivity, is the most appropriate to take for this research. In addition to helping to overcome issues relating to positionality, it is argued that reflexivity also “adds depth and plurality to the inquiry process” (Rogers, 2012, p. 4).

1. **Preliminary Findings**

As outlined above, the research in question has developed into two distinct areas, and therefore the preliminary findings of each will be discussed in turn.

1. **1. The EFL Regulations and the Positive Action Framework**

The key theoretical question under consideration is how the EFL’s regulations fit within the positive action framework in the UK. An in-depth consideration of the definitions and theory of positive action is beyond the scope of this paper, however Barmes (2009, p. 623) defines positive action as “An activity designed to improve the position… of a given social group or subgroup…on the basis that its member suffer systematic disadvantage in that regard”. It is important to note that this is different to positive discrimination, where protected groups are automatically favoured, irrespective of merit (Jarrett, 2011). When considering positive action as defined by Barmes, it appears that the EFL’s regulations fit within this, as they provide a benefit in terms of a guaranteed interview to members of the given group, i.e. BAME football managers and coaches. However the applicants must be suitably qualified, therefore merit is still a key consideration and they are not likely to be considered a form of positive discrimination.

Whilst the EFL’s regulations can be considered a form of positive action conceptually, this does not necessarily mean that they will fit within the legal framework. The law on positive action in the UK is covered by Sections 158 and 159 of the Equality Act 2010. Section 158 of the Act is a general provision, and states that where there is a need, underrepresentation or disadvantage, organisations can take special measures to overcome this, as long as they are proportionate. In the instance of recruitment or promotion, however, Section 159 may apply. This covers situations where there are two equally qualified candidates, and in this instance employers may take a candidate’s protected characteristic into account when deciding whom to appoint or promote – this is normally called the “tie-break” provision.

The two sections are mutually exclusive, so if a measure fits within one section, it will not be covered under the other. To firstly consider Section 159, as stated, this concerns the recruitment stage, however the EFL’s regulation concern the pre-interview stage and deciding whom to interview rather whom to appoint, which is not included within the meaning of “recruitment” in Section 159 (5). This means that the regulations are not likely to be covered under Section 159, and are more likely to be considered a special measure under Section 158. The issue with this, however, is that as stated, the measures under Section 158 must be proportionate. EU case law tells us that in order to be proportionate, there must be a savings clause and therefore an element of discretion built. This means that a regulation is not likely to be considered proportionate if the special measure is a blanket policy. Because of this, the way that the EFL’s regulations have been drafted mean that they do not fit neatly into the legislative framework in the UK, as they appear to apply in every instance where a BAME coach applies. However, we cannot say for definite that the regulations do not fit within the framework, as this could only be determined if it was challenged in the courts through a reverse discrimination claim.

It is important here to acknowledge the ‘Two Ticks’ scheme, now called the ‘Disability Confident’ symbol. This is a scheme ran by Job Centre Plus for disability. This enables to guarantee an interview to applicants with a disability who meet the minimum criteria and therefore is similar to the way that the EFL’s regulations have been drafted. It is important to note, however, that disability is a unique protected characteristic, as under Section 13 of the Equality Act 2010, it is not direct discrimination to treat a disabled person more favourably than a non-disabled person.

Despite the problems identified with the EFL’s regulations, it is argued that the situation facing BAME managers and coaches means that some form of positive action measure is necessary. Barmes (2009, p. 626) argues that positive action is needed to overcome inequalities where they have persisted “notwithstanding legal and other interventions to reduce them”. Further, the Government’s Standard Note on positive action suggests that the concept might be used “to redress systemic, historical or institutional discrimination in order to promote diversity” (Jarrett, 2011, p. 3). It is argued, therefore, that positive action is necessary in order to overcome the barriers facing BAME coaches. Because of this, the next stage in the theoretical aspect of this research is to identify solutions that will make the EFL’s regulations fit more easily within the legislative framework and have more of a positive impact.

1. **2. Perceptions of the EFL’s Regulations**

To date, eight interviews have been conducted, considering the views of individuals involved with football on the EFL’s regulations. As this research is still early on in the data collection process, themes are still very much developing and so this paper will discuss three emerging themes.

One key theme emerging surrounds the problems that exist with the regulations, and a number of problems have been identified in the interviews so far. One such problem is that many participants feel that the regulations appeared to come from nowhere, with many unsure about the consultation and thought process behind them. Many participants believe that this will have a knock-on effect on how the regulations are received. As they seemed to come from “nowhere” there appears to be a lack of understanding behind the rationale of the regulations, resulting in them being viewed negatively, with many people questioning why they have not been introduced for other protected characteristics. The fact that many within the game view the regulations negatively is likely to impact their success: if people do not believe that the regulations are necessary or do not understand why they were introduced, they may not be applied consistently and therefore may not result in significant positive change for BAME managers and coaches.

Despite the problems identified with the regulations, one key theme emerging from the interviews is that the regulations is the idea that they are at least a positive step. Most participants acknowledge the fact that action needed to be taken to redress the imbalance in coaching, and identified the fact that whilst there has been much discussion around the underrepresentation of BAME coaches for many years, little action has been taken. Participants praised the fact that the EFL have actually introduced the regulations rather than just continued to discuss the issue. Many participants stated that whilst there may be problems with the regulations, something had to be done and that this is a good first step. Participants felt that the EFL were likely aware of the backlash that the regulations would cause and so they felt that they should be praised for introducing them in spite of this.

A final emerging theme is the importance of football in society. All participants interviewed to date have discussed the role that football can play in advancing equality and inclusion with society. Participants acknowledged the fact that whilst football did not cause racism or related issues in society, there is no reason why football cannot act as an example for the rest of society. Participants identified the reach that football has, with many stating that if these regulations work, they could be introduced for other sports or other industries more generally.

1. **Original Contribution**

Research into the experiences of BAME coaches has been undertaken by key organisations: the SPTT Reports (2014, 2015 and 2016) and research conducted by the League Managers Association (2015) have both outlined the current situation with regards to the numbers of BAME football coaches and have provided some qualitative exploration of their experiences and the barriers that they face. Similar research has been conducted into BAME coaching within sport more generally by Sporting Equals (2011) and Sports Coach UK (2014), and research by Cashmore and Cleland (2011) has also explored the views of fans on the reasons behind the underrepresentation of BAME coaches. Despite this research into the experiences of BAME coaches and the barriers they face, there is currently a lack of research into perceptions of the measures aimed at increasing representation, in particular the EFL’s regulations. Further, the broader issue of racial inequalities within football is “still largely unexplored” from an anti-discrimination law perspective (Veuthey, 2013, p. 76). This research aims to fill this gap, by considering the perspectives and opinions key stakeholders with the game on these proposals, as well as providing a consideration of the proposals through an anti-discrimination and equality law perspective.
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