

CHNO: 012

Book Title: Gender Equity in UK Sport Leadership and Governance

Editor(s): Philippa Velija, Lucy Piggott

E-ISBN: 978-1-80043-206-2

Book-meta-DOI: 10.1108/9781800432062

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-80043-207-9

Subject Group:

PIT: **CHP**

DOI: 10.1108/978-1-80043-206-220221012

Copyright Code: M

Copyright-statement: Copyright © 2022 by Emerald Publishing Limited

Copyright-year: 2022

Copyright-holder: Emerald Publishing Limited

Publisher-name: Emerald Publishing Limited

PUBLICATION-DATE:

DAY: 27

MONTH: Jan

YEAR: 2022

Element Type: Manuscript

Figures: 0

REFERENCE STYLE : rnm

CPO RESPONSE ID :

CUSTOMER: emerald

CONVERSION: nlmbook

## A Sociological Analysis of the Gender Pay Gap Data in UK Sport Organisations

Philippa Velija

Solent University

### Abstract

In this chapter I provide a sociological discussion of the gender pay gap legalisation by drawing on data in the sport sector across public and private commercial sports organisations. The gender pay gap is a significant reporting tool as it refers to the difference in the average hourly wage of all men compared to all women across an organisation (gov.uk, 2017). It is part of legislation introduced in the UK in 2017 which requires all employers with 250 or more employees to calculate and publish annually their gender pay gap data (gov.uk, 2017). The patterns emerging from the data indicate that the highest disparity in gender pay remains in those organisations where professional sport is commercialised around male performance (average gender pay gap is 59.1% in 2018–2019). In this chapter I draw on figurational concepts of power that enable the analysis of gender relations processually and draw on the role of shame and embarrassment to discuss the ways in which gender pay gap reporting may be used as a power resource to challenge ongoing inequalities in sport governance.

**Keywords:** Gender pay gap; mean gender pay; power; figurational sociology; bonus pay; shame

### Introduction

In this chapter I draw on figurational concepts of interdependence, the theory of established and outsider relations and the emotional levellers of shame to consider how the publication of gender pay gap data reflects changing gender relations, and how it can be utilised as a power resource for marginalised groups. This chapter discusses the gender pay gap in relation to women working in the sport sector to move beyond other research that has predominantly focused on differentials between male and female athletes' pay (Flake, Dufur, & Moore, 2013). The gender pay gap is a significant reporting tool for gender relations as it refers to the difference in the average hourly wage of all men compared to all women across an organisation (gov.uk, 2020). The data discussed in this chapter is publicly available as part of legislation introduced in 2017 which requires all employers with 250 or more employees to calculate and publish their gender pay gap data annually (gov.uk, 2017). I start the chapter by familiarising readers with the key terminology and theoretical perspective adopted.

### The Gender Pay Gap Explained

The gender pay gap is different from unequal pay, which has been legislated for since 1970 in the Equal Pay Act. Unequal pay refers to paying men and women performing the same jobs for a different salary ([Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2020](#)), while the gender pay gap refers to the average hourly wage of all men and women across a workforce (Acas, 2017). The data that organisations must use for reporting gender pay gap data is taken from payroll data on 31st March each year. The aim of introducing the gender pay gap reporting tool was to increase awareness of gender issues in the workplace that are reflected in the pay gap and to improve pay equality ([ONS, 2018](#)). It is now mandatory for organisations with more than 250 employees to publish and report specific figures about their gender pay gap. This must include: the mean and median gender pay gap, the mean and median bonus gender pay gap, the proportion of men and women in the organisation receiving a bonus payment and the proportion of men and women in each quartile pay band ([gov.uk., 2020](#)). Both private and voluntary sector employers must also publish a written statement on their website about their data. Any organisation not complying with the gender pay gap reporting breaches the Equality Act 2010 and so could face penalties for non-reporting, which can include fines for non-compliant organisations ([CIPD, 2020](#)). Despite the threat of fines, the actual follow-up for non-reporting and those returning inaccurate reports is low ([Barr & Perraudin, 2019](#)). For example, in 2018, it is reported that 1,456 companies were contacted with enforcement letters, but to date it is not clear how many organisations have been fined or penalised ([Barr & Perraudin, 2019](#)). In response to the Covid-19 outbreak in March 2020, the Government Equalities Office (GEO) and the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) decided to suspend enforcement of the gender pay gap deadlines for the reporting year (2019/2020), which affects some of the data discussed in this chapter. Where data for 2019/2020 is reported it is included.

## Key Terms and Definitions

The terminology adopted in this chapter is drawn directly from the requirements set out in the gender pay gap reporting mechanism and to aid an understanding for the rest of the chapter I will outline these now. The mean hourly rate refers to the average hourly wage across the entire organisation, and it is used as a measure of the difference between women's mean hourly wage and men's mean hourly wage ([CIPD, 2020](#), p. 5). Each organisation must also report on quartile pay bands, which are the proportions of male and female full pay employees in the lower, lower middle, upper middle and upper quartile pay bands (CIPD, 2020, p. 5). These are calculated by splitting all employees in an organisation into four even groups according to their level of pay. The purpose of quartile data is to identify the proportion of women in each pay quarter, which is particularly useful to highlight discrepancies in the highest and lowest bands of pay.

Bonus pay proportions refer to the proportion of male and female employees who were paid bonus pay during the year, while the bonus pay gap is calculated as a mean and median. The mean bonus pay gap (for bonuses as a percentage of men's pay) is expressed as a percentage and is calculated by 1) taking the mean bonus amount for men, 2) subtracting the mean bonus amount for women, 3) dividing the result by the mean bonus for men, and 4)

multiplying this figure by 100 ([gov.uk, 2020b](#)). In the following section I discuss the theoretical concepts that are supporting the analysis of the gender pay data in this chapter.

## Figurational Sociology and Gender Relations in Sport

A figurational sociological perspective adopts a long-term approach to understanding the role of interdependence in power relations ([Dunning & Hughes, 2013](#)). [Elias \(1970\)](#) refuted the concept of power as something that someone possesses, and instead emphasised power as a structural characteristic of all human relationships ([Elias, 1970](#)). Interdependence refers to power balances in the way people depend on one another and it is a key concept in figurational sociology and the conceptualisation of power. These balances of power and how they change over time are empirically explored in civilising processes and the concept of functional democratisation which details the social transformation of power relations over a long period of time. This transformation of power occurs through denser webs of interdependence which are the result of diminishing contrasts and increasing varieties between people and groups (Mennell, 1992). These interdependencies increase the mutual identification between groups so people can exert varying degrees of reciprocal influence and control. In demonstrating the nature of power and relations between groups, Elias examined relations between a community group and developed the theory of established and outsider relations to provide an empirical example of power balances between distinct groups, drawing on the role of gossip in collective group identities (Elias & Scotson, 2008). Shifting power relations between groups include a process of equalisation and a trajectory to reciprocal dependency which reflects processes of equalisation that can be empirically evidenced. Relations between groups remain in flux and moving towards equalisation is different from equal, therefore reflecting the ongoing inequalities between different social groups ([Malcolm, 2021](#)). These relations require greater self-control, greater interdependence, and mutual identification in a greater number of situations ([Dunning & Hughes, 2013](#)). The theory of established and outsider relations also provides an example of how group identities are impacted by a drag effect exerted by ideas rooted in the past ([Crow & Laidlaw, 2019](#)). The theory of established and outsider relations illustrates the ways a broader social structural analysis of power relations influence the acceptance of different explanatory accounts.

An example of functional democratisation and interdependency can be found in Nicholson's (2021) (chapter 3) where she discusses historic policy and practice that advocated for sports in the UK to have one governing body overseeing their development to drive forward equality. This policy implementation resulted in some unintended outcomes. On the one hand, it gave advocates of women's sport a way to challenge dominant power structures in sport. This is because, through women's sport being governed by the same organisations that governed men's sport, denser forms of interdependency developed between men's and women's sport and women's sport could no longer be ignored. This policy implementation also led to changes to funding regulations, meaning that women's sport came to perform an essential function for the former male sport organisations. However, at

the same time, this policy meant that many women who worked in the former women's governing bodies no longer had a role. Furthermore, as women's sport became more commercially viable with more paid positions in semi-professional women's sport, these positions were taken by men (Velija, 2018).

This example can be understood as part of the process of equalisation of gender relations, with an increase in resources and paid coaching and administrative roles in women's sport. However, with these leadership and governance spaces continuing to be dominated by men reflecting complex power imbalances as part of the process of equalisation. As women have had more influence in sport organisations, they have drawn on a wider range of behavioural norms as a power resource. As Clayton-Hathway (2021; Chapter 9) outlines, arguments for greater equity in sport governance have included both business and moral cases. Additionally, social justice arguments include that gender parity in sport governance is a matter of fairness, human rights, and a key dimension in achieving gender justice.

This argument of moral and ethical reasons for inclusion reflects social norms of the time, as equity amongst groups becomes more expected – through laws such as Equality Act (2010), but also through social expectations on behaviours and through interdependent relations with others. The successful use of moral arguments as the main source of power is characteristic of the kind of society in which we live, a society with a relatively tightly knit network of interdependencies, democratized power centres and, related to this, a relatively strong mutual identification and high level of mutual expected self-restraint ([Van Stolk & Wouters, 1987](#)). Elias theorised how the emotional levers of shame, embarrassment and stigmatization can influence the internalization of external behavioural regulations, which are features of the social response to change. Elias demonstrated empirically that, within modern societies, shame has become an increasingly dominant agent of social control due largely to its progressively taboo and invisible nature (Dunning and Hughes, 2012). As Elias argued, these reflect patterns of advancement of thresholds of embarrassment, shame and repugnance ([Mennell, 1992](#)). Wouters (2007) later utilised Elias' theorising to emphasise how shame and embarrassment are not the same in all cultures and time periods.

In this chapter I draw on the concept of interdependence, the theory of established and outsider relations and the emotional levellers of shame to understand the publication of gender pay gap data and the ways in which this reflects modern and changing power relations regarding gender and other forms of inequalities. Gender pay gap reporting is public and legislative, and the publication of gender pay gap data reflects a process of equalisation as well as highlighting how compliance has the potential to shift behavioural expectations in workplaces as noncompliance may impact on potential reputational damage for an organisation ([gov.uk, 2020](#)).

## Method

In this chapter an exploratory analysis of the gender pay gap in the sport sector is presented to discuss patterns and consider how gender pay gap reporting may illustrate the complexity discussed above in terms of understanding the current inequities in the sport sector. Only employers with 250 employees must report their data, and few sport organisations employ this many people, so the data is not presented as a detailed statistical analysis.

Organisations must publish reports on their gender pay on their own website and on the UK Government website. This meant the data was publicly accessible, and the gov.uk website <https://gender-pay-gap.service.gov.uk/> was utilised. The data can be searched in several ways, and I adopted the following consistent strategy to access data on relevant sport organisations. Firstly, a list of recognised sport governing bodies ( $n = 58$ ) in the UK were sourced. I then used the government pay gap website search function to identify whether any of these had submitted gender pay gap data. Eleven of these organisations had reports on gender pay gap from 2017, which can be found in section two on sport organisations. The organisations' data for subsequent years was also documented. Secondly, I utilised the search term 'sport' in the search box and this brought up data from 172 employers. At this stage I used the following inclusion and exclusion criteria: sport organisations were included (this included NGBs) and transport, leisure manufacturing and sports equipment organisations were excluded. This resulted in data being obtained from a further five employers. The third search utilised was the employer type search function on the website, using the list of Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes used by the government to identify a company's business type. After reviewing all the SIC codes, two were relevant to this search: 93,120 Activities of Sport Clubs, 93,199 Other Sport activities. This initially resulted in 52 organisations being identified, but after closer filtering organisations were removed that were duplicates from the results of searches one and two. After these three stages of searching, 56 organisations were included. For the discussion, I have themed these organisations across three groups: National Sport Sector Organisations, Governing Bodies and Professional Clubs, of which the latter is mainly professional football clubs. The data presented in this chapter includes mean gender pay gap, pay quartiles and bonus pay. Where an organisation had a report referring/explaining their gender pay gap, these reports were analysed with the purpose of considering how the report mechanism has encouraged reflection on their current gender pay gap.

## National Sport Sector Organisations

In this section, data is discussed from those organisations that have a broad remit to support the development of sport and promote physical activity across a sector. These organisations are governmental organisations that are funded and are accountable to the government, thus compliance with the reporting is critical for funding. These are detailed in [Table 7](#) tbl1.

Insert Table 7

Sport England are jointly funded by the Government and The National Lottery and are responsible for growing and developing grassroots sport and getting more people active in England. [sportscotland](#) have the same remit for Scotland. The English Institute for Sport (EIS) is funded by UK Sport and their purpose is to provide support for British Olympic and Paralympic Sport and Athletes. UK Sport are responsible for elite sport in the UK and are funded by Government and lottery funding. They do not have data on their gender pay gap because they employ less than 250 employees. The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) are a department within the UK Government, with responsibility for culture and sport in England. While the DCMS has a remit larger than sport, I decided to include them as a government organisation as governmental responsibility for sport sits within this department. The following table compares the gender pay gap across these four organisations ([Table 8](#) [tbl2](#)).

#### Insert Table 8

Across these organisations the average gender pay gap is 9.4% in 2018/2019. Looking at the data over a three-year period (where the data is available) and across similar organisations shows a differential gap depending on the organisation. [sportscotland](#) have the largest pay gap of 10.8 %, which grew during the data capture period. In the following reporting data in [Table 9](#) [tbl3](#) we see the proportion of women in the highest and lowest pay quartiles.

#### Insert Table 9

[sportscotland](#) have the largest 'gap' in relation to those who were in the highest paid and lowest paid quartiles in the organisation. This may in part explain their gender pay gap. [sportscotland](#)'s own report on this data is discussed in their *Equality at sportscotland* report ([sportscotland, 2019](#)). In this report they discuss how they have adopted a mainstreaming approach to equality where they have committed to inclusion across the organisation which 'underpins everything we do' ([sportscotland, 2019](#), p. 8). The report goes on to discuss how occupational segregation influences their gender pay gap, as 'men and women are clustered into different occupations' ([sportscotland, 2019](#), p. 42). Occupational segregation and the dominance of men in certain roles reflects some of the ongoing inequalities in the workplace. In their analysis they accept that they are committed to equal pay, but there is less commentary on the gender pay gap.

Sport England are one of the few organisations who report on gender pay gap data despite the fact they do not have to due to having fewer than 250 employees. ([Sport England Pay Gap Report, 2017, 2018, 2019](#)). In their 2017 report they reflect on how the mean gender pay gap is much lower than other organisations, as benchmarked against the charities and not for profit sector (which was 8.6%) ([Sport England, 2017](#)). In their written statements,

organisations can choose how to benchmark the data and decide whether this should be against certain SIC codes or across all sectors. Sport England note how, in 2017, there is imbalance in the pay quartiles because women make up a higher proportion of office admin ([Sport England, 2017](#)). The document ends with a commitment to action focusing on, 'recruitment, our culture, progression and engagement'. The 2018 report follows a similar format, recognising improvement in all areas, including mean gender pay gap and some improvements in population in pay quartiles, with an analysis that more women are in admin roles and more men in higher paid facility roles. The actions remain the same. In 2019, however, the mean gender pay gap had increased to 10% and is now higher than those in the charity sector (5.6%). They note that this was due to gender imbalance within the upper pay quartile, at director level there are six men and one woman, and in senior management positions, 23 women and 18 men. In the report it notes some of the strategies that Sport England were adopting, included encouraging more men to apply for lower paid job roles so there are less women in the lower quartile, adopting a mentoring scheme and encouraging shared parental leave ([Sport England, 2019](#)).

The English Institute for Sport (EIS) had a mean gender pay gap of 6.6% and 13.4% in 2018 and 2019, respectively ([EIS, 2019](#)), and discussed how changes such as senior leadership job shares for women and Senior Leadership Team review of pay have occurred, but also reflects how these changes have not yet affected the Gender Pay Gap. The organisation reflects how, through an analysis of the pay quartile data, they are working on approaches to address these discrepancies through a diversity and inclusion strategy and action plan. These organisations all showed some reflection of the data and an approach to addressing inequities.

## National Governing Bodies (NGB)

In this section the data on the gender pay gap for national governing bodies (NGBs) is presented. The role of a NGB is to manage and regulate a sport and it is responsible for the administration and development of the sport and distribution of funding. Despite there being 58 NGBs ([UK Sport, 2017](#)), only nine NGBs employ more than 250 people and had data on the gender pay gap, in addition to one voluntarily report from the Rugby Football League. The data in the first section ([Table 10](#) **tbl4**) details the mean gender pay gap for each of the 10 organisations, and the average gender pay gap in this sector in 2018/2019 is 25.97%.

Insert table 10

There is a significant difference across organisations in the mean gender pay gap. The highest mean gender pay gap from organisations in this sector are the Scottish and Welsh Rugby Unions, while the lowest is The Jockey Club. The mean gender pay gap does not differ over the 2017/2018 and

2018/2019 period. The Rugby Football League, who provided a voluntary report, had managed to significantly reduce their gender pay gap by 2019/2020 over the two-year period ([Table 11](#) [tbl15](#)).

#### Insert Table 11

The data on the pay quartiles gives an indication of whether a dominance of men or women in certain roles may influence the gender pay gap data. The data shows that those with lowest female representation in the highest pay quartile also have the largest gender pay gap, showing that discrepancies in gender equity remain most prominent across the highest paid leadership positions. For example, in the ECB only 12% of women are in the highest paid quartile. Women are affected by occupying the lower paid positions and the continued gendered segregation of labour. Those in the highly valued positions are also paid bonuses, and several NGBs paid bonuses to their staff ([Table 12](#) [tbl6](#)).

#### Insert Table 12

[This data](#) is particularly significant because bonuses are paid to those with performance positions in an organisation, which tend to include those working with professional teams, and [this data](#) confirms that roles which pay bonuses are more likely to be taken by men. The women's mean bonus was lower than men's in all cases. In the case of Welsh Rugby Union, no women received a bonus payment and in the case of the Scottish Rugby Union this was 80% and 83% lower for women than men over the reporting period.

## Professional Sport Organisations

In this section I discuss data from professional sport clubs. These 35 organisations were identified as they all employed more than 250 employees. The organisations in this sector were mainly from professional football and rugby clubs. These are associated more with men's sport than women's sport, where the opportunity for professional play is more likely for men than women. The fact that organisations in this group were dominated by traditional male sports reflects ongoing inequities in elite sport and the commercialisation of specific sports. This sector had high variation in gender pay gap data, and more organisations were seen to be submitting late reports. In this sector there was an average gender pay gap in 2018/2019 of 59.1%. [Table 7](#) details the data for mean gender pay gaps from 35 organisations. Given the larger number of organisations reporting in this section only mean gender pay gap and bonus pay are reported ([Table 13](#) [tbl7](#)).

#### Insert Table 13

In this section several trends appear, including the number of late reports and the discrepancy in mean gender gap in these organisations. Although there are more organisations in this group, the number of late reports and high gender pay gap reflects a less diverse workforce. In 2019, the average gender pay gap across all organisations reporting was 17.3% ([Commons Library, 2020](#)). Across the data presented in [Table 7](#) only two of the organisations has a gender pay gap less than this average. Twenty of the organisations had a higher gender pay in 2018/2019 than in 2017/2018, and seven organisations in 2017/2018 have a mean gender pay gap of more than 80%. The gender pay gap across all those reporting is larger for those in the private sector than those in private sector ([Commons Library, 2020](#)).

In this section for further analysis I explored the websites and reports for those reporting the largest gender pay gaps. On this basis, I looked at Stoke City Football Club (92.5 and 91.5), Arsenal (79.6 and 78) and Manchester City (87.7 and 86.1). Stoke City Football Club report that:

Stoke City is an equal opportunities employer operating a strict 100% equal pay for equal job policy. Stoke City does not discriminate on any basis including gender.

([Stoke City, 2018](#))

Reverting to emphasising compliance on equal pay rather than discussing the gender pay gap is significant in how the gender pay gap can be viewed by organisations. British Football clubs had the biggest gender pay gap ([Marsh, 2019](#)), with men earning vastly more in these organisations. The data across these organisations is influenced by a minority of highly paid individuals (players and executives). While this might explain the gap, it does little to challenge or question why such highly paid roles are dominated by men. In the Manchester City gender pay gap report 2019 the hourly pay gap is explained by the men's first team and first team coaching staff, but again there is little reflection on why these teams are paid so much and why so many of the staff working in performance are male. The report also notes that the club need to consider the 'complex issue'. While they are correct to assert the complexity of the gender pay gap in cases where there is a smaller but still significant gap, this is not the case for Manchester City. The issue that presents such a discrepancy is the large payments made to male players and those working in high positions, such as coaching the men's team. This is not particularly complex to understand. Within their report, Arsenal chose to present the gender pay gap data in two ways: including the players and first team manager and without. Again, the reason for such discrepancy in their gender pay gap refers to players (and their managers). They do, however, acknowledge that the reporting mechanism has enabled them to bring 'gender diversity in football into sharp focus' ([Arsenal, 2018](#), p. 2). The bonus pay data also demonstrated a significant gap ([Table 14](#) [tbl8](#)).

Insert Table 14

The bonus pay gap data highlights how bonuses are paid to roles that are performance related, and in these roles there are more men than women employed. In four organisations no women received a bonus, and this did not change across the reporting period. In the [Manchester City report \(2019\)](#) it is again noted that the bonus gap is due to 'men players' (2019, p. 3) and the 'number of men in senior roles compared to women who are eligible for bonuses' (2019, p. 3). These reflections do little to challenge gendered patterns, where more men are in senior positions. In this sector there was more of a tendency to 'explain' the gender pay gap as fixed, or something that can be explained as naturally occurring because the men's game brings in more money than the women's game, but this does little to question the ongoing inequalities in the game.

## A Figural Analysis of Power Relations and Gender Equity in UK Sport Governance

The mandatory reporting of the gender pay gap data is reflective of a process of equalisation in gender relations, as organisations must reflect on their gender pay gap and at least publicly outline how they plan to address this. For organisations that are publicly funded more pressure can be exerted, and for private organisations the moral and/or business argument may be utilised. Gender pay reporting reflects differences in power relations between groups, as well as reflecting greater levers of mutual understanding as organisations must try to better understand how the gender pay gap affects their female employees ([Dunning & Hughes, 2013](#)). They are at least forced to see the position of maternity, low pay, and part time work from the standpoint of women and attempt to understand and address inequalities. The acceptance and critical discussion of this was varied across organisations, however. While the reporting of gender pay gap data may reflect a process of equalisation, it also highlights where the ongoing inequalities remain, and how despite an expectation that the gender pay gap should be reduced there are some sectors where the gender pay gaps reflects more extensive inequalities. There was a difference between those organisations that receive public funding, displayed by organisations in section one having a lower gender pay gap (9.4%) than organisations in section three (59.1%). These differences show that while there are trend towards greater interdependency and equalisation, this process is not uniform.

This alerts us to the complexity of gender relations and processes of equalisation. The gender pay gap's may provide less of a resource for challenging attitudes that marginalise women. The differential data suggests there are cultural lags and differences in attitudes in both the established and outsider group. This is noted by [Van Stolk and Wouters \(1987\)](#) who supply a detailed discussion about how established and outsider groups may respond different during fluctuating changing interdependent relations. The variation in bonus pay gap data highlights an extensive discrepancy where the roles where bonuses are paid are far less likely to be roles that women are employed in. Within these organisations the bonus pay gap also illuminates the gendered decisions around which positions are eligible for bonuses. This indicates there is still a dominance of men in roles that sport

organisations prioritise and value, as reflected in bonus pay. There is also evidence of a lag to new behavioural ideals (Alikhani, 2014), with some people resisting attempts to reorganise familiar patterns. Elias' approach to power alerts researchers to focus on power relations between interdependent groups where there is reciprocal dependency, and consider how power relations remain in flux.

Elias' observations on shame as a form of social control and the relationship between shame, embarrassment, habitus and social control are useful tools for thinking about the gender pay gap data because it is not solely an individual response but can be reflective of social expectations/standards of the time. While shame might be more commonly thought of as an individual emotional response, shame occurs through social interaction ([Goudsblom, 2016](#)). There is a social dimension to shame which can also occur as a collective phenomenon, as in the case of those not following expectations of gender equity or committing to more equal labour patterns ([Goudsblom, 2016](#)). As well as reflecting processes of equalisation, the gender pay gap data also illuminates the complex power relations between groups of people. I make three observations in regards to the role of gender pay reporting in understanding gender relations in contemporary societies: 1) it highlights the changing acceptance of women working in sport, as well as the ongoing inequities in gender and labour in sport, identifying specific organisations and gendered patterns where the lag is most apparent, and how bonus pay is awarded; 2) it acts as a collective form of shame for those organisations with large pay gap data, while simultaneously offering an opportunity for other organisations to demonstrate their compliance which may link to notions of group disgrace and charisma discussed by Elias and Scotson (2008); 3) the gender pay gap data, while public, can also be pushed behind the scenes in an organisation and privately ignored, rather defending the data as natural. All of these highlight the complexities of power relations, it is too early to see a noticeable difference in the reduction of the gender pay gap. However, this provides evidence for the ways in which the outsider group can exert pressure on the established group.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, I have provided a sociological discussion of the gender pay gap data for sporting organisations. The patterns emerging from the data indicate that the highest disparity in gender pay remains in those organisations where professional sport is commercialised and mainly commercialised around male performance (average gender pay gap is 59.1% in 2018–2019). These trends therefore reflect the process of professionalisation and commercialisation in sport where greater gender imbalances of power still exist. This is particularly clear in the bonus pay data, in which the roles women are more likely to occupy are less likely to be worthy of bonus pay, as these high-performance roles are more likely to include men. The data across other types of organisations is more mixed, but women often still occupy a higher proportion of lower paid staff in these organisations. These gendered labour patterns signify that, while the gender pay gap provides specific information about gendered pay within the workplace, it also reflects wider gender relations outside of work. This includes factors such as working around childcare and loss of income from maternity pay, all of which

influence the gender pay gap. Looking at trends and patterns is informative alongside more qualitative data that explores women's experiences of working in the sector. The publication of the data and legalisation reflects the process of equalisation in gender relations, but also highlights where the ongoing inequities exist. The limitation of the gender pay gap reporting is that it does not give insight into issues of inequalities around intersectionality in the sector and how different groups of women are marginalised in the sector. As discussed in Chapter 2 Black women are underrepresented in the sector, and there is a wider lack of diversity that needs addressing.

The data discussed in this chapter highlights the ongoing inequities in sport governance and leadership through looking at the data on mean gender pay gap, pay quartiles and, where relevant, bonus pay. This data is affected by the sector being dominated by organisations that employ fewer than 250 people and by the decision to suspend reporting during Covid-19. However, a first analysis of the data provides an interesting insight into gender equity in the sector. A figurational analysis is useful in two ways. Firstly, it helps to provide an empirical discussion on the process of equalisation and a further analysis of gender pay gap data over time will continue to provide insight on the effectiveness and complexities of these processes. Secondly, it is useful to consider the role of shame as a collective phenomenon and power resource for groups challenging ongoing gender inequities in sport, and more could be considered in relations *between* groups. While the data in this chapter presents interesting insight on gender pay gaps, it would be beneficial to consider this alongside data from those working in the organisations. There is a need for data that shows the process of equalisation empirically alongside more nuanced understanding of the relations between groups in the workplace and how gender relations and interdependence impact on the identities of those working the sector. This reflects Elias' concepts where greater mutual identification between groups may provide greater opportunities for outsider groups, it may heighten resistance to equalisation processes (Mennell, 1992). This shows how in phases of emancipation, the gender pay gap data can be used to exert pressure on organisations

## References

Acas. Acas. *The Gender Pay Gap Explained*. Retrieved from <https://gender-pay-gap.service.gov.uk/public/assets/pdf/gender-pay-gap-explained.pdf>.

Accessed on June 1, 2021. Refstyled

Alikani, 2014. Alikanoa, B. (2014). Towards a Process -oriented model of democratisation or de-democratisation. *Human Figurations*, 3(2). Retrieved

from <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/11217607.0003.202?view=text;rgn=main> Refstyled

Barr and Perraudin, 2019. Barr, C. & Perraudin, F. (2019). Lack of sanctions 'makes a mockery' of gender pay gap reports. Retrieved from

<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/feb/28/lack-of-sanctions-makes-a-mockery-of-gender-pay-gap-reports> Refstyled

CIPD, 2020. CIPD. (2020). Pay Fairness and pay reporting. Retrieved from <https://www.cipd.co.uk/knowledge/strategy/reward/pay-fairness-reporting-factsheet#ref>. Accessed on May 1, 2021. Refstyled

Commons Library, 2020. Commons Library. (2020). The gender pay gap. Retrieved from <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/sn07068/>. Accessed on May 1, 2021. Refstyled

Crow and Laidlaw, 2019. Crow, G. & Laidlaw, M. (2019). Norbert Elias's extended theory of community: From established/outsider relations to the gendered we-I balance. *The Sociological Review*, 67(3), 568–584. doi:10.1177/0038026119829772 Refstyled

Dunning and Hughes, 2013. Dunning, E. & Hughes, J. (2013). Norbert Elias and modern sociology: Knowledge, interdependence, power, process. Bloomsbury. Refstyled

Elias, 1970. Elias, N. (1970). *What is Sociology?* Columbia University Press. Refstyled

Elias, N. and Scotson, J.L., 2008. *The established and the outsiders* (The collected works of Norbert Elias, Vol. 4). Dublin: UCD.

English Institute for Sport EIS, 2019. English Institute for Sport EIS. (2019). Gender pay gap report. Retrieved from <https://eis2win.co.uk/app/uploads/2019/06/Gender-Pay-Gap-Report-2019.pdf>. Accessed on May 1, 2021. Refstyled

Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2020. Equality and Human Rights Commission. (2020). What is equal pay? Retrieved from <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/what-equal-pay>. Accessed on April 12, 2021. Refstyled

Flake et al., 2013. Flake, C. R., Dufur, M. J., & Moore, E. L. (2013). Advantage men: The sex pay gap in professional tennis. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 48(3), 366–376. Refstyled

Goudsblom, 2016. Goudsblom, G. (2016). Shame as social pain. *Human Figurations*, 5(1). <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/11217607.0005.104?view=text;rgn=main> Refstyled

GOV.UK, 2020a. GOV.UK. (2020a). Gender pay gap information. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/the-gender-pay-gap-information-employers-must-report>. Accessed on April 1, 2021. Refstyled

Gov.uk, 2020b. Gov.uk. (2020b). Making your gender pay calculations. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/making-your-gender-pay-gap-calculations>. Accessed on April 1, 2021. Refstyled

Malcolm, 2021] Malcolm, D. (2021). Post-truth society? An Eliasian sociological analysis of knowledge in the 21st century. *Sociology*. DOI: 10.1177/0038038521994039 Refstyledme

Manchester City, 2019] Manchester City. (2019). Manchester city gender pay gap report. Retrieved from <https://mediacd.mancity.com/cf/media/h4xnobj/man-city-gender-pay-gap-report-2019.pdf>. Accessed on May 1, 2021. Refstyled

Marsh, 2019] Marsh, R. (2019). Lets talk about the race pay gap. Retrieved from <https://www.rg-foundation.org/blog/lets-talk-about-the-race-pay-gap>. Accessed on May 1, 2021. Refstyled

Mennell, 1992] Mennell. (1992). *Norbert Elias: An introduction*. University College Press. Refstyled

Nicholson, R. (2021) 'Holding a Gun at Out Heads': The Sports Council's Role in Merger- Takeovers of Women's Sport, 1985-2000. In Velija, P and Piggott, L. (eds) *Gender Equity in Uk Sport Leadership and Governance*. Emerald

ONS, 2018] ONS. (2018). Understanding the gender pay gap. Retrieved from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/earningsandworkinghours/articles/understandingthegenderpaygapintheuk/2018-01-17>. Accessed on February 31, 2021. Refstyled

Sport England, 2017] Sport England. (2017). Sport England gender pay gap report. Retrieved from <http://direct.sportengland.org/media/13160/sport-england-gender-pay-gap-report-2017.pdf>. Accessed on May 1, 2021. Refstyled

Sport England, 2018] Sport England. (2018). Sport England gender pay gap report. Retrieved from <http://direct.sportengland.org/media/13830/sport-england-gender-pay-gap-report-2018.pdf>. Accessed on April 1, 2021. Refstyled

Sport England, 2019] Sport England. (2019). Sport England gender pay gap report. <https://sportengland-production-files.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2020-03/Gender%20Pay%20Gap%20Report%202019.pdf?AxPfBwP.JWF8GFULbGqPdbkIuerQIrdS> Refstyled

Sportscotland, 2019] Sportscotland. (2019). Equality at sportscotland. Retrieved from <https://sportscotland.org.uk/media/4712/final-2017-19-equality-mainstreaming-and-outcomes-report.pdf>. Accessed on June 1, 2021. Refstyled

Stoke City, 2018] Stoke City. (2018). Gender pay gap report. Retrieved from <https://www.stokecityfc.com/club/club-information/gender-pay-gap-report/>. Accessed on April 1, 2021. Refstyled

UKSport, 2017] UKSport. (2017). 55 national bodies now compliant. Retrieved from <https://www.uk sport.gov.uk/news/2017/12/20/55-national-bodies-now-fully-compliant-with-new-world-leading-governance-code-for-sport#:~:text=News->

[.55%20national%20bodies%20now%20fully%20compliant%20with,leading%20Governance%20Code%20for%20Sport&text=UK%20Sport%20and%20Sport%20England,new%20Code%20for%20Sports%20Governance.](#) Accessed on April 31, 2021. Refstyled

Van Stolk and Wouters, 1987. Van Stolk, B., & Wouters, C. (1987). Power changes and self-respect: A comparison of two cases of established-outsider relations. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 4(2-3), 477-488. Refstyled

Wouters, C., 2007. *Informalization: Manners and emotions since 1890*. Sage.

Table 7. Organisations Included as 'National Organisations'.

Name of Organisation	Number of Employees
sportscotland (late report)	250-499
Department for digital Culture and Sport	500-999
English institute of Sport	250-499
Sport England	Less than 250

Table 8. Mean Gender Pay Gap Data in National Organisations.

Name of Organisation	% Difference in Hourly Rate (Mean)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Sportscotland	10.8	11.7	Not provided
Department for digital Culture and Sport	3.3	7.5	5.6

Name of Organisation	% Difference in Hourly Rate (Mean)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
English institute of Sport	6.6	13.4	Not provided
Sport England	6.4	5.3	10.1

Table 9. Proportion of Women in Lowest and Highest Pay Quartiles in National Organisations.

Name of Organisation	2017/2018		2018/2019		2019/2020	
	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid
Sportscotland	35%	60%	32%	58%	Not provided	
Department for digital Culture and Sport	52%	55.3%	49.5%	58.6%	51.6%	58.7%
English institute of Sport	43.3	57.1	42.9%	55.6%	Not Provided	
Sport England	40.7%	61.4%	45.8%	60.3%	50.7%	61.4%

Table 10. Mean Gender Pay Gap Data for National Governing Bodies.

Name of Organisation	% Difference in Hourly Rate (Mean)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Amateur Swimming Association (ASA)	11	11	Not reported
England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB)	38	43.6	
The Football Association (FA)	Late report 21.5	16.7	
The Jockey Club	3	9	
Rugby Football Union	23	20.7	
Scottish Rugby Union	52	50	
British Horse Racing Authority	16	18	17
Welsh Rugby Union	39.3	50	Not reported
All England Lawn Tennis Club	25	20	21
Rugby Football League (Voluntary Report)	24.5	20.7	11.9

Table 11. Proportion of Women in the Highest and Lowest Pay Quartiles in National Governing Bodies.

Name of Organisation	2017/2018		2018/2019		2019/2020	
	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid
Amateur Swimming Association (ASA)	50%	54%	50%	61%	Not reported	
England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB)	12%	29%	14%	35%		
The Football Association (FA)	24.2%	28.6%	25.2%	31.7%		
The Jockey Club	44.7%	28.7%	40.5%	26.2%		
Rugby Football Union	23.7%	36.3%	18%	31%		
Scottish Rugby Union	3%	30%	4%	30%		
British Horse Racing Authority	22%	53%	22%	49%	32%	47%
Welsh Rugby Union	13.2%	7.8%	9.7%	20.5%	Not reported	

<!--Col Count:7-->Name of Organisation	2017/2018		2018/2019		2019/2020	
	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid	Highest Paid	Lowest Paid
All England Lawn Tennis Club	35%	61%	41%	56%	37%	57%
Rugby Football League	29%	49%	31%	47%	28%	40%

Table 12. Bonus Paid Data in National Governing Bodies.

<!--Col Count:4-->Name of Organisation	(% ) lower of Women Mean Bonus Compared to men		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Amateur Swimming Association (ASA)	No bonus paid		
England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB)	60.2	58.5	Not reported
The Football association (FA)	13.7	35.1	
The Jockey Club	13.1	29	
Rugby Football Union	75.1	37	

Name of Organisation	(% lower of Women Mean Bonus Compared to men)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Scottish Rugby Union	80	83	
British Horse Racing Authority	66	42	27
Welsh Rugby Union	no women received a bonus	no women received a bonus	Not reported
All England Lawn Tennis Club	62	56	48
Rugby Football League (Voluntary Report)	79	37	Not reported

Table 13. Mean Gender Pay Gap Data in Professional Organisations.

Name of Organisation	% Difference in Hourly Rate (Mean)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Brighton and Hove Albion (football)	59.7	76.4	Not reported
Celtic FC	24.5	27.9	
Chelsea Football Club	83	86.1	86.8
Exeter Rugby Club Limited	17.2	67.1	Not reported

Name of Organisation	% Difference in Hourly Rate (Mean)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Gloucester Rugby Limited	Late 60	61.4	
Manchester City Football Club	87.7	86.1	86.9%
Manchester United Football Club	NRR	79.2	Not reported
Norwich City Football Club	76	67	
Stoke City Football Club	92.5	91.5	
Swansea City FA	87.8	87.6	
Arsenal (Football)	79.6	78	78.9
West Ham Football Club	87.4 (Late)	85.1	Not reported
Wolverhampton Wanderers (football)	60.3	63.3	80.4
Hull City Tigers (rugby)	NRR	83	Not reported
Bristol Rovers (football)	46.6	52	
Middlesbrough football & athletic company (1986)	83	77.8	
Preston North End Football Club, limited	64.4	65.5	

Name of Organisation	% Difference in Hourly Rate (Mean)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
The Sheffield United football club limited	56.6	80.1	
Birmingham city football club plc	60	83	
Nottingham forest football club limited	68.8	69.4	
Fulham football club limited	62.1	44.5	
West Bromwich albion football club	84.4%	85.4	
The Blackburn Rovers football and athletic	64.9	60.3	
Leicester football club	78	79.2	
Cardiff city football club limited	75.6	Late 76.8	
The Rangers football club	65	68	
The Huddersfield town association football club	76.2	91.7	
Brentford FC limited	69.6	70	

Name of Organisation	% Difference in Hourly Rate (Mean)		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Walsall football club	31.5	34.8	30.8
Notts county football club	4.6	9.5	9.5
Aberdeen football club	55.9	55.6	59.6
Heart of Midlothian (football)	43.1	38.7	Not reported
Doncaster Rovers limited	45.5	49.9	
Tranmere rovers football club limited	Late 28.3	28.3	
Exeter city AFC limited	Late 28	NRR	NRR

Table 14. Bonus Pay Data in National Governing Bodies.

Name of Organisation	Bonus		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Brighton and Hove Albion	93.1%	91.8%	No Report
Celtic FC	43.1%	53.3%	
Chelsea Football Club	88%	92.2	94.3

Name of Organisation	Bonus		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Exeter Rugby Club Limited	54.4	65.2%	
Gloucester Rugby Limited	Late 59.1%	82.8%	
Lawn Tennis Association	Did not report - Late		
Manchester City Football Club	98.8%	97.3%	98.3%
Manchester United Football Club	NRR	79.2%	No Report
Norwich City Football Club	91%	90%	
Stoke City Football Club	98.9%	98.2%	
Swansea City FA	97.2%	92.2%	
Arsenal	92.4%	89.6%	91.2%
West Ham Football Club	53.2%	30.4%	

Name of Organisation	Bonus		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Wolverhampton Wanders	94.9%	96.7%	97.9%
Hull City Tigers		92% lower	No Report
Bristol Rovers	90.2%	94% lower	
Middlesbrough football & athletic company (1986) limited	97.3%	94.2%	
Preston North End Football Club, limited	No women received a bonus	No women received a bonus	
The Sheffield United football club limited	70.8%	98.7%	
Birmingham city football club plc	72%	29%	
Nottingham forest football club limited	99.9%	99.7%	
Fulham football club limited	94.1%	78.1%	

Name of Organisation	Bonus		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
West Bromwich Albion football club	94.2%	96.5%	
The Blackburn Rovers football and athletic	99.1%	96.6%	
Leicester football club	93%	90%	
Cardiff city football club limited	No women received a bonus	No women received a bonus	
The Rangers football club	No women received a bonus	No women received a bonus	
The Huddersfield town association football club	92%	95.5%	
Brentford FC limited	98.5%	98%	
Walsall football club	99%	92%	96%
Notts county football club	No women received a bonus	No women received a bonus	No women received a bonus

Name of Organisation	Bonus		
	2017/2018	2018/2019	2019/2020
Aberdeen football club	76.8%	75%	67.7%
Heart of Midlothian	49.1%	No women received a bonus	No report
Doncaster Rovers limited	86.8%	90.5%	
Tranmere rovers football club limited	Late 31.7	31.7%	
Exeter city AFC limited	89.8%	Not required to report	Not required to report

