

SOCIAL CAPITAL AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN DENMARK

More than Gaining Public Trust

H. Thomas R. Persson

Università Bocconi, Italy

Abstract Strong focus on the promotion of health and social integration aspects in society means the state has increased pressure on sport associations to deliver its social policy agenda. The building of (corporate) social responsibility is offered as a possible progressive response to changes in Danish state sport policy and as a way to increase its social capital. A correlation between (corporate) social responsibility and social capital is established and visualized in the official stand on social responsibility of individual and umbrella sport governing bodies, and Danish state policy. Ness's definition of corporate social responsibility as the necessity and the duty of companies to behave responsibly, ethically and sustainably, and to be transparently accountable to their stakeholders, is transferred to sport associations. Social capital could be defined as the relational resources that we as individuals or as part of a collective, such as a sport association, inherit or intentionally construct to achieve our own goals. Depending on the structural and normative characteristics of the social system in which it operates, it can facilitate but also limit individual and collective action. Development of a contemporary grounded social responsibility by the sport governing bodies suggests a gain in social capital, new memberships and future assurance of financial and social support.

Key words • corporate social responsibility • integration • social capital • sport governing bodies • sport policy

The Danish sport movement lives and thrives in and through its associations. In fact there have probably never been more sport associations or clubs than there are today. From a quantitative perspective Danish sport associations are in good health, despite some problems of retaining youth in the mid-teens. The latter is, on the other hand, not a problem specific to Denmark and Danish sport life (Ibsen, 2006). Nevertheless, sport associations have during the last 20 years gradually been put under greater pressure. A strong focus on the promotion of health and social integration aspects in Danish society has resulted in the Danish state's increasing expectations that sport associations will deliver the current social policy agenda (Ibsen, 2006; for a similar debate in the UK cultural sector, see Mirza, 2006). Although the public response from Danish sport governing bodies and their clubs, which in most cases are exclusively made up of volunteers, is that you cannot put an even greater burden on leaders, coaches and functionaries, who already devote all their spare time to children and youth owing to their love for the sport (fieldwork in 2007). Nevertheless, in my first encounter with the Danish

field of organized sport, I was asked for my opinion on social responsibility by the secretary general of one of the largest sport governing bodies. What at the time was one interesting topic amongst many, has grown in importance in the Danish case, not least because the question has repeatedly been asked. This article proposes that a type of social responsibility mirroring the corporate social responsibility of the business sector could be a central element in the development of Danish sport policy and fundamental to the sport governing bodies' procurement of social capital, defined as 'social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness' (Putnam, 2007: 137).

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) as an act has been around for some time, represented by work carried out by families and companies such as Rowntree and Cadbury in the UK and Rockefeller and Carnegie in the USA (Clement-Jones, 2004). CSR is today a well-known and generally accepted concept, commonly defined as the idea that companies or organizations should incorporate social, sometimes environmental, concerns in their way of doing business (see COM, 2006; Demirag, 2005). The idea is to go beyond complying with contemporary legislation and for companies to invest in fair practices in relation to their stakeholders, human capital and the environment. Although there are many similarities between larger companies and the larger sport governing bodies, such as growing budgets, responsibility to members/the state/shareholders and potential members/customers, little research has been carried out on the relationship between governing bodies of sport and (C)SR in a European context. This analysis therefore makes no distinction between companies and sport associations: although different, they can both be judged on the grounds of being legal entities responsible to their respective stakeholders.

It is more common to find a differential focus, for example, the environmental responsibility of sport organizers. In this context, articles by Chernushenko et al. (2001) and Ioakimidis (2007) are particularly welcome. This literature is, however, neither from nor about Europe. Nevertheless, we do find European literature with a similarly exclusive focus on integration, or the lack thereof, in the sport arena. Contributions from Collins et al. (1999) on sport exclusion, from Pfister et al. (2003) on women's participation in decision-making bodies, from Fundberg (2004) on organized sport's ability to influence integration processes positively, and from Spracklen et al. (2006) on the slow progress of national sport organizations in creating equality of outcomes in the UK, are all making valuable but somewhat one-sided contributions.

Looking at (C)SR as a potential response to the Danish sport sector's situation in relation to changing sport policy, this article fills a gap by opening up a new debate in the European sport literature. By revealing the correlation between CSR and social capital it will contribute to the knowledge of policy-makers in both sport governing bodies and the political arena.

Fieldwork

This article is based on a year's fieldwork I carried out in Denmark during 2007 as part of a larger research team looking at sport and social capital in the

European Union covering the Czech Republic, Italy, France and Denmark (Sport and Social Capital in the European Union, 2006). During the fieldwork a multi-sited ethnographic approach was applied through the combination of observations, semi-structured interviews and document analyses. The observations and interviews were conducted at national and regional sport governing bodies during annual assemblies, conferences, committee meetings, sport clubs and local, regional and national sport events. All citations from Danish texts or oral statements have been translated by the author with the aim of keeping their colloquial style and authenticity intact.

The primary source of inspiration for this article comes from the testimonies of people working at national and regional sport governing bodies together with analyses of policy documents and ministerial press releases. Nonetheless, this is not an attempt to give an ethnographic description of the Danish field of sport. Instead, the article attempts to abstract the current Danish sport policy discourse through a discussion of corporate social responsibility and social capital.

Corporate Social Responsibility

There has been a longstanding debate between those advocating the extension of companies' corporate social responsibilities and those opposing anything that goes beyond profit-making. Representing the latter camp, Friedman (1962, 1970) stressed that a firm's sole responsibility was to increase its profits. Davis (1973), on the other hand, defined the firm's responsibility as to consider and to respond to 'issues beyond the narrow economic, technical, and legal requirements of the firm' (1973: 312; for a similar argument, see OECD, 2001).

Amongst CSR literature of a more recent date we find amalgamated discussions of CSR, corporate financial performance (CFP) and corporate social performance (CSP) (Baron, 2001). Baron's slightly more adaptable and approachable version of CSR stresses that though firms should seize every opportunity to apply a strategic CSR approach, in similar fashion to how they seize market opportunities, over-altruistic behaviour may weaken the CFP, which in turn may come to the attention of the market control: the share market.

The share market represents what we call stakeholders, and good (responsible) business is all about understanding who your stakeholders are. In fact, stakeholders are those without whose support, or 'moral license to operate' (Rodin, 2005), the company or organization would cease to exist. This knowledge indirectly generates value, not only for the company but also for others around it: the so-called stakeholders (Burdess, 2004). The Parma-based Barilla school-sport initiative would be a concrete example (Baglioni, 2007). Ansoff's (1965) reaction to the early stakeholder theory, which stressed that it confused responsibilities with objectives, was later counter-argued by Freeman (1984), amongst others. Freeman, who pointed out the insufficiency of Ansoff's argument, advocated that companies were not only responsible to their shareholders, customers, suppliers and employees, but also to regulatory agencies, competitors, consumer agency groups and the media.

The wider stakeholder community responsibility argument is supported by Llewellyn (2004), who asserts that CSR adds a significant value beyond the com-

pany's reputation. Whilst consumers increasingly distinguish between responsible and non-responsible companies, governments and regulators are ever more likely to grant concessions to companies demonstrating exemplary records of corporate responsibility (Llewellyn, 2004). Consequently, management needs to understand the legitimacy of all different stakeholder claims in order for companies to be CSR-proactive (Munilla and Miles, 2005).

The relationship between the Danish sport governing bodies and the Danish state is one of mutual dependency. Whilst the governing bodies of sport are dependent on the state in order to obtain funding for all their activities, the Danish state is dependent on the umbrella sport governing bodies to implement its own policy-making. The Danish state is consequently one of the sport governing bodies' major stakeholders, and without its financial support many of the governing bodies of sport would be forced to lower their ambitions (for a similar discussion on mutual dependency between state and sport governing bodies, see Enjolras and Waldahl, 2007). The Danish state's official encouragement to companies to engage in CSR has so far been limited to promoting an inclusive labour market, a labour market which should include people with 'a reduced working capacity, disabled, ethnic minorities and long-term unemployed' (Rosdahl, 2002: 3). Although this inclusive integration approach which was promoted by the Danish government as a vision of the Danish welfare society should be recognized, it is closer to the definition of diversity management than any of the CSR definitions mentioned here (Doherty and Chelladuraj, 1999).

This analysis subscribes to Ness's (2005: 17) simple definition of 'corporate social responsibility [as] the necessity and the duty of a company to behave responsibly, ethically and sustainably, and to be transparently accountable to its stakeholders'. In any attempt to transfer the idea of CSR to the arena of sport and sport governing bodies, several questions arise. In the following section the article tries to shed some light on the concept of moral responsibility and moral agency, both central to CSR. To what extent can these concepts be applied to sport governing bodies that are made up of both employees and volunteers, and represent hundreds of thousands of individuals through their membership of local sport clubs? In addition, and as a corollary to that question, how should the stakeholder sphere of a sport governing body be conceived?

Can Sport Governing Bodies Have Moral Responsibilities?

That the concept of moral responsibility is admittedly at the heart of these questions is made clear in both Davis's (1973) and Rodin's (2005) discussion of CSR. Moral responsibility, however, goes hand in hand with being a moral agent,¹ and the question is consequently one of connection between being an individual and being morally responsible (Hull, 2002). That is, what makes us individuals moral agents is what enables us to coexist in a society. Or to put it another way, it is the capacity to understand and to deliberate over the possible courses and consequences of our actions in the context of a society's time and place, specific rules and standards of conduct that makes us moral agents (Boatright, 2003; Erskine, 2003). If you are not a moral agent, then you are not morally responsible for your actions. But can you be a moral agent if you are not an individual?

As Erskine (2003) rightly points out, the concept of moral responsibility is either prescriptive or evaluative of agents' perceived ability to foresee, understand and intend the outcome of their actions, or lack thereof (Erskine, 2003). Hence, moral responsibility can be applied as a manual or as a standard by which to measure both individuals and organizations; that is, we act according to an unwritten manual and we measure other people's or organizations' actions by (one trusts) the same unwritten manual. As stressed by Rodin:

A significant consensus has developed in recent decades among many academics, NGOs, government agencies, and business leaders that private corporations have moral obligations to a set of 'stakeholders' beyond their legal owners. (Rodin, 2005: 163)

This analysis consequently argues that the governing bodies of sport should be held accountable for their actions in the same way as a moral agent. Sport governing bodies may not possess individual consciousness, rationality or self-awareness, or the ability to show remorse or empathy, which are all indicators of a moral agent, but they are made up of individual moral agents, who together form a formal decision-making structure which as a legal unit can be held responsible for its actions. Hence, individuality (by association) and agency become interchangeable (Hull, 2002). An association is therefore responsible for its individual members' action, when they act as representatives of that association, but the individual member is also responsible for the action of his or her membership association. As a result, individuals are praised or condemned for their agency, which makes the connection one of necessity but not sufficiency (Hull, 2002).

Though no sport governing body can be a moral agent per se, we should be able to hold them answerable to specific ethical codes, in similar fashion to other specialized groups or institutions. As Boatright (2003) points out, ethics is a rough synonym for morality. As normative ethics is commonly seen as group-specific, we are talking about a potential code of ethics for sport governing bodies. Such a SGB code of ethics would indicate which rules and norms should be taken into account when decisions are made. With a focus on justification, these questions are specifically important to normative ethics. When morality is the subject, the main concern is to find the means of showing that your rules and standards are the right ones (Boatright, 2003). Consequently, we need to decide who the stakeholders of the sport governing bodies are, that is, who is part of the network, and who can claim ownership not only of the organization, but the interpretation of societal values and norms, in order to establish a code of conduct regarding (C)SR accounting rules. The recent establishment of an ethical committee by the Danish Football Association could be seen as a step in this direction. Its ethics committee quite rightly points out that their stakeholders are not only active practitioners, but also trainers, coaches, referees, entire clubs, umbrella and international organizations, the organized crowds and fans, *state and municipalities*, private companies in the shape of established and potential sponsors and partners, media and *the entire population* (DBU, 2008); for a discussion on fans as consumers and stakeholders in relation to the natural monopoly of sport, see Foster (2000).

One of the central pillars of CSR thinking is based on the relationship between companies and their stakeholders. The need to include governing bodies

of sport in discussions of (C)SR is consequently made clear in the stakeholder relationship between the Danish sport governing bodies and the Danish state. After the issues of moral responsibility and moral agency have been examined, it has become clear that according to their make-up of individual moral agents and being a legal unit/entity with stakeholder relationships the sport governing bodies should be considered to have a moral responsibility. Their level of moral responsibility will be judged by the stakeholders. It will be argued later that a positive outcome from such a judgement may be valued in terms of acquiring social capital.

Social Capital

Capital is unavoidably at the centre of any discussion of business, whether we are talking about multinational companies or governing bodies of sport. The latter would of course not be able to organize sport unless they had sufficient funds. Furthermore, we have seen that to gain and to understand profit as well as capital is more complicated than the balancing of books, and in fact is heavily dependent on the stakeholders of the companies. All forms of capital, however, involve the creation of assets. By allocating resources that could be used up in immediate consumption we create assets that generate a potential flow of benefits over a future time perspective. This may be done with egocentric values, with a smaller group of individuals, but also with the greater good in mind. The collected benefits generated by capital may be positive for some while harming others. This is also true for social capital (Ostrom and Ahn, 2003). Social capital is now defined, through combining descriptions supplied by Bourdieu (1997 [1991], 2006 [1999]), Coleman (1987, 1988) and Putnam (1993, 1995), as the relational resources that we as individuals or as part of a collective, as well as organizations or companies, inherit or intentionally construct in order to achieve our own goals. Depending on structural and normative characteristics of the social system in which it operates, social capital can facilitate but also limit both individual and collective action.

The Route and Roots

It is in this collective action, or community building, that we find the origin of social capital. Hanifan's (2003 [1920]) West Virginia study is commonly credited with being one of the first explicit usages of the term and concept of social capital, although Tocqueville (2003 [1840]) in his study of American democracy is commonly credited with being a, if not the, founding father of the concept of social capital. In Hanifan's study of community building, which in many ways is just as current today as it was for its 1920s' contemporary readers, social capital is explained by drawing on business organization and corporation, making links between the accumulation of capital and of people. The argument is based on an assumption that the individual is socially helpless, if left to him/herself, and therefore needs to build networks. It is in the act of reaching outside the family circle to neighbours and acquaintances in our need for corporation that we build social capital. In a similar way, it is by reaching outside the immediate 'sport

family' that the sport governing bodies, as well as clubs, will gain wider support for their cause.

This is supported by Granovetter's (1973) theory of weak ties. According to Granovetter, it is the weak ties between people that lead to social mobility, political organization and social cohesion, whilst 'the stronger the ties connecting two individuals, the more similar they are, in various ways' (Granovetter, 1973: 1362). That is, the stronger ties which are to be found in closed clusters will therefore add little to already established access to information channels, whilst the weaker ties are more likely to link members of different social circles.

Coleman (1987, 1988), heavily grounded in rational choice theory, views social capital as the function of action and not the product, that is, social interaction is the means or norm by which individuals trade and are restricted to trade favours in their efforts to pursue their self-interest. Social capital is, however, not exclusive to norms followed by sanctions, but also obligations and expectations underpinned by trust, as well as the information-flow capability of the social structure in which the social capital inheres. Although it is the presence of social norms that restricts individuals in their exchange, it is the same social norms that constitute social capital and which lead to a higher level of overall satisfaction (Coleman, 1987). Such exchange, however, will continue only for as long as it is favourable for both parties. If financial capital can aid achievement in the form of material advantages, and if human capital provides the individual with cognitive advantages, then social capital provides the access to human capital (Coleman, 1988). Though Coleman (1988) stresses that while social capital, in contrast with other types of capital, inheres in the structure of relations between and amongst individuals, it is neither encapsulated in the individuals nor what they produce. Nonetheless, just like other types of capital, social capital carries a context-dependent value which facilitates certain actions whilst being useless or even counterproductive and destructive in other contexts. Coleman provides us here with a strong connection to CSR. As we have established, the CSR of an organization is, just like social capital, norm and value context-dependent, and as such interpreted and judged by the organization's stakeholders. Consequently, only for as long as the organization can demonstrate a CSR favourable for both parties will exchange continue (Coleman, 1988; Llewellyn, 2004).

By social capital, Putnam (1995: 664–5) means '... features of social life – networks, norms, and trust – that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives'. Although admitting that social capital might come with negative side effects, Putnam (1995) stresses that his interest lies in the forms of social capital that serve the greater good of society. By building on Coleman's ideas of social structure, and linking them with Putnam's emphasis on trust, norms and networks as those characteristics of social organizations that mobilize and render social capital more efficient within a society, we are brought to the central issue of all co-operations and partnerships. The sport governing body is no exception. Trust is at the core of Putnam's argument, it is part of the normative system and it regulates possibilities to network. Likewise, the more people taking part in organized life, trusting the organization in which they are engaged, the better civic ends are served (Putnam, 1995). Although social capital is by definition always positive, as Putnam (1993, 1995) rightly points out, social

networks often have powerful externalities, which may be positive for some and negative for others. Examples of such networks could be oligopolies, the Ku Klux Klan or Al Qaeda (Putnam, 2007).

This darker side of social capital brings us to Bourdieu, and a slightly narrower view of the realm of social capital. Social capital is in his view neither the macro-level 'cure-all' medicine which many contemporary policy-makers make it out to be, nor a 'catch-all' concept without a historical and social context (Burnett, 2006). Whilst your economic and cultural capital may be decisive in whether you practise a specific sport or not, it is from the time invested in 'that' sport that you accumulate social capital (Bourdieu, 1997 [1991]). That is, social capital is something which you procure from long-term investment in exclusive arenas (Bourdieu, 2006, [1999]). In Bourdieu's (1997 [1991]) view, it is time commitment, money and specific competence which ensure the reproduction of social capital. This article partly concurs with Bourdieu's argument, but adds that whilst social capital always comes with an exclusive side to it, it is in the opening up, by bridging, by not ignoring the weak ties, that social capital becomes truly productive. Hence, it is by understanding who their stakeholders are that the sport governing bodies will be able to capitalize on their potential social capital.

The framework of social capital theory and that of the (C)SR model are accordingly linked. Trust, norms and networks which are at the core of social organizations and fundamental to co-operation and partnership are just as central to the stakeholder relationship of the (C)SR model as to the framework of social capital theory and, more to the point, to the procurement of social capital. In the following two sections the increasing expectations that sport associations will deliver the social policy agenda of the state will be contextualized through a brief description of the Danish sport field and an overview of Danish sport policy.

Denmark

Denmark's history of sport is well documented by authors such as Jørgensen (1997), Korsgaard (1982) and Trangbæk et al. (1995). This is neither the time nor the place to add to an already extensive volume of work. Nevertheless, for the non-Danish reader, it is important to stress that Denmark has three umbrella sport governing bodies: the DIF (the National Olympic Committee and Sports Confederation of Denmark), the DGI (the Danish Gymnastics and Sports Associations) and the DFIF (the Danish Company Sport Association). The last is not included in this analysis because of its exclusive focus on adult sport. The DGI is an amalgamation of the Danish Gymnastics and Youth Clubs (DDGU) and the Danish Rifle, Gymnastics and Sport Associations (DDSG&I) and the youngest of the three umbrella sport governing bodies (umbrella SGBs). Rooted in the Danish countryside and the Danish Rifle Clubs (DDS, founded in 1861), the DGI has had a central role in Danish enlightenment politics and formation of 'Danish culture' through its predecessors (DGI, 2007a; Korsgaard, 1982; Trangbæk et al., 1995).

Although it is an umbrella SGB with an executive committee of nine, after recent reorganization, the DGI is still a relatively flat organization. Nevertheless,

it is governing 16 independent regional multi-sport associations, one national association and 5000 local associations responsible to 1.3 million individual members. The DGI exclusively governs amateur (sport for all) sport. Whilst it is the independent regional associations that organize the everyday activities of the DGI, the national association has the task of being both assistant and developer. Although gymnastics still have a central role within the organization, the Rifle Clubs Association has only an associated role, whilst other sports such as badminton, football and handball are responsible for a large percentage of the total number of current DGI members (DGI, 2007a). The DGI sees its activities as a means of education and self-realization, expressed as:

Through practising sport in an association, members learn how to value other people and how to see themselves as part of a fellowship, whether this is the association itself or society in general. (DGI, 2007b)

The DIF, which also is an umbrella SGB, in contrast with the DGI governs 52 individual national sport federations, and 1.6 million individual members distributed in 11,000 clubs. Sport under the umbrella of the DIF has the structure of a pyramid: the DIF at the top deals with national and federation issues, national sport governing bodies handle their sport-specific issues, the regional/district level is in charge of tournaments, competitions and education, and municipality/local level represents the interest of the clubs in relation to the local municipality. It governs both amateur (sport for all) and elite sport, and is responsible for Danish participation at the Olympic Games.

Sport is a cultural activity, and the practising of sport and good friendships in club environments are goals in themselves and not the means to solve social, health and other societal problems. This is the DIF's position. For the same reason we will work for the preservation of the autonomy of sport. (DIF, 2007c)

Consequently, the DIF sees their activities as a means of their own, which puts them firmly in the context of the development of cities, leisure and welfare policy, but also in the international tradition (DIF, 2007a; Jørgensen, 1997; Trangbæk et al., 1995). Although the DIF asserts that sport associations should never be forced to contribute to solving societal problems, they acknowledge the great social importance and the positive side effects that stem from people getting together to practise sport in associations. They consequently assert their willingness to collaborate with authorities in their attempts to solve societal problems (DIF, 2007c).

During the fieldwork mentioned I focused on three different sport governing bodies which in terms of membership size are all in the top ten of Danish sport. Whilst they are all organized under the umbrella of the DIF, they appear closer to the social capital and social responsibility values and aims of the DGI. Like most Danish sport governing bodies, these three have clearly stated values and aims. They stress self-realization, equal values, dialogue, openness, trust, democracy and the creation and maintenance of a community based on associative-membership. Although their aims are closer to the formulation of a (C)SR strategy than the DIF, neither of them has at this point a public policy on this topic (fieldwork in 2007; DIF, 2007a; DGI, 2007a).

Sport Policy

With a few exceptions, such as the Act on Football Pools, Lotteries, and Betting Games (1948), the General Education Act (1991/2000), the Act on the Promotion of Elite Sport (2004) and the Municipal Reform Act (2007) there are no laws with an explicit focus and effect on sport. The total public sport grants in Denmark come to an annual DKK 3.3 billion. The municipality grants make up the largest part with DKK 2.7 billion together with DKK 1.8 billion in facilities grants and another DKK 0.9 billion in special local subsidies. On a national level, the state supports the DIF, the DGI, the DFIF and Team Denmark with approximately DKK 550 million, the Ministry of Culture with another DKK 40 million from pools, betting games and lotteries, and 10 million from the counties at a regional level (DIF, 2007a). The Municipal Reform, which was implemented in 2007 and cut the number of municipalities from 270 to 98, changed the regional and local structure and thereby presented new challenges but also possibilities for the sport governing bodies and clubs in relation to the issue of social responsibility. The full impact of this reorganization of the local political landscape in terms of policy-making and implementation is not yet known. Although there are fewer authorities to deal with for the major sport governing bodies, the people representing the local level of sport seem to agree that the changes will lead to greater competition for support from their local municipalities.

Though sport organizations have a history of being involved in politics, the DGI being an obvious example, sport in Denmark has traditionally been treated as almost an apolitical subject, in contrast with its neighbours Norway, Sweden and Germany. Part of the reason behind the apolitical take on sport is found in the ongoing discussions on the governance of Danish sport. The large numbers of sport-active voters could easily alter any political situation. Though still active, the debate is primarily led by the different sport governing bodies. DIF has historically argued that there is no need for more than one umbrella SGB, whilst the DGI has stressed that the plurality of goals, motives and ways of doing sport makes it impossible to contain it all within one organization (Ibsen, 2002). Nevertheless, a general dialogue has been opened up between the two umbrella SGBs (DGI, 2007c, 2007d). What will come out of the recent concrete collaborations between the DGI and the DIF in relation to the area of fitness is still too early to predict (DGI, 2008; DIF, 2008).

That sport has been assigned to the Cultural Ministry since 1976 with a rhetoric stressing that sport is culture, but with financial support based on values such as health and social cohesion, is just a further example of the apolitical but sometimes ambivalent approach (Trangbæk et al., 1995). Sport is seen as instrumental, and less as an activity with an intrinsic value, as in the case of culture. Sport is consequently the odd man out in the Ministry of Culture's responsibilities (Trangbæk et al., 1995). This analysis asserts that there is an increase in the non-sport specific measures making use of sport for the exchange of 'tagged' financial support. This is supported in the sport discourse where it is argued by people making a living from sport that there is a policy change on the horizon (fieldwork in 2007). That the Social Affairs and Integration Ministries are likewise making use of sport, and their going outside their own domain in pursuance of non-sport specific goals confirms

the general trend (Ministeriet for Flygtninge, Invandrere og Integration, 2007; Socialministeriet, 2007). The Social Affairs Ministry has launched initiatives such as the 2007 World Cup in football for homeless people, and sport programmes for overweight children; the Integration Ministry has launched a sport school with a specific focus on children from immigrant backgrounds, and special integration money has been channelled to sport clubs with the official aim of facilitating access to sport; whilst the main initiatives of the Cultural Ministry are focusing on how to attract mega sport events to Copenhagen. Even with the creation of Team Denmark in 1985, backed up by the Act for the Promotion of Elite Sport (2004), sport is still in part the means to achieve something else. The glory of elite accomplishments is to make Danes proud of Denmark, maybe even to take up sport, but also to spread the Danish brand abroad and to attract foreign investors to Denmark. This is recognized by both the DIF organization and the political establishment and was recently stressed in a DIF newsletter which presented Danish sport as a global marketing tool (DIF, 2007b; Kulturministeriet, 2007a; Ministeriet for Flygtninge, Invandrere og Integration, 2007; Socialministeriet, 2007; Trangbæk et al., 1995).

Although sport policy at the level of sport governing bodies is individual, professionalism is a keyword which unanimously applies to the major sport governing bodies. Professionalism, according to the governing bodies of sport, is to improve the organization of the individual sport on all levels. This is commonly interpreted as becoming more responsive to the reality facing sport, clubs, and individual members. For clubs the most current topic is that of volunteers and youth. Despite a historically high number of volunteers, one-third of all Danes are involved in voluntary work (Koch-Nielsen, 2005), the club representatives argue that they are both struggling with holding on to and attracting new volunteers (fieldwork in 2007). Whilst the overall number of active members is either steady or steadily increasing, the 'youth problem' which arises around the age of 15 is increasing. The Danish FA (DBU, 2007) has in the past reported that their sport is losing approximately 77 percent of its players during a period of six teenage/youth years. Today this problem is generally recognized and high on the agenda of both individual and umbrella SGBs (fieldwork in 2007; see also DIF, 2007d). The Danish government has responded to both problems in different ways. The taxable pay and reimbursement for the 'unpaid' voluntary work have been raised, and the 'Thank a volunteer campaign' was launched in 2007. In addition, the Minister of Culture has appointed an amateur sports committee to find out 'how we create better conditions for ordinary people to go in for sport and exercise' (Kulturministeriet, 2007b).

The two last sections have tried to describe Danish sport, the important historical division of sport governance, the support system and the state's faith in sport exemplified by policy-making, together with some of the immediate challenges facing the sport movement. The final part of the article will discuss what it regards as the most important challenges facing Danish sport in the foreseeable future, but also attempts to provide some suggestions on what the next step should be for the governing bodies of sport as well as for sports scientists.

Discussion

The question of social responsibility that constituted the starting point for this article should be read as one possible response to the described discourse and actual policy change. This is backed up by ethnographic observations and statements from representatives of different Danish governing bodies of sport (fieldwork in 2007), and the aim of this article has been to raise questions in the hope of opening up a new and fruitful discussion about the future state-financed support of organized sport.

As we have seen, norms and values, trust and the values of networks are all central elements, not only to social capital, but also to (corporate) social responsibilities (D'Angelo and Lilla, 2007; Leider et al., 2007; Putnam, 2007). Trust is built within a social structure, within a value system in which networks are created; the individual members exchange favours, and both the trust and the networks are reconfirmed. Hence the analytical value of concepts such as (corporate) social responsibility and social capital,

lies first in the fact that it identifies certain aspects of social structure by their functions . . . The function identified by the concept of 'social capital' [and (C)SR are] the value of these aspects of social structure to actors as resources that they can use to achieve their interest. (Coleman, 1988: 101)

Norms and value systems are central to every society and culture, independent of size and consequently of the creation of both (C)SR and social capital. More to the point, however, what we are interested in is the production of trust as the remunerativeness of recognized (corporate) social responsibility. The act of recognizing (C)SR is best described as mirroring Granovetter's (1973) intermediary personal contact, the weak tie, who functions as the confirmation of the trustworthiness of the leader. Differently from Granovetter's leader, however, all sport governing bodies have at the very least indirect connection with all of the inhabitants of the society in which they work and consequently no option but to be responsive to both known and unknown stakeholders in their role as interpreters of the local norms and value system. This is certainly the approach of the Danish FA.

Recent policies, projects and legislative changes show the state's ambiguous relationship with the sport sector, but it also highlights the sport sector's ambiguous approach to social responsibility. That the state has great faith in sport as the magic tool for social change is exemplified by the appointment of the amateur sport committee, whose mission could be described as the repair of their great tool. The somewhat ambiguous approach to social responsibility by the sport sector is, on the other hand, exemplified by DIF's firm belief that the intrinsic value of sport is precisely sport, whilst it is simultaneously involved on several levels in carrying out social integration policy projects in partnership with different ministries.

Many clubs and, to a different extent, sport governing bodies have on their own initiative for some time been voluntarily taking on social responsibilities that local councils or the state in the past would have seen as their pigeon. What is

new is the increasing numbers of initiatives of paying, and sometimes collaborating with, sport governing bodies and clubs to design and carry out special measures intended to solve societal problems. This trend is in line with a wider European liberal trend of gradually handing over social responsibilities to families and the third sector and is here and in the general discourse interpreted as an unofficial change to the historically hands-off sport policy, Team Denmark excepted (fieldwork in 2007; KPMG, 2002).

The response from the sport sector has been mixed, but the general perception is that this greater interest in sport as a tool for societal change presents both challenges and possibilities (fieldwork in 2007). Whilst sport clubs might perceive it as having to put greater stress on their voluntary organizational structure, it may also be opening up the possibility for further funding, which may result in greater membership. In similar fashion, the response from some representatives of the sport governing bodies has been one of arguing that their member clubs are not capable of coping with more responsibility, whilst others have stressed that a greater social responsibility may result in greater possibilities. The latter is not least applicable to the sport governing bodies themselves and their negotiating power (fieldwork in 2007).

In conclusion, the connection between (corporate) social responsibility and social capital established here not only enables us better to understand the underlying mechanisms of (C)SR, but also attracts policymakers and helps them better to understand the benefits of engaging in (C)SR activities. That is, taking a proactive (C)SR approach, as described by Llewelly (2004), will no doubt increase the social capital portfolio of the sport governing bodies in regard to their stakeholders and put them in an advantageous position in relation to future local and national governments and state sport grants. That is:

A strategic CSR perspective helps immunize the firm [/SGB] from subsequent pressure from NGOs [/stakeholders], and allows the firm [/SGB] to exploit its investments in CSR for the development of distinctive competencies, resulting in superior, sustainable performance. (Munilla and Miles, 2005: 385)

The failure to take such an approach will quite likely result in a position where those remaining on the outside will feel pressured into complying.

An exclusive focus on integration measures, as in the Danish government's CSR promotion, contextualizes the Integration Ministry's approach towards the different Danish sport actors and represents a partial break with the darker side of social capital (Bourdieu, 2006 [1999]). Nevertheless, as we have seen, it is only one part of a more holistic (C)SR perspective. This article would argue that the sport governing bodies are facing a great opportunity to anticipate coming sport policy changes by responding to the mood of their stakeholders, with or without membership. Subsequently, a holistic (C)SR approach needs to be responsive to the reality facing its members, stakeholders and society, in similar fashion to the professionalism trend within the sport governing bodies. If they have the ambition to hold on to existing members as well as attract new ones, the governing bodies of sport have probably no choice but to comply with current (long-term) trends.

As a result, the world of sport can add another sport to an already large number: (corporate) social responsibility. This is a different type of sport, an interdisciplinary sport for the sport governing bodies. It is a race or a tournament which they do not need to enter, as they are already part of it by default. The sport governing bodies will be judged and compared with their equals, and they will as a result only need to decide their own level of ambition and whether they want to follow or lead. What is needed, and this is where researchers in the field of sport can make a real contribution, is further investigation and collaboration with both state and policy-makers in the governing bodies of sport to develop a system of SGB-(C)SR accountability, or an *Associative Community Social Responsibility* accountability.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges that this research was funded by the European Commission 6th Framework Marie Curie Excellence Grant MEXT-2005-025008 'Sport and Social Capital in the European Union' awarded to Dr Margaret Groeneveld and Bocconi University. The author would also like to thank D. Numerato, S. Baglioni, C. Fusetti and D. Voges for their comments on an early draft of this article, and the Department of Sport Science at Malmö University which during the process of writing this article has hosted him as a guest researcher.

Note

1. The use of the word 'agents' throughout this text does not refer to the sport agents who represent players, brands or clubs.

References

- Ansoff, I. (1965) *Corporate Strategy*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baglioni, S. (2007) 'The Italian Way to Welfare? Primary Education and Sport Co-production in Parma: Bridging Private Interest with Public Goals', paper presented at the EGPA Annual Conference, Third Sector Study Group, Workshop 'Co-production in the Delivery of Public Services', Madrid.
- Baron, D.P. (2001) 'Private Politics, Corporate Social Responsibility, and Integrated Strategy', *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* 10: 7–45.
- Boatright, J.R. (2003) [1993] *Ethics and the Conduct of Business*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Bourdieu, P. (1997) [1991] 'Idrottsutövning och idrottskonsumtion' [Physical Exercise and Sport Consumption], in P. Bourdieu (ed.) *Kultur och Kritik* [Culture and Critique], pp. 189–211. Gothenburg: Daidalos.
- Bourdieu, P. (2006) [1999] 'Site Effects', in P. Bourdieu et al. (eds) *The Weight of the World – Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, pp. 123–9. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burdess, C.P. (2004) 'Mutual Benefit and Responsible Business Practice', in J. Hancock (ed.) *Investing in Corporate Social Responsibility – A Guide to Best Practice, Business Planning & the UK's Leading Companies*, pp. 97–110. London: Kogan Page.
- Burnett, C. (2006) 'Building Social Capital Through an "Active Community Club"', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 41: 283–94.
- Chernushenko, D., van der Kamp, A. and Stubbs, D. (2001) *Sustainable Sport Management: Running*

- an Environmentally, Socially and Economically Responsible Organization*. Geneva: UNEP.
- Clement-Jones, T. (2004) 'Corporate Social Responsibility – Bottom-line Issue or Public Relations Exercise', in J. Hancock (ed.) *Investing in Corporate Social Responsibility – A Guide to Best Practice, Business Planning & the UK's Leading Companies*, pp. 5–13. London: Kogan Page.
- Coleman, J.S. (1987) 'Norms as Social Capital', in G. Radnitzky and P. Bernholz (eds) *Economic Imperialism: The Economic Approach Applied Outside the Field of Economics*, pp. 133–55. New York: Paragon House Publishers.
- Coleman, J.S. (1988) 'Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital', *American Journal of Sociology Supplement* 94: 95–120.
- Collins, M.F., Henry, I.P., Houlihan, B. and Buller, J. (1999) *Research Report: Sport and Social Exclusion. A Report to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport*. London: Institute of Sport and Leisure Policy, Loughborough University, available online at: [www.sportdevelopment.org.uk].
- COM (2006) 136 final, Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee – 'Implementing the Partnership for Growth and Jobs: Making Europe a Pole of Excellence on Corporate Social Responsibility', Brussels, 22 March.
- D'Angelo, E. and Lilla, M. (2007) 'Is There More Than One Linkage between Social Network and Inequality?', IRISS Working Paper 2007–12, CEPS/INSTEAD, Differdange, Luxembourg.
- Davis, K. (1973) 'The Case For and Against Business Assumption of Social Responsibilities', *Academy of Management Journal* 16(2): 312–22.
- DBU (2007) 'Frafald' ['Decline'], *DBU Bulletin* 2: 1–28.
- DBU (2008) 'Baggrund' ['Background'], available online at: [http://www.dbu.dk/print/print_page.aspx], accessed 27 March 2008.
- Demirag, I. (2005) *Corporate Social Responsibility, Accountability and Governance – Global Perspectives*. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.
- DGI (2007a) 'Historie' ['History'], available online at: [http://www.dgi.dk/OmDGI/Historie.aspx], accessed 16 May 2008.
- DGI (2007b) 'Objectives of DGI – The Local Association', available online at: [www.dgi.dk/forside/sprog/eng_objective.aspx], accessed 27 July 2007.
- DGI (2007c) 'DGI og DIF enige om at søge samarbejde' ['DGI and DIF are Agreed on Seeking Collaboration'], available online at: [http://www.dgi.dk/artikel.aspx?aid=9248], accessed 23 August 2007.
- DGI (2007d) 'DGI: Samarbejde med DIF skal styrke foreningslivet' ['DGI: Collaboration with DIF Will Strengthen Club Life'], available online at: [http://www.dgi.dk/artikel.aspx?aid=10327], accessed 11 August 2007.
- DGI (2008) 'DIF og DGI går sammen om fitness-satsning' ['DIF and DGI Collaborate on Fitness Venture'], available online at: [http://www.dgi.dk/artikel.aspx?aid=11499], accessed 2 February 2008.
- DIF (2007a) 'DIF – Legislation and Public Grants', available online at: [http://www.dif.dk/DIFUK/Forside/Sports%20in%20DK/Legislation%20and%20public%20grants.aspx], accessed 11 August 2007.
- DIF (2007b) 'Sport som global markedsfører af Danmark' ['Sport as Denmark's Global Marketing Tool'], available online at: [http://www.dif.dk/OmDIF/Forside/Nyheder/2007/06/20070620_sport_global_markedsfoerer.aspx], accessed 20 June 2007.
- DIF (2007c) 'DIF som debatør' ['DIF as Debater'], available online at: [http://www.dif.dk/ForOffentligeMyndigheder/Forside/DIFHoldninger/DIFsomdebatoer.aspx], accessed 18 August 2007.
- DIF (2007d) 'Nedgangen skal vendes' ['The Decline Will Be Turned Around'], available online at: [http://www.dif.dk/OmDIF/Forside/Nyheder/Nyhedsarkiv/Nyheder/Arkiv/2004/04/20040429_9.aspx], accessed 23 August 2007.
- DIF (2008) 'DIF og DGI går sammen om fitness-satsning' ['DIF and DGI Collaborate on Fitness'], available online at: [http://www.dif.dk/OmDIF/Forside/Nyheder/2008/01/20080129_foreningsfitness.aspx], accessed 29 January 2008.
- Doherty, A.J. and Chelladuraj, P. (1999) 'Managing Cultural Diversity in Sport Organisation: A Theoretical Perspective', *Journal of Sport Management* 13: 280–97.

- Enjolras, B. and Waldahl, R.H. (2007) 'Policy-making in Sport – The Norwegian Case', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 42: 201–16.
- Erskine, T. (2003) 'Making Sense of "Responsibility" in International Relations – Key Questions and Concepts', in T. Erskine (ed.) *Can Institutions Have Responsibilities? – Collective Moral Agency and International Relations*, pp. 1–16. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foster, K. (2000) 'How Can Sport be Regulated?', in S. Greenfield and G. Osborn (eds) *Law and Sport in Contemporary Society*, pp. 267–82. London: Frank Cass.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman/Ballinger (Harper Collins).
- Friedman, M. (1962) *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Friedman, M. (1970) 'The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits', *The New York Times Magazine* 13: 122–26.
- Fundberg, J. (2004) 'Vi vs Dom: Idrottens förmåga och problem med integration' ['We versus Them: Sport's Ability and Problem with Integration'], available online at: [www.idrottsforum.org].
- Granovetter, M.S. (1973) 'The Strength of Weak Ties', *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 1360–80.
- Hanifan, L.J. (2003) [1920] 'Social Capital – Its Development and Use', in E. Ostrom and T.K. Ahn (eds) *Foundations of Social Capital*, pp. 22–35. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hull, D.L. (2002) 'The Social Responsibility of Professional Societies', *Metaphilosophy* 33(5): 552–65.
- Ibsen, B. (2002) *En eller flere idrætsorganisationer – hvorfor forskelle mellem de nordiske lande?* ['One or Several Sport Governing Bodies – Why Differences between the Different Nordic Countries?'], in H. Eichberg and B. Vestergård Madsen (eds) *Idrættens enhed eller mangfoldighed* [The Unity or Manifoldness of Sport], pp. 187–212. Århus: Klim.
- Ibsen, B. (2006) *Foreningsidrættens i Danmark: Udvikling og udfordring* ['Club-sport' in Denmark: Development and Challenges]. Copenhagen: IDAN.
- Ioakimidis, M. (2007) 'Green Sport: A Game Everyone Wins', *The Sport Journal*, available online at: [http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/green-sport-game-everyone-wins], accessed 16 May 2008.
- Jørgensen, P. (1997) *Ro, renlighed, regelmæssighed – Dansk Idræts-Forbund og sportens gennembrud ca. 1896–1918* [Peace, Cleanliness, Regularity – The Sport Confederation of Denmark's Breakthrough c. 1896–1918]. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.
- Koch-Nielsen, I., Skov Henriksen, L., Fridberg, T. and Rosdahl, D. (2005) *05:20 Frivilligt Arbejde – Den Frivillige Indsats i Danmark* [Voluntary Work – The Voluntary Efforts in Denmark]. Copenhagen: Socialforskningsinstituttet.
- Korsgaard, O. (1982) *Kampen om kroppen – Dansk idræts historie gennem 200 år* [The Struggle about the Body – Danish Sport History through 200 years]. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- KPMG (2002) *Eliteidræt i andre lande* [Elite Sport in Other Countries]. Copenhagen: DIF.
- Kulturministeriet (2007a) *Idrættens Mangfoldighed* [The Manifoldness of Sport], available online at: [http://www.kum.dk/sw343.asp], accessed 11 August 2007.
- Kulturministeriet (2007b) 'Pressemeddelelse 3. Juli 2007: Kulturministeren nedsætter breddeidrætsudvalg – Danmark i bevægelse' ['Press Announcement 3 July 2007: The Minister of Culture Appoints an Amateur Sport Committee – Denmark in Motion'], available online at: [http://www.kum.dk/sw59873.asp], accessed 23 August 2007.
- Leider, S., Möbius, M.M., Rosenblat, T. and Do, Q.A. (2007) 'How Much is a Friend Worth? Directed Altruism and Enforced Reciprocity in Social Networks', Federal Reserve Bank of Boston: Research Centre for Behavioral Economics and Decision-making, Working Paper 07–11.
- Llewellyn, G. (2004) 'Corporate Governance, Best Practice', in J. Hancock (ed.) *Investing in Corporate Social Responsibility – A Guide to Best Practice, Business Planning & the UK's Leading Companies*, pp. 111–23. London: Kogan Page.
- Ministeriet for Flygtninge, Invandrere og Integration (2007) available online at: [www.nyidanmark.dk], accessed 11 August 2007.
- Mirza, M. (ed.) (2006) *Culture Vultures – Is UK Arts Policy Damaging the Arts?* London: Policy Exchange.
- Munilla, L.S. and Miles, M.P. (2005) 'The Corporate Social Responsibility Continuum as a Component of Stakeholder Theory', *Business and Society Review* 4: 371–87.

- Ness, E. (2005) 'Corporate Social Responsibility', in C.S. Brown (ed.) *The Sustainable Enterprise – Profiting from Best Practice*. London: Kogan Page.
- OECD (2001) *Corporate Social Responsibility – Partners for Progress*. Paris: OECD Publications.
- Ostrom, E. and Ahn, T.K. (2003) *Foundations of Social Capital*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Pfister, G., Ottesen, L. and Habermann, U. (2003) *Women at the Top' – On Women, Sport and Management. Third Sub-report: The First Results*. Copenhagen: Institute of Exercise and Sport Sciences, University of Copenhagen.
- Putnam, R.D. (1993) 'The Prosperous Community: Social Capital in Public Life', *American Prospect* 13: 35–42.
- Putnam, R.D. (1995) 'Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America', *PS: Political Science and Politics* XXVIII: 664–83.
- Putnam, R.D. (2007) '*E Pluribus Unum*: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century – The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture', *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30(2): 137–74.
- Rodin, D. (2005) 'The Ownership Model of Business Ethics', *Metaphilosophy* 36: 163–81.
- Rosdahl, A. (2002) 'The Policy to Promote Social Responsibility of Enterprises in Denmark', Working Paper 10: 2002, Socialforskningsinstituttet, Copenhagen.
- Socialministeriet (2007) *VM for Hjemløse* [World Cup in Football for the Homeless], available online at: [http://www.social.dk/ministeriets_omraader/udsatte_grupper/hjemloese/Hjemloesefodbold/baggrund_hjemloeseVM.html], accessed 11 August 2007.
- Sport and Social Capital in the European Union (2006–8) 'Sport and Social Capital in the European Union', available online at: [<http://www.unibocconi.it/sportandsocialcapital>], accessed 11 August 2007.
- Spracklen, K., Hylton, K. and Long, J. (2006) 'Managing and Monitoring Equality and Diversity in UK Sport: An Evaluation Standard and Its Impact on Organizational Change', *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 30: 289–305.
- Tocqueville, A. de (2003) [1840/1945] 'Of the Use Which the Americans Make of Public Associations in Civil Life', in E. Ostrom and T.K. Ahn (eds) *Foundations of Social Capital*, p. 3. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Trangbæk, E. et al. (1995) *Dansk idrætsliv – Velfærd og fritid: 1940–96* [Danish Sport Life – Welfare and Leisure Time: 1940–96]. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

H. Thomas R. Persson is working at IPAS, Università Bocconi, Italy. He holds a PhD in Ethnic Relation from CRER, University of Warwick, UK. He is currently Guest Researcher at the Department of Sport Science at Malmö University.

Address: Östergatan 11, 21125 Malmö, Sweden.

Email: thomas.persson@unibocconi.it