



The International Journal of the History of Sport

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/fhsp20

Holding Their Own? Assessing the Merger of Men's and Women's Field Hockey in England

Rafaelle Nicholson

To cite this article: Rafaelle Nicholson (2024) Holding Their Own? Assessing the Merger of Men's and Women's Field Hockey in England, The International Journal of the History of Sport, 41:10-11, 1129-1149, DOI: [10.1080/09523367.2024.2352101](https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2024.2352101)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2024.2352101>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 10 Jun 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 478



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Holding Their Own? Assessing the Merger of Men's and Women's Field Hockey in England

Rafaele Nicholson 

Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

In 1996, the All England Women's Hockey Association (AEWHA) and the men's Hockey Association (HA) merged, ending a policy of separatism lasting over a century. In contrast with governance mergers in other sports, the AEWHA were able to exert a substantial amount of influence over the form and timing of the merger due to the financial clout of women's hockey. However, the inclusion of quotas within the new English Hockey Association (EHA) did not prevent the governance of field hockey in England from becoming male-dominated post-merger. The lack of cultural integration between the old HA and the new EHA proved to be a barrier, with the old separatist practices of the HA ensuring many women felt uncomfortable and voiceless in the period after the merger. The forced move to merged governance therefore reduced the autonomy and representation of women within English hockey. The merger changed hockey's governance structures, but it did not change the competing organizational cultures sufficiently for women to flourish within the EHA, and did not result in greater gender equality or equity.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 2 August 2023

Accepted 29 April 2024

KEYWORDS

Field Hockey; women's history; gender; governance; oral history

According to former Hockey Association (HA) President Robin Elliott's recollections, a meeting with the women of the All England Women's Hockey Association (AEWHA) in circa 1995, at which a possible merger of the AEWHA and HA was discussed, was particularly difficult:

At the top table, all the ladies were along there, and they were defensive. You felt, 'I don't know why they're being defensive. We're going forward to do this together.' And I was going there just - I was going along to put a point if they wanted. I wasn't even asked to speak, I think, so a hell of a long way for there and back ... I thought, 'they're not really very welcoming that I've come down and I'm available to talk them through what we are [doing]'. I certainly felt they were very much elder statesladies. They were out to hold their own.

I thought, 'This is not the way we need to go forward'. But they came round I expect.¹

Within 18 months, they had indeed 'come round'. On December 7, 1996, at a meeting at the new National Hockey Centre in the city of Milton Keynes, the AEWHA – which had been in existence for over 100 years – voted to dissolve itself and join up

CONTACT Rafaele Nicholson  rnicholson@bournemouth.ac.uk  Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, United Kingdom.

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

with men's hockey, establishing a brand new, joint national governing body: the English Hockey Association (EHA).²

Little is known about this ground-breaking decision to join English men's and women's hockey together. This is a striking omission given that merged governance has now become the norm for every national federation, with mergers also taking place in New Zealand (1989) and Australia (2000), following the merger of the International Hockey Federation (FIH) and the International Federation of Women's Hockey Associations (IFWHA) in 1983. Despite the initial resistance described by Elliott, a merger of men's and women's hockey in England also became imperative in the mid-1990s. However, as a case study of merged governance within sport, the 1996 English merger illustrates that moving from separate to merged sporting organizations can undermine the autonomy and influence of women within these organizations.

Liberal feminists promote the integration of women within existing sporting structures, but a radical feminist perspective sees this as impossible, due to the deep-rootedness of masculine hegemony within these structures. Instead, radical feminists argue that difference in women's sport should be valued over sameness, noting that many women-only sporting organizations promote alternative, progressive values such as an ethic of non-competitiveness and care.³ A radical feminist lens, while not the focus for the analysis of this merger, does provide a starting point for a possible critique of the process, based on the extent to which women within hockey continued to enjoy the autonomy and representation in hockey governance after the merger which they experienced within the AEWHA.

Internationally, studies of amalgamations between men's and women's sporting organizations have found that such processes increase male control at the expense of female autonomy.⁴ Across English sport as a whole, recent research has demonstrated that the transition from separate to merged governance which took place in the 1990s was profoundly disempowering for women in many sports, including squash and cricket.⁵ However, field hockey has been labelled 'one of the leading sports' for gender equality, with recent figures suggesting an almost 50/50 split in terms of participation in the UK.⁶ It may be that amalgamation looks different in a context where women bring significant financial and membership clout to the negotiating table. This article investigates the extent to which women's voices were represented in the merger process and within the new English Hockey Association, and whether the women were - as Elliott suggested - able to 'hold their own'.

Between February 2020 and March 2023, eight individuals who were at the forefront of the HA-AEWHA merger participated in oral history interviews - five men and three women. All interviewees gave informed consent to participate in the research, and gave permission to share their real identities; they were also offered the chance to review the interview transcripts to check for accuracy and to request sections be deleted or anonymized.⁷ Table 1 lists the interviewees. No one declined to participate in the research, but the time-limited nature of the study precluded the inclusion of further interviewees.⁸ While the research deliberately includes voices from both the AEWHA and HA, the sample was not designed to be consciously 'representative' of any particular group or viewpoint; rather, the aim was to explore the merger from a more affective perspective than the blander one offered by the official merger documentation.

Table 1. Oral History Interviewees.

Interviewee	Role
Stephen Baines	HA / EHA Chief Executive 1986 to 1998
Sue Catton	AEWHA Centenary Co-ordinator 1993 to 1995
Robin Elliott	HA President 1995 to 1997, EHA Vice-President 1997 to 1998
Teresa Morris	AEWHA Secretary (job title later changed to Chief Executive) 1978 to 1996
Monica Pickersgill	AEWHA President 1992 to 1996, inaugural EHA President
Ben Rea	Chair of HA Council, inaugural EHA Council member
Duncan Snook	HA / EHA Finance Director 1993 to 2001
Peter Webb	Chair of HA Coaching Committee, member of New Association Steering Group 1996 to 1997, EHA Vice-President 1998 to 1999

Oral history, a method dating back to the 1960s, captures ‘history from below’, documenting the experiences of those overlooked in official histories. It is still a relatively underutilized method by historians of sport.⁹ Its challenges have been well-documented: oral testimonies must always be treated with care due to the unreliability of memory and the ways in which current cultural discourses impact on the ‘composure’ of identity within interviews.¹⁰ Researcher positionality is also a critical consideration. In sport research, this means being conscious not just of gender, ethnicity and age in relation to the interviewees, but the relationship to the sport in question.¹¹ In this instance, my status as a cultural outsider with no background in hockey seemed to actually confer advantage. My sense is that I was perceived as a neutral observer with no particular ‘axe to grind’ in relation to the merger, encouraging interviewees to speak freely.

Postmodernist scholars like Alessandro Portelli have embraced the subjectivity of individual oral accounts: oral history allows an understanding of the *meaning* of events to those impacted by them.¹² Within the history of sport, these accounts are a way of giving voice to sportswomen whose activities have often been absent from the written archive.¹³ In the case of women’s field hockey there is relevant archival material available to consult, notably in the AEWHA archive at the University of Bath and at the Hockey Museum in Woking, Surrey.¹⁴ Yet oral histories are particularly pertinent for this research, given that organizational changes like mergers are ‘highly emotional life events’ whose impact cannot be wholly understood via written archives.¹⁵ The oral histories have been read intertextually with the archival material, to provide a richer and more in-depth understanding of the merger process. Overall, the merger changed hockey’s governance structures, but it did not change the competing organizational cultures sufficiently for women to flourish within the EHA, and did not result in greater gender equality or equity.

The History of Women’s Field Hockey

The history of women’s field hockey is not well-served in the literature. Until recently, much of what was known came via internal AEWHA documentation, including a 1954 pamphlet by Marjorie Pollard. This pamphlet relays the establishment of the first private women’s hockey club in 1887 at Molesey in Surrey, and the tour to Alexandra College in Dublin by a team from Newnham College, Cambridge which spawned the idea for the AEWHA.¹⁶ Kathleen McCrone linked the playing of hockey at girls’ public schools and women’s colleges to the growth in women’s hockey clubs

from the 1880s, describing the early growth of women's hockey as 'one of the major success stories in the early history of women's sport'.¹⁷ Recent research by Joanne Halpin has explored the AEWHAs strong attachment to amateurism and resistance to competitive hockey in the north of England in the period before the Second World War.¹⁸ The work of Jean Williams has expanded the focus internationally, showing how early tours developed links between the AEWHAs and other women's hockey associations as 'an element of female imperial, and post-colonial, connectivity'.¹⁹ Clearly, the path of separatism embarked upon by the AEWHAs was influential globally, with women's and men's field hockey being organized independently in Australia, New Zealand and Canada.²⁰

However, there has been much less work covering the post-1945 period, and no historical work which focuses specifically on the move towards merged governance in field hockey in England and elsewhere. The two existing studies which deal with the period immediately following the merger of the AEWHAs and the HA in 1996 are contemporary sociological ones. Houlihan and White's 2002 work on sports development considers the policy context in which four national governing bodies of sport (NGBs) were operating. They conclude that in the case of hockey, the drive from the UK government to improve corporate governance and financial management provided one motive for the AEWHAs-HA merger.²¹ In the same year, an article by Shaw and Slack examined the construction of gender relations within sporting organizations, based on interviews with staff from three different NGBs. The study was intended to be anonymous, but 'NGB C' is clearly identifiable as the EHA, and describes the existence of antagonistic relationships between former AEWHAs and HA members which were an evident legacy of the still-recent decision to merge.²²

The management literature indicates that mergers are complex negotiations with a high likelihood of an unsuccessful outcome.²³ There are a number of reasons for this: a lack of planning; the fact that decision-making is usually centralized after the merger, alienating those individuals at lower levels of the organization; and personnel clashes, which can prevent the new entity from running smoothly.²⁴ Culture is also seen as a key barrier to effective mergers in the world of business: many mergers fail due to a lack of cultural integration.²⁵ These critiques are well worth exploring within the context of the English field hockey merger.

'Touch Me Not': English Hockey Prior to the Merger

From the beginning of organized field hockey in the late nineteenth century, the women's and men's games in England were separately governed. The women who formed the AEWHAs initially applied for affiliation to the existing men's HA (founded in 1886), but the HA rejected their application due to the HA's ideological objections to the idea of women playing hockey. In 1895, the women therefore moved to establish their own Association, and instituted the principle that 'no man may hold executive office'. This rule remained in place until the merger. While the HA had no such rule, a glance at their membership lists in any given year reveals that they, also, were an almost entirely single-sex organization. Though many men's and women's clubs shared facilities, most functioned independently of each other; at the national level, coaching, umpiring and management of the England teams were entirely separate.

While the HA's rejection of the AEWHA was no longer within living memory by the 1980s, Shaw and Slack suggest that historically strained gender relations between the two Associations had by the 1990s become reified.²⁶ This was borne out by the AEWHA's secretary, Teresa Morris, who had no background in hockey when she joined the AEWHA staff in 1978:

It was a bit sort of 'touch me not' ... From what I can understand, the women wanted to join the Hockey Association and were told to get lost, and therefore they set up their own. And that meant that they were going to keep it very much to themselves ... old habits die hard don't they?

Personally, I thought it was all a load of rubbish, I mean quite frankly, I can't think why they had to have that animosity. And I don't think the men ever had it against us ... But they were never given the chance to show willing, if you like ... it was ridiculous.²⁷

Morris's counterpart in the HA, Stephen Baines, concurred: 'We'd never been in each other's office in 100 years. We had absolutely no contact at all. Zero.'²⁸ The men's and women's games were not just run by separate associations, but by people who barely had any contact with and were deeply suspicious of each other.

By the late 1980s, this gap was beginning to be bridged: in April 1987, the Associations made a revolutionary step, setting up their first ever joint committee, the Joint Initiative Group. The Group consisted of HA President Phil Appleyard, Baines, and Mike Ward from the HA Management Committee and three members of the AEWHA Executive, and it met roughly every three months between 1987 and 1992 'to examine areas of common interest and to determine how a closer relationship could be developed'.²⁹ In 1988, the AEWHA and HA set up a joint Hockey Coaching Association, while the following year they became partners in a National Hockey Development Scheme, setting up a national network of Development Officers for hockey who worked across both men's and women's hockey. In 1992, they created a joint AEWHA/HA umpiring award.

Yet in spite of this 'cooperation', oral histories emphasize the continuing culture clash between the two organizations: some former members of the HA displayed a tendency to belittle the achievements of the AEWHA, as well as expressing disregard for the more 'amateur' ethos which prevailed within the governance of women's hockey. One male interviewee suggested that the AEWHA had been run from a 'shed in the garden': 'I suppose they must've had an Annual General Meeting, I think it was probably held in the lady's shed ... and the ten of them who were doing the work turned up'.³⁰ Peter Webb recalled that some members of the HA had referred to the AEWHA as 'the blue stocking brigade', while Baines reflected that the two Presidents – Monica Pickersgill (a deputy headmistress) and Phil Appleyard (an international fisheries consultant) – were worlds apart in their view of hockey governance: 'He viewed it as running the business, she viewed it as running sport'.³¹ No wonder, then, that Pickersgill was nervous about these early attempts at cooperation: 'I mean we didn't, didn't really know them as people, the top men and so on. Didn't really know them, and certainly it was hard to develop respect for some of them ... [some] were very unpleasant to deal with at times'.³² At the HA's own Planning Weekend, held in Oxfordshire in August 1990, Ward stated that he 'did not believe that amalgamation was right for the Hockey Association in the short or medium term'. The minutes do not elaborate on his reasoning, but it

was noted elsewhere that there was a continued 'reluctance from the AEWHA to join with the HA' due to concerns 'that a Joint Association will be male dominated'.³³ Given the existing cultural clash, developed across almost a century of separatism, these concerns were perhaps understandable.

Crucially, and presumably partly in response to this culture clash, the Joint Initiative Group (conceived by the HA) was never sold to the AEWHA as a path towards merger. In a speech given by Appleyard to the AEWHA in 1987, he laid out what he saw as 'The Future of Hockey', describing 'mutual problems and challenges' for the two organizations, including school hockey, public relations, media coverage, sponsorship, and the laying of more synthetic turf pitches. However, clearly conscious of his all-female audience, he stressed that the HA were merely seeking 'coordinated policies', concluding: 'there is so much common ground which we can develop *without losing our independence*'.³⁴

This, then, was the shape of English hockey as the 1990s dawned. The separate governance of women's and men's hockey remained an important principle to those involved in running the sport. From a radical feminist perspective, this separatism was a strength: it provided the women of the AEWHA with almost absolute autonomy.

'We Were Left with No Choice': The Push towards a Merger

The key question is why, within 10 years of Appleyard's speech, a merger would take place, given that neither association appeared to have much appetite for one. In fact, the push for merger came externally via two male-dominated organizations. The first of these was the international governing body for hockey, the International Hockey Federation (FIH). The FIH had itself merged with its female equivalent, the International Federation of Women's Hockey Associations, in April 1983, following the inclusion of women's hockey for the first time at the 1980 Olympics in Moscow.

Many national hockey associations had always been joint, and the FIH seems to have been becoming increasingly impatient with those who defied this norm. Morris recalled:

There was quite a lot of behind-the-scenes pressure from the FIH ... 'Why aren't you one association?' Well again you see, they didn't like - some of it was logistical, because when they were dealing with all these countries, when it came to people like us ... they really felt that it was such a nuisance when they had to deal with - instead of dealing with a country, they had to deal with two lots of that same country, and quite often saying very different things.³⁵

Elliott concurred:

It wasn't the wish of the England Hockey Association to join up. It had never been considered, but it was the international hockey board ... who'd directed that there should only be one hockey body per country. And England were one of the big countries in the world who weren't already a single operation ... the international body said, 'we only want' - really leading up to the Olympic Games, they didn't want there to be two different associations coming from any one country.³⁶

At the FIH's Executive Board meeting, held during the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games, it was agreed that the eight remaining separate national associations of hockey

‘should take the first step [to merger] by setting up common umbrella structure’, with reports expected by 1998 setting out ‘a definite plan and calendar for a future merger’.³⁷

However, the Sports Council – the government quango responsible for allocating funding to sporting organizations – were applying more urgent pressure within England. By the 1990s, both the AEWHHA and the HA were heavily dependent on Sports Council grant-aid; between 1993 and 1996, their government grants amounted to £158,000 annually for the women and £215,000 annually for the men.³⁸ However, the Council was increasingly making this dependent on the two organizations developing a closer relationship. In 1992, the AEWHHA were told that their joint application with the men’s Hockey Association for £35,000 to fund a National Development Programme would be approved only on the basis of ‘future co-operation of the two governing bodies’, while in 1993, the Council’s new policy document *Women and Sport* recommended that all national governing bodies of sport ‘establish a single governing body’.³⁹ This policy resulted in mergers being forced upon a number of sports as a seeming *fait accompli*.⁴⁰

The Council was keen to stress publicly that it was not attempting to force the HA and AEWHHA into a merger. In September 1988, *Hockey Field* magazine published a letter from Elizabeth Dendy, the Council’s National Liaison Officer for Hockey, in which she objected to the magazine’s claim that a merger was being ‘urged by the Sports Council’:

Our role is not to interfere with the autonomy of governing bodies. However, our concern is for the most effective development of hockey and, to that end, a considerable amount of tax-payers’ money has been channelled. As guardians of that grant, it is our job to see that it is well spent without duplication, overlap or waste. We have been encouraged over the last few years to see the two games coming together to make the best use of available resources.⁴¹

Yet a consistent theme in oral histories was that behind the scenes, the Sports Council was being much more direct in calling for a full merger:

It was just a recommendation, but then it became a very strong recommendation, and then of course they couldn’t force us to do it, but they said, ‘if you don’t do it you don’t get the money’. (Rea)

We would have meetings with, I mean I think the top guy at the Sports Council then was Derek Casey and I’m sure he would be explaining why the associations needed to merge if they wanted to get access to high performance funding. They weren’t going to be doing funding two bodies so I think the writing was on the wall, and I think it was accepted very readily that this was the way forward. It forced the hand of the associations to then start merger talks ... We were left with no choice. (Baines)⁴²

The AEWHHA and HA were discussing a possible merger from 1992. However, knowledge that National Lottery funding for sport – rumoured to run into the millions – would commence in 1995 increased the impetus for a merger. According to interviewees, the Sports Council encouraged the perception that merged organizations would be given preference for Lottery funds. Duncan Snook explained:

The authorities, UK Sport, Sport England were gearing themselves up for this pot of money ... Some said it was billions, some said it was 10 million. There was such a variety of reporting on it ... There was also this compelling argument about, 'we won a gold in Seoul, we won a bronze in Barcelona. We haven't really done much in terms of World Cups since. We haven't done much, in terms of Champions Trophies since. We haven't done much, in terms of this or that, whatever. How do we get to the next level?' ... I think the compelling argument was, 'if we don't join together we'll be left behind' ... Lottery funding was the clincher.⁴³

As these three male voices suggest, external pressure to merge was being felt equally urgently by the HA as by the AEWHA.

Indeed, an important point which is overlooked in the existing literature is that sporting mergers are often equally undesired by male organizations, who also find them disempowering. Across all the oral history interviews, the sense of powerlessness was potent, emphasizing that the merger was imposed on English hockey, rather than being driven from within.

'Absolutely 50/50': The Mechanics of the Merger

The first formal mention of a merger seems to have been within the HA's 'Forward Planning Paper', dated 4 December 1991, which states: 'The HA supports entering into negotiations with the AEWHA with a view to ultimate amalgamation'.⁴⁴ In September 1992, both associations met at the Sports Council offices in London, 'to discuss whether or not there should be talks regarding a merger'. The following month, the AEWHA raised the issue at a Council meeting, and formal approval was given to consider a merger.⁴⁵

The AEWHA and HA set up a Working Party with a specific remit to drive forward the merger, with representatives from both associations: Pickersgill, Morris, Joyce Clarke and Pauline Wetton for the women, and Ian Forster, Tony White, Mike Ward and Baines for the men.⁴⁶ Between November 1992 and June 1996, this group met regularly, to iron out points of difficulty and draft proposals for the new joint association. By autumn 1993, when Duncan Snook was interviewed for the role of Finance Director at the Hockey Association, he recalled that the merger was already well in train:

It was specifically mentioned in the job description ... [The interview] was in the boardroom of the Hockey Association offices ... And clearly what had been laid out as a representative group from each Association.

I was asked about the prospect of the merger, not necessarily mechanically how it would be done, the process, whatever, but almost like the principle of it ... I was excited rather than daunted by it.⁴⁷

The Working Party eventually agreed to a timetable whereby two sets of general meetings of both associations would take place in June and then December 1996. At the June meetings (held on 5 and 8 June) there was a ballot on the principle of dissolution; while on 4 and 7 December, both associations would then actually vote on whether to dissolve themselves with effect from 1 June 1997, when (providing the votes passed) the new association would come into being.⁴⁸

From the outset, the AEWHA was fully represented in the amalgamation process. Equal representation was considered so fundamental that it was even agreed that the chair of the Working Party would rotate on a meeting-by-meeting basis between Pickersgill and Forster (the HA's Chairman). When the Working Party morphed into an 'Interim Steering Group' in June 1996, the new group consisted of the presidents, hon treasurers and chief executives of the two current associations, plus two further nominated representatives from each. Crucially, it was also chaired by White, who had umpired women's hockey for decades and was considered by both sides to be a 'neutral' arbitrator.⁴⁹ The contrast with sports like cricket and squash, whereby merger 'talks' were dominated by male voices, is notable.⁵⁰

Field hockey is considered to be a leading example of gender equity within team sport in the UK. This stems from the historical mass participation of women in hockey. One recent study has concluded that 'women's amateur hockey was actually a much more popular sport in the public imagination than the men's game'; certainly, the numerical and financial clout of the AEWHA in the early 1990s was substantial.⁵¹ By the time of the merger in May 1997, the projected assets of the AEWHA stood at £153,000, while those of the HA were £152,000 – almost complete equity.⁵² This bears out a comment made by Snook:

It was absolutely 50/50. The new EHA emerged, it was, 'that's our Association'. It's not, 'because we've put in however x thousand pounds more, we've got more of a take coming out of the side' ... it was one of the principles: 'There's no point going into this if the outcome is weighted in some way'.⁵³

The AEWHA therefore felt able to demand equal representation during the process. They carried out a full member consultation on the proposed changes, and circulated draft proposals to all AEWHA (and HA) members in June 1993, February 1995, and November 1995, outlining precisely what the new body would look like and how it would run. They sought feedback on each occasion and adjusted proposals accordingly. Finally, in December 1995, the Working Party held six roadshow meetings around the country to allow members a chance to present any further objections.

All this took place over several years; discussions and consultations lasted so long that the original plan to have the new organization in place ahead of the 1996/97 season proved impossible, and the launch date for the new association was delayed by a year. In fact, the timing was critical for the AEWHA, who were due to celebrate their centenary in 1995, and refused to contemplate any suggestion that a merger might take place before then. Pickersgill and Catton recalled:

MP: That was, we had to have our centenary before we could take this. It wouldn't have gone through, the women wouldn't have allowed that to happen.

SC: No, and I think the Sports Council accepted that didn't they?

MP: Because what we were celebrating there was a different thing, yes.

SC: Yes and I think that historically, the Hockey Association, they'd had their centenary, they'd got - it was important for the women to show, 'well look, we've got that strong base as well, to come together and to acknowledge. So I think yes that was a, that was pretty fundamental ...

MP: I don't ever remember that being particularly a big conversation. I think it was something that we said very strongly and that they [the HA] went along with from the start.⁵⁴

The language used by Pickersgill here ('the women wouldn't have allowed that to happen') emphasizes the strength and influence of the AEWHA within the merger process. The women also seem to have recognized the importance of asserting themselves in the process via a centenary celebration, suggesting there was some nervousness around being perceived as weaker or less significant than the men.

The AEWHA were also able to lay down guidelines on the language surrounding the merger process. Within management scholarship, it is recognized that mergers often take place as a result of significant pre-existing differentials in power and resources, while in the context of sports governance mergers, it is almost always the women who are not seen by their male counterparts as 'equal' partners.⁵⁵ The AEWHA were therefore adamant that the word 'merger' should not be used in any official documentation; in one contemporary memo, White described use of the word as 'taboo'.⁵⁶ Baines and Morris recalled:

In fact interestingly enough it was never called a merger. The women's association always wanted to call it the formation of a New Association. I think they were concerned of the strength of men's hockey and being dominated. (Baines)

That was something we said right from the word go, 'Let's not talk about mergers', because as soon as you talk about mergers, there's a question of who's top dog and all these sorts of things, that's why 'New Association'. And we religiously always referred - and everyone did that. The only people that ever talked about mergers was the press ... But within the two associations we always religiously spoke of it as the New Association. (Morris)⁵⁷

While the term 'merger' may have been considered publicly taboo at the time as a way of trying to head off potential objections, there was a private recognition that, in reality, the formation of the new association did amount to a 'merger'; and many interviewees referred to it as such. It is for this reason that the term has been adopted here.

Nonetheless, the fact that the AEWHA were able to dictate the language used to publicly describe the process suggests a significant level of influence. Representation and consultation were insisted upon by the AEWHA. This is a significant difference from other sporting mergers discussed in the literature, and is indicative of the numerical strength of women's hockey in England in the 1990s.

'NOT NEGOTIABLE': Consultation and Compromise

A review of the merger documentation shows that the English Hockey Association (EHA) emerged from the talks as a genuine compromise between the two sides. Once again, this contrasts with sports like cricket and squash, whereby merger 'talks' were either non-existent, or descended into stand-offs whereby the women's side were forced to concede to male demands.⁵⁸

This should not be taken to imply that the process was easy, nor that the meetings were not fraught with difficulty at times. Pickersgill remembers the process as 'rough and tough', while Baines describes it as 'hard work and frustrating'. As Peter Webb put it: 'people were fighting their corner for the best they could get out of it'.⁵⁹ Three

issues in particular stand out as being key sticking points: the name of the new association, what the new management and committee structures would look like, and (relatedly) how the new association would be staffed.

The name of the new association was a particularly emotive issue for the men of the HA. During the consultations, the Working Group proposed a variety of alternative suggestions (including English Hockey Union, All England Hockey Association and Hockey England), but the HA membership remained almost unanimously in favour of retaining their old title. Being the Hockey Association was seen as a global badge of honour, as one letter to HA Chairman Ian Forster, dated February 28, 1996, explained:

I think it would be quite disgraceful if we were to abandon our heritage and to allow ourselves to be called the English Hockey Association ... We gave Hockey to the World, as we did Rugby Football, Lawn Tennis and, I think, perhaps Athletics in the modern form. We still have the Rugby Football Union, the Lawn Tennis Association and the Amateur Athletic Association, none of whom have parochialised themselves by including the word English in their title.⁶⁰

The AEWH membership appeared to have no such attachment to their own 'All England' branding, yet were staunchly against the suggestion that a new association might maintain the HA label. As Morris put it: 'we felt like that really would look very much like a takeover if that happened'.⁶¹

Despite numerous strong objections from HA members, by January 1996 the Working Group had settled upon the name 'English Hockey Association'. Ben Rea explained:

It was a good compromise, the English Hockey Association. It kept 'Hockey Association', it threw England in, and it covered both sides. Pretty obvious really. But still there were a lot of old fogies still complaining, 'It was the Hockey Association, we all knew it as that, why did you change it, the women should've accepted the name, it still covered them'.⁶²

Some HA members may have been unhappy, but a new name ensured that the New Association would not feel to either side as if it was simply another iteration of the men's Hockey Association. This was therefore a victory for the cause of gender equity in English hockey.

The second issue regarding the new association related to its management and committee structures. The draft constitution of the new EHA, developed between 1993 and 1997, largely replicated the existing structure of the HA, with committees for coaching, competitions, the constitution, international and external affairs, international teams, technical matters, umpiring, and youth development. Yet bringing two organizations together into one effectively meant that the number of committee positions within the new association would halve, which was a source of tension for both sides. As Peter Webb explained:

[Meetings] would be difficult in the sense of we were discussing issues about ... 'who's going to be this and who's going to be that?' ... There would have been a joint umpiring committee and a joint coaching, they were all put in together. And that meant that some people didn't stay on those committees ... And if you're sitting comfortably on a group of 12 umpires who are selected and then suddenly there's only six go in ... you do actually have to make those decisions.⁶³

The HA believed that when establishing new committees, the principle of 'best person for the job' should prevail; yet the AEWHA insisted that the EHA constitution should enshrine the principle of equal representation for men and women. The women's reasoning for this was presented very differently by male and female interviewees. Morris described it as a way 'to keep everyone happy', but Elliott and Baines felt that it had been a path to ensure the over-representation of women within the New Association:

I know the only thing I felt was that the ladies did feel that they wanted to be in office as of right very early on, which was fine because otherwise they could have been dominated. But the men didn't seem to want to dominate ... Anyway, I think all ladies are in charge now, aren't they? (Elliott)

The men had a very strong team of people, but some of them we lost because of the merger. They didn't carry on because there wasn't enough jobs for them. So there was talent that was lost, because they had to go because they were being replaced by a woman ... A lot of British sport is run by women. It's been run by women for a long time. (Baines)⁶⁴

In the minds of both Elliott and Baines, female representation within the EHA via quotas has subsequently spread across other sports; both believe (erroneously) that women now represent a majority within the governance of British sport.⁶⁵ The continued resentment about quotas highlights the emotive nature of memories of the merger, even a quarter of a century after the fact.

By the time the Working Group finalized the draft constitution of the EHA in 1997, the AEWHA's view had once again largely prevailed. The constitution dictated that of the eight committee chairs, four should be men and four should be women; that the initial members of the standing committees would be nominated by the Councils of the AEWHA and HA 'who shall ensure equality of gender representation on each Committee'; and that the President and Vice-President 'shall not be of the same gender' and that each should serve a maximum term of three years 'with change of gender every three years'. The only compromise was that some of these formal quotas would be time-limited: for example, the need for a rotating female/male presidency would be reviewed after six years.⁶⁶

Uniquely amongst the English team sports which underwent mergers between 1993 and 1998 (football, hockey, lacrosse, and cricket), the first ever president of the new, merged association in hockey would also be a woman: Monica Pickersgill. Pickersgill was in fact voted in by the members of the Steering Group ahead of her HA counterpart, Robin Elliott – a mark of the respect with which she was regarded by her colleagues. Her ascendancy to the very top of the EHA also symbolized the continued influence of the AEWHA during the merger process.

The final of the three key issues related to the office and staffing of the new association. Merger discussions were taking place in a context whereby the new National Hockey Centre in Milton Keynes had recently opened. The intention was for this National Centre – the brainchild of Appleyard – to be hockey's Wembley, staging all future internationals. The key point in relation to the merger is that it was only viable with the support of the AEWHA, which provided £500,000 towards the project.

Because the Centre was a joint project, it seems to have been taken for granted that the AEWHA would relocate from their existing office in Shrewsbury to Milton Keynes, where

the HA's own office had been based since 1992. The men did not countenance the possibility that the women might prefer the new association to be located elsewhere; when Morris was asked whether the EHA could instead have been based in Shrewsbury, she laughed and said: 'You can't think the men would've come here.'⁶⁷ Thus on July 31, 1996, the AEWHAs office in Shrewsbury High Street closed for the final time.

This meant that it was clear from very early in the negotiations that none of the existing three AEWHAs staff would carry over post-merger, for the very practical reason that none wished to relocate from Shrewsbury to Milton Keynes.⁶⁸ The question of what the merger would mean for the HA's own paid staff was much thornier. In the initial discussion paper, circulated to all AEWHAs and HA members in June 1993, both sides outlined their views:

The H.A. wishes all current staff to be retained for the following reasons:

- It does not wish to carry on its affairs until June 1996, or possibly a time in the preceding year, with senior members of its staff uncertain as to their future.
- It owes a duty to its staff and their families who have already suffered considerable upheaval and disturbance in moving to Milton Keynes.
- It does not wish to lose the accumulated and valued expertise of its present staff.
- Both Associations will have acted honourably to their own staff if all are offered continuing employment in the new Association.

A.E.W.H.A. appreciates the need for some continuity but wishes all appointments to be advertised. Existing staff may of course apply ... There should be equality of opportunity in the appointment of staff to a new association.⁶⁹

HA President Phil Appleyard clearly felt extremely strongly about the issue. In his copy of the discussion paper, his handwritten, annotated comments are visible; next to this section he has scrawled in capital letters, underlined: '**NOT NEGOTIABLE**'.⁷⁰

The AEWHAs were equally intransigent. In late 1993, Pickersgill and Forster exchanged heated correspondence on the issue, having discussed it with their respective Management Committees. Appleyard's own letter to the HA Council on 16 December concluded that the issue was 'absolutely integral to the formation of any new Association and, unless the AEWHAs can agree, I see little future in continuing the negotiations'.⁷¹ The very concept of a merger appeared to be on a knife edge.

A year's deadlock ensued. Finally, though, at a meeting between the Management Committees of both organizations on October 29, 1994, the Committees agreed that all existing HA staff members would indeed have their roles automatically transferred over to the new association.⁷² It is unclear exactly why the AEWHAs agreed to shift their stance, except that it seems to have been something of a quid pro quo: at the same meeting they also secured assurances that amongst the volunteer workforce, gender quotas would be put in place, as already noted.

However, that was not the end of the matter. In early 1997, in conversations with the Interim Steering Group, the Sports Council agreed to offer a substantial Lottery Revenue grant of £19 million over eight years to the EHA, to enable the establishment of a World Class Performance Programme. However, the Sports Council imposed the condition that all top jobs in the EHA must be advertised externally

post-merger, on the basis that ‘the award of lottery funds ... would create an Association of significantly larger scale and responsibility than heretofore and would require strong leadership and careful management’.⁷³ This included the roles of Chief Executive (held by Baines) and Finance Director (held by Snook). The condition was later hastily withdrawn by the Sports Council after a suggestion that such a move might be subject to legal challenge; yet at the first ever National Council meeting of the EHA, held on June 14, 1997, the Council nonetheless agreed that all senior positions would be externally advertised.

Baines immediately sought legal advice and was advised that if the EHA were to proceed in this way, he had a good case against them for breach of contract.⁷⁴ The issue was finally resolved at a stormy, three-hour Special Council Meeting on August 29, 1997, during which Baines ‘stated that if the position was advertised he would not apply and would regard it as constructive dismissal’. A secret ballot, by eleven votes to ten, then took place reversing the Council’s previous decision and agreeing that Baines (and Snook) would both automatically continue in post.⁷⁵

Finally, after an exhausting few years of negotiation, the parameters for the new EHA were in place. The women of the AEWHHA had fought hard, and secured much (although not all) of the ground they had wanted: a new name for a new association and numerically equal representation on EHA committees. Perhaps most significantly of all, the new organization would be headed by a woman. The question was how well the merged organization would function in practice.

‘You Women Come and Join Us Men’: The EHA and Gender Equity

Within six years of the coming together of English men’s and women’s hockey, the new merged organization – the English Hockey Association – was defunct, forced to suspend operations in 2002 due to serious financial problems.⁷⁶ According to the BBC, by April that year the EHA had accumulated debts of £700,000 and had to be bailed out by Stuart Newton, the chairman of Brighton & Hove Hockey Club, who offered a £500,000 interest-free loan.⁷⁷ Eventually, the EHA’s member clubs agreed to hand over the running of the sport to a new limited company, Hockey England Ltd, which has remained the NGB in charge of hockey ever since.

Four of the eight interviewees were no longer involved in the EHA by the time this occurred, and the remainder either did not wish to discuss this ‘end’ to the EHA’s operations, or requested that their remarks be anonymized, presumably for fear of legal ramifications. The publicly available archival material does not extend beyond the first two years of the new organization, meaning that it is difficult to provide a full analysis of the EHA’s economic woes, or definitively say that the upheaval of the merger somehow ‘caused’ these financial difficulties. However, there is certainly a feeling that the speed of the process and the sudden, resultant influx of money from the Sports Council was a contributing factor. One interviewee stated:

They [the EHA committee] didn’t know how to cope with that sort of money all of a sudden and got carried away then realized it was for four years, and it became disaster quite quickly. I mean, well-intentioned people who were out of their depth I think really... they certainly got £12 million and, ‘that’s wonderful, we’ve been doing on half a million’, so they hired cars and, you know, bought all sorts of kits and everything else

and other bits. But it's rarely sustainable, and came the moment after two years where they'd spent four years money... It was just amateurs running out of their debts and spending money that they didn't realize they had.

This interviewee saw the merger as having sped up what would have otherwise been a much slower process of professionalization at the top levels of English hockey governance.

The EHA may also have been hampered by the disunity within its ranks. Indeed, any assessment of the effectiveness of the English Hockey Association needs to be situated in the context of continued opposition to the merger, even after it had been formally been voted through. In an interview with *Hockey Digest* published in October 1994, Pickersgill outlined the concerns felt by AEWHA members:

There is, within our association, particularly among some older members, a worry that women's hockey could be downgraded within a single governing body. There is a group which feels women's rights have to be safeguarded ... There is this feeling that men will take over.⁷⁸

Even in the light of the compromises outlined, many AEWHA members remained concerned that the men would dominate in the post-merger period. Pickersgill recalled that some of her longtime colleagues, (including Joyce Clark, who was actually a member of the merger Working Party) continued to oppose the policy, right to the end:

She [Joyce] was, she was not on my side in bringing us together ... she was very uneasy about it ... There was some really good women who thought it was a bad move ... Because they saw the Association as a very successful one anyway as it was and we didn't need the men ...

I mean there was a body of women, certainly people like Joyce who thought that they needed to look after something that was very precious to them, and what was being suggested could destroy that.⁷⁹

When the results of the June 1996 votes were announced, only six out of 52 representatives on the HA Council voted against the merger; yet in a full postal vote of its members, 58 of the AEWHA held out against the move (although 419 voted in favour).⁸⁰ Although this represents a similar percentage who opposed the move (11% of men vs 12% of women), it does also suggest that in absolute terms more women than men may have struggled to buy into the concept of the new, merged EHA.

Both Baines and Morris argued that as a result of fears about the men 'taking over', the final EHA constitution was less prescriptive than it should have been:

They watered down the constitution to make sure everybody was happy ... It had to go to AGMs at both associations ... They produced a constitution that would work, but was not necessarily going to produce the results quickly. (Baines)

We were going to have this blank piece of paper, but the inevitable happened and we were both guilty of this, but, 'we've always done it like that', and gradually it did become the thing that we had said it wouldn't be, which was a cobbled together ... Well, because it was so cobbled, one could see that it was only going to be an interim ... one knew that that wasn't going to last for very long. But it was enough to get it over the line if you like, and iron it out afterwards. (Morris)⁸¹

The time pressures imposed by both the Sports Council and the FIH, who in June 1997 imposed a rule that all national hockey associations must merge by 2000, increased the sense of needing to simply get the merger over the line, with no time to consider some of the thornier issues in detail.

One such issue was what would happen to the separate women's and men's associations which existed at local level – complicated by the fact that the AEWH and HA regional boundaries were not the same. The Steering Group got around the issue by stating that 'existing Territorial, Divisional and women's and men's County Associations should have a commitment to integrate and that full integration should be achieved by June 2002'.⁸² In practice, some associations ignored the directive altogether (the West continues to maintain separate male and female associations to this day). Other local 'mergers' bore out the fears expressed by Joyce Clark and others. Ben Rea recalled:

Mainly, to start off with, the men were the presidents and the chairmen and not the women ... probably because they were there and they said, 'Well you're going to join us', rather than - you know, it wasn't - I don't think it was complete sort of, 'We're equal'. Yes, 'You women come and join us men' ... A lot of the senior women said, 'Thank you very much but we've done our bit now, we'll move out' ... I think the older ones, the 70-year-olds, who had been doing it for a long time said, 'Well it's different and I think I've done my bit now, I don't want to start again'.⁸³

In 2002, Houlihan and White found that the EHA was 'experiencing an erosion of the position of women in decision-making positions ... at the county and regional levels'.⁸⁴

The workings of the EHA in the immediate post-merger period reveal an issue intrinsic to any merged sporting organization: mergers change governance structures but they do not change culture. The EHA was tasked with bringing together men and women used to working together in their own, siloed ways; Snook, who overnight transferred from his role as HA Finance Director to EHA Finance Director, described the early environment:

We'd got 100 years plus of doing things a different way, right down to different levels of league and county representation, regional representation. A different way that you may qualify for a national knockout. So, a lot of the, I wouldn't say friction, but a lot of the things that needed to be sorted was the philosophy of how the game was run ... When the cultures of the game came together, rather than just the finances and the rules and the staff, I think that was probably a harder journey, than the actual sort of almost mechanistic joining together.⁸⁵

Shaw and Slack's 2002 study of the EHA concluded that the organization still harboured 'antagonism', grounded in 'historical suspicion and uncertainty'.⁸⁶

The constitutionalized quotas which had been intended to protect the women from feeling marginalized within the new EHA were often ineffective. To begin with, the men replaced the male sociability of HA meetings with an annual lunch:

Somebody said, 'we need to meet regularly, as men' ... Well there's a lunch every year and has been ever since ... It was people who had been top jobs in the men's association. I think they said, 'look, it's a new association, it's not got the various things that ... you're not going to have a buddy buddy exercise with the women for some time etc., so why don't we just meet up once a year and talk?' (Webb)⁸⁷

This occasion did not just serve symbolically as an ‘Old Boys Club’, but was actually named the ‘Hockey Old Boys Lunch’. Even within a merged organization, then, gender separatism continued to prevail in specific pockets, making it difficult for female volunteers to feel truly equal. Pickersgill’s memories of this time are instructive:

I know it took a long time to feel that we were equal even after we agreed that the trust was there ... That even though we had the appropriate numbers on the committees, the weight and value of those members was not accepted as, totally as equal because they didn’t think we’d been there and done it.

And I remember after I was, after we’d come together and I was then elected the first President of the Association in Europe, I sensed every time I appeared at any event in the early days and they were talking about or I was introduced as the new President of England [spoken quietly] ‘she’s, it’s a woman!’⁸⁸

Far from being made to feel included, Pickersgill was therefore singled out and experienced the discomfort of being the ‘token woman’ at these events.

This assessment of the EHA, though brief, bears out the findings of contemporary management scholars, who have concluded that the mere presence of women at the top levels of an organization is not a sufficient condition to advance gender equality in sport governance.⁸⁹ Women may have been present within the EHA – most notably in the figure of Pickersgill as the organization’s first president – but as an organization, it was far from a panacea for gender equity. The lack of cultural integration between the old HA and the new EHA proved to be a barrier, with the old separatist practices of the HA ensuring many women felt uncomfortable and voiceless in the period after the merger.

A Successful Merger?

Given the short-lived nature of the EHA, especially in contrast to its predecessor organizations which had between them lasted over 200 years, it would be difficult to conclude that the merger was a wholehearted success. Although the available evidence is not sufficient to suggest that the failure of the EHA was directly linked to the 1996 merger, a six-year reign which ended in virtual bankruptcy is not a good advert for merged governance. When placing sporting mergers on a spectrum, the AEWHHA-HA amalgamation sits at the more gender-equitable end of the scale. The women’s insistence on bringing into existence a brand new association, with a new title, and on full representation on all EHA committees, combined with their ability to draw out merger negotiations over a number of years to ensure the AEWHHA was able to celebrate its centenary, all points to a substantial amount of influence in shaping the form of the new, merged association.

Even so, the process can hardly be described as empowering for the women of the AEWHHA, nor indeed for the men of the HA. The impetus for the merger came externally, via the UK government and the FIH, giving both organizations no choice but to follow a particular policy path. Despite strict gender quotas, the resultant organization – the EHA – was far from perfect in terms of gender equity. The example of the EHA reinforces the suggestion in studies of business mergers that the failure of mergers is often due to a lack of cultural integration.

More generally, researchers should examine more carefully the efficacy of governance mergers within sport which are externally imposed: a merger is clearly a failure if the end result – even in a sport considered gender-equitable in participation terms – is increased male supremacy at the expense of female autonomy. For all that merged governance has now become the norm within global field hockey, a merger of two NGBs is not always a smooth path to achieving gender equality or equity.

Notes

1. Interview with Robin Elliott, 20 June 2022, by author.
2. Milton Keynes is a city in Buckinghamshire, about 50 miles northwest of London, and housed the UK's National Hockey Stadium between 1995 and 2003.
3. Lois Bryson, 'Sport and the Maintenance of Masculine Hegemony', *Women's Studies International Forum* 10, no. 4 (1987): 349–60; Jennifer Hargreaves, *Sporting Females* (London: Routledge, 1994), 250.
4. Barbara Cox and Shona Thompson, 'From Heydays to Struggles: Women's Soccer in New Zealand', *Soccer and Society* 4, no. 2 (2003): 205–24; Megan Stronach and Daryl Adair, "'Brave New World" or "Sticky Wicket"? Women, Management and Organisational Power in Cricket Australia', *Sport in Society* 12, no. 7 (2009): 910–32.
5. Raffaella Nicholson, "'Holding a Gun At Our Heads': The Sports Council's Role in Merger-Takeovers of Women's Sport, 1985-2000", in *Gender Equity in UK Sport Leadership and Governance*, ed. Philippa Velija and Lucy Piggott (London: Emerald, 2022), 51–68.
6. GB Hockey, <https://www.greatbritainhockey.co.uk/latest/news/gb-women-using-hockey-to-drive-equality-in-sport> (accessed July 31, 2023).
7. Ethical approval to carry out the research was granted by Bournemouth University. Ethics ID number 26494.
8. The hockey interviews formed part of a project examining multiple sports, carried out as part of a three-year fellowship funded by Bournemouth University.
9. Fiona Skillen and Carol Osborne, 'It's Good to Talk: Oral History, Sports History and Heritage', *The International Journal for the History of Sport* 32, no. 15 (2015): 1883–98.
10. Alistair Thomson, *Anzac Memories: Living With the Legend* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
11. Skillen and Osborne, 'It's Good to Talk', 1888.
12. Alessandro Portelli, 'What Makes Oral History Different?', in *The Oral History Reader*, ed. Rob Perks and Alistair Thomson (Oxford: Routledge, 2016).
13. Lisa Taylor, 'Confronting Silences in the Archive: Developing Sporting Collections with Oral Histories', *Sport in History* 43, no.3 (2023): 293–306. See also Carly Adams and Mike Cronin, 'Sport and Oral History', *The International Journal for the History of Sport* 36, nos. 13–14 (2019): 1131–5.
14. Woking is a town in the county of Surrey, about 23 miles from London.
15. Verena Kusstatscher and Cary Cooper, *Managing Emotions in Mergers and Acquisitions* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2005), 1.
16. Marjorie Pollard, *Women's Hockey: From Village Green to Wembley Stadium* (London: MacDonald & Evans, 1954).
17. Kathleen McCrone, *Sport and the Physical Emancipation of English Women, 1870-1914* (London: Routledge, 1988), 130.
18. Jo Halpin, "'Will You Walk into Our Parlour?": The Rise of Leagues and Their Impact on the Governance of Women's Hockey in England 1895-1939' (PhD thesis, University of Wolverhampton, 2019).
19. Jean Williams, *A Contemporary History of Women's Sport, 1850-1950* (Oxford: Routledge, 2014), 155.

20. On Australia, see Janet Beverley, 'More than a Game: Australian Women's Hockey, 1896 to 2000' (PhD thesis, University of Queensland, 2022). On Canada, see John McBryde, 'The Bipartite Development of Men's and Women's Field Hockey in Canada in the Context of Separate International Hockey Federations' (Masters thesis, University of British Columbia, 1986).
21. Barry Houlihan and Anita White, *The Politics of Sport Development: Development of Sport or Development for Sport?* (London: Routledge, 2002), 164–205.
22. Sally Shaw and Trevor Slack, "It's Been Like that for Donkey's Years": The Construction of Gender Relations and the Cultures of Sports Organizations', *Sport in Society* 5, no. 1 (2002): 86–106.
23. Alexander Roberts, William Wallace, and Peter Moles, *Mergers and Acquisitions* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Business School, 2003), 20.
24. Han Nguyen and Brian H. Kleiner, "The Effective Management of Mergers", *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal* 24, no. 8 (2003): 447–54.
25. J. Lalith Kumar and S. Ambika Kumari, 'Cross Cultural Differences in Mergers and Acquisitions', *Journal of Legal Studies and Research* 8, no. 1 (2022): 312–23.
26. Shaw and Slack, "It's Been Like That For Donkey's Years", 96.
27. Interview with Teresa Morris, September 30, 2022, by author.
28. Interview with Stephen Baines, July 5, 2022, by author.
29. AEWHHA and HA Press Release, May 18, 1987, England Women's Hockey Association collection, A/3/6, University of Bath Archives, Bath, United Kingdom (hereafter Bath).
30. The interviewee in question requested that this quote remain anonymous.
31. Interviews with Peter Webb, February 4, 2020 and Stephen Baines, July 5, 2022, by author.
32. Interview with Monica Pickersgill, April 5, 2023, by author.
33. HA Planning Weekend minutes, August 4–5, 1990, England Women's Hockey Association collection, E/1/35, Bath.
34. Phil Appleyard, 'A Personal Perspective on the Future of Hockey', speech given to AEWHHA 10 July 1987, Mike Ward Collection (uncatalogued), The Hockey Museum, Woking, United Kingdom (hereafter THM). My emphasis.
35. Interview with Teresa Morris.
36. Interview with Robin Elliott.
37. The quote from the FIH Board meeting is cited in a letter from Tony White to Mike Davies, 19 September 1996, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/5, Bath.
38. 'Revised Draft Proposal: New Body to Govern Men's and Women's Hockey in England', November 1995, England Women's Hockey Association collection, E/1/52, Bath.
39. Sports Council, 'Grant Assessment Panel Minutes', February 6, 1992, National Athletics Archive, ATH/SC/1/8/6, University of Birmingham archives, Birmingham, United Kingdom.
40. Nicholson, 'Holding a Gun at Our Heads'.
41. Letters Page, *Hockey Field*, September 1988.
42. Interviews with Ben Rea, September 6, 2022 and Stephen Baines, July 5, 2022, by author.
43. Interview with Duncan Snook, June 13, 2022, by author.
44. HA forward planning paper, December 4, 1991, England Women's Hockey Association collection, E/1/41, Bath.
45. AEWHHA and HA meeting minutes, September 16, 1992 and February 1, 1993, Mike Ward Collection (uncatalogued), THM.
46. At the time of the study, Joyce Clarke and Pauline Wetton were not available for interview, while Ian Forster, Tony White and Mike Ward had all died.
47. Interview with Duncan Snook.
48. The June and December meetings were deliberately staged as close together as possible, in order to prevent the vote of one Association swaying the vote of the other.
49. George Croft, 'Man of Integrity', *Hockey Sport*, March 1997.
50. Nicholson, 'Holding a Gun at Our Heads'.

51. Jean Williams, David Lewis-Earley, Kay Biscoomb and Katie Dodd, 'MRV Hosts the Queen: Family History, Memory and Hockey's Proud Heritage', *Sport in History* 43, no. 3 (2023): 333.
52. Steering Group minutes, November 6, 1996, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/7, Bath.
53. Interview with Duncan Snook.
54. Interview with Monica Pickersgill and Sue Catton, April 5, 2023, by author.
55. Stronach and Adair, 'Brave New World': 914.
56. Memo from Tony White, November 23, 1996, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/7, Bath.
57. Interviews with Stephen Baines and Teresa Morris.
58. See for example Rafaëlle Nicholson, *Ladies and Lords: A history of women's cricket in Britain* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019). Chapter 7 deals with the merger of women's and men's cricket in England.
59. Interviews with Monica Pickersgill, Stephen Baines, and Peter Webb.
60. Letter to Ian Forster from MJA Hill, February 28, 1996, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/4, Bath.
61. Interview with Teresa Morris.
62. Interview with Ben Rea.
63. Interview with Peter Webb.
64. Interviews with Robin Elliott and Stephen Baines.
65. In fact, Sport England and UK Sport found in 2018 that just 75% of organizations had met their minimum requirement of 30% women on boards. See *Annual Survey 2018/19, Diversity in Sport Governance Report*, www.uksport.gov.uk (accessed July 30, 2023).
66. 'English Hockey Association Constitution', England Women's Hockey Association collection, A/2/36, Bath.
67. Interview with Teresa Morris.
68. 'AEWHA change of address'. Bath, England Women's Hockey Association collection, A/3/6. Morris did continue to offer consultancy services for another 12 months but this work was mostly done remotely.
69. Discussion Paper 1, 'New Body to Govern Women's and Men's Hockey in England', June 1993, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/1, Bath.
70. Ibid.
71. Correspondence between Ian Forster, Monica Pickersgill and Phil Appleyard, November to December 1993, Mike Ward Collection (uncatalogued) THM.
72. 'New appointments within the EHA', undated, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/12, Bath.
73. Ibid.
74. Letter from PR Wild at Kidd Rapinet Solicitors to Stephen Baines, August 4, 1997, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/12, Bath.
75. 'Minutes of the Special Council Meeting', 29 August 1997, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/12, Bath.
76. 'English hockey's future in danger', BBC Sport, April 11, 2002, http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/other_sports/1923998.stm (accessed February 28, 2024).
77. 'Rescue Deal for English Hockey', BBC Sport, 4 May 2002, http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/other_sports/1965159.stm (accessed February 28, 2024).
78. *Hockey Digest*, October 1994.
79. Interview with Monica Pickersgill.
80. Letter from Tony White to AEWHA and HA, 20 June 1996, England Women's Hockey Association collection, H/1/4, Bath.
81. Interviews with Stephen Baines and Teresa Morris.
82. 'English Hockey Association Constitution', England Women's Hockey Association collection, A/2/36, Bath.
83. Interview with Ben Rea.

84. Houlihan, and White, *The Politics of Sport Development*, 93.
85. Interview with Duncan Snook.
86. Shaw and Slack, 'It's Been Like That For Donkey's Years', 96.
87. Interview with Peter Webb.
88. Interview with Monica Pickersgill.
89. Johanna Adriaanse and Toni Schofield, 'The Impact of Gender Quotas on Gender Equality in Sport Governance', *Journal of Sport Management* 28, no. 5 (2014): 494.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on Contributor

Dr. Rafaele Nicholson is a historian of women's cricket and the author of *Ladies and Lords: A History of Women's Cricket in Britain*. She is a Senior Lecturer in Sports Journalism at Bournemouth University, a freelance journalist who writes for *The Guardian* and *Wisden*, and a former chair of the British Society of Sports History.

ORCID

Rafaele Nicholson  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9128-201X>