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Abstract

This thesis analyses the relationship between national identity and sport within Scotland, focusing on rugby union and association football. It investigates the complexity of defining a sporting ‘Scottish national identity’, and suggests the possibility of competing definitions of national identity existing in Scotland within and across the two sports. The aim of the study is to critically examine existing assumptions surrounding Scottish sporting nationalism, to situate the conspicuously absent rugby union within the literature, and to locate contemporary Scottish sporting nationalism in post-1999 Scotland.

Through the use of semi-structured interviews and observation, empirical data was collected and analysed utilising a cultural studies theoretical framework. The theoretical explanations have been informed by the work of Pierre Bourdieu’s explanatory formula of practice and, at a secondary level, by Erving Goffman’s dramaturgical model, demonstrating the compatibility of synthesising these two social theorists’ concepts in formulating original research explanations. The findings suggest that the national identity and sporting relationship in Scotland is multi-faceted with a variety of overlapping factors contributing to sports supporters’ feelings of national identification. Elements of a subtle class habitus emerge as a primary facet shaping national identity perception across both sports, revealing a class-based relationship to accumulating social and cultural capital at local and national levels. While national identity in Scottish sport is shown to be a factor shaping supporter identification, the typical understanding of national identity previously utilised and accepted in much of the literature is shown to be overly simplistic. Furthermore, other factors are shown to shape and affect local and national sporting identification in meaningful ways, which are often overlooked at the expense of seeking out the ‘national’ explanation.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Sport is one specific way in which we make and remake ourselves as individual and collective agents, and in which we make and remake the social world that surrounds us. As such, its meanings and structures are connected in an indisissoluble way to the ‘raw’ experiences of material history (Morgan, 1994: 64).

Bairner (2001) provides a reminder that “the complex relationship between the people and nationality is reflected in the worlds of sport” (p. 172). Sport provides fertile ground for analysing the relationship between collectivities and national identity, and this is perhaps particularly apparent in Scotland. Murray Watson’s (2003) work on English migrants residing in Scotland provides an illustrative example. Watson’s study reveals that the migrants became most aware of Scottish national identity when sport was involved. Although sport and national identity remain closely associated in Scotland, there remains a degree of conceptual ambiguity. For example, Bairner suggests that Scots have little “difficulty with the concept of nationalism in general and sporting nationalism in particular” (p. 172). However, questioning the unity of a Scottish sporting nationalism, beyond mere “superficial coherence”, Bairner then adds, “Scots remain divided as to what their nationalism requires at the level of politics and the resultant debate is reflected in the construction of sporting nationalism” (p. 172).

How then is sporting nationalism constructed in Scotland and in what ways does it impact upon Scottish sport and society? McCrone et al. (1995) examine Scottish heritage, claiming it is significant because it “rests on a national and cultural dimension” (p. 182). For them, heritage is a reflection of nationalism, yet revealingly it “may not, and frequently does not, carry political overtones” (p. 182). They assert that you do not have to be a Scottish nationalist to be a cultural nationalist although they accept that “it has become increasingly more difficult to separate the cultural and political realms in modern Scotland” (p. 182). How difficult is it to be a Scottish sporting nationalist without being a ‘Scottish nationalist’? Do McCrone et al.’s heritage findings carry over into Scottish sport? Is it becoming increasingly difficult to be a Scottish sporting nationalist without being a political nationalist? Moreover, in Scotland, whether or not one is defined as a cultural (sporting) or political nationalist only becomes significant once we identify which nation is being celebrated. In other words, it may not simply be the cultural
Generating data on Scottish sport, particularly on the fans of Scottish sport, will hopefully provide qualitative insights into the relationship between sport and national identity in Scotland, allowing sociologically grounded claims to be made. In his study of media texts and sporting identities Whannel (1998) stresses the need to move beyond mediated accounts and to examine audience consumption and reception. The importance of audience / fan consumption to identity analyses is highlighted further by Bairner (2001) who claims “it is undeniable that it is usually in the behaviour and attitudes of fans rather than those of participants that the relationship between sport and identity becomes apparent” (p. 165). Finn and Giulianotti (1998) concur claiming that Scottish sport, particularly football, is the most common representation of Scottish national identity. Bairner (2001) notes that in Scotland “a degree of unity in both political culture and sporting nationalism has been secured by way of anti-Englishness” (p. 172). He claims that this has been stronger in sport than in politics and adds:

Whether or not this remains the case will be crucial as far as further moves toward Scottish independence are concerned. Conversely, it is at least possible that, with the arrival of a separate assembly and some degree of self-government, the Scots will have far less need of sporting nationalism than in the past (p. 172).

Is the Scottish national identity exhibited by the national sports teams' fans still immersed in anti-Englishness and, whether it is or not, can we simply dismiss it as lacking in political will, or even as debilitating? In addition, are there differences or distinctions within the cleavages of Scottish rugby union and football fandom in relation to Scottish national identity?

The early 1990s witnessed the beginnings of a national shift in Scotland that seemed to construct rugby union, rather than football as capturing the desires and feelings of the Scottish people (Jarvie, 1993). The 1990 Grand Slam win over England at Murrayfield, the Scottish Rugby Union (SRU) stadium, in a winner-take-all" encounter witnessed the official adoption by the SRU of Flower of Scotland. Jarvie cites the events leading up to the 1991 Scotland v England Rugby World Cup clash
at Murrayfield, as especially significant. If these events witnessed the beginnings of a national shift, then on March 26th, 2003 this national shift had firmly become established when Scotland’s two male national teams were playing competitive international fixtures at their respective homes on the same day, with Murrayfield housing 45,739 fans in Edinburgh, and Hampden, the national football stadium housing 37,938 fans. These two Scotland international fixtures, the rugby union one contesting the Six Nations and the football tie contesting Euro 2004, signify the apparent shift in fan popularity with almost eight thousand more fans going to see Scotland’s rugby union team.

Within national identity studies, rugby union has become a potentially central analytical feature, in part due to its increasing profile in conjunction with the professionalisation and globalization of the sport. Additionally, there remains a lack of existing research into rugby union and Scottish national identity. Tuck (2003) provides further rationale explaining that previous research into sport and English identity has overlooked rugby union. This paucity of research exists despite acknowledgement that rugby union within the British Isles represents a unique arena for studying the production and construction of national identities (Tuck and Maguire, 1999; Tuck, 2003). Maguire and Tuck (1998) predict that rugby union will become a central feature in sport and national identity discourse within the British Isles. Dunning and Sheard (2005) admit that if they were to write Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players today, “nationalism is a subject to which we would have paid more attention” (p. 250). This perhaps illustrates the growing awareness of the relationship between national identity and rugby union in the United Kingdom. By conducting club based analyses of selected rugby union fans within Scotland alongside their football counterparts, and relating these findings to existing football-centred research, this thesis provides an original contribution which, it is hoped, provides a better understanding of rugby union and football fandom in relation to Scottish national identity.

This thesis presents a sociologically driven examination of the relationship between sporting fandom and Scottish national identity. The nature of contemporary supporter self-identifications within Scottish rugby union and football and their relevance to wider social and political developments are discussed and analysed.
The thesis examines the linkages between supporting Scottish rugby union and football clubs and notions of wider Scottish identity, incorporating national, regional, local and class based identity factors. It maps the relationship between rugby union and football fandom, situating this in post-devolution Scotland.

Specifically, the thesis examines the extent to which popular representations of Scottish national identity are exhibited or eschewed by fans of Scottish rugby union and football, and it questions whether or not there are a variety of Scottish sporting identities existing within and across clubs. Is there a diverse or unified sociocultural representation between the fans of the respective clubs and sports? Are there meaningful patterns in relation to class, ethnicity, and religious factors? Do the fans of the respective clubs support Scotland's national teams? Are there differences between the sports in terms of being perceived by the fans to represent a popular form of Scottishness and to what extent do these forms of Scottishness constitute a national identity, a nationalist identity or a patriotic identity?

As revealed in the thesis, class factors remain significant in the construction of Scottish national identities. However, in terms of national identity studies in Scotland at least, it appears that other classificatory concepts such as religion and ethnicity have succeeded in pushing class to the margins of analysis. This may be partially related to class within sociology becoming problematic, partly as a result of its increasingly difficult conceptual nature in post-industrial Britain. As Ray Williams (2005) asserts in discussing post-industrial society, “the relation between ‘class’ and ‘nation’ (‘people’) proved to be exceptionally complex, and indeed is still complex” (p. 240). Class, however, refuses to disappear from the sociological radar and continues to increase or negate power, albeit in more subtle ways, for particular sections of modern society. As Bourdieu (1984) shows:

The fundamental proposition that the habitus is a virtue made of necessity is never more clearly illustrated than in the case of the working classes, since necessity includes for them all that is usually meant by the word, that is, an inescapable deprivation of necessary goods. Necessity imposes a taste for necessity which implies a form of adaptation to and consequently acceptance of the necessary, a resignation to the inevitable... Social class is not defined solely by a position in the relation of production, but by the class habitus which is ‘normally’ (i.e., with a high statistical probability) associated with that position (p. 372).
Following on from Bourdieu's useful definition, Stephanie Lawler, the joint editor of Sociology (2005) introduces a special issue devoted to class by explaining:

The articles here argue for the continuing significance of class as a means of analysing forms of inequality ... They consider class inequality not simply as a matter of economic inequality but also as circulating through symbolic and cultural forms- through, for example, the means by which people become judged as morally worthwhile, or as having the right kind of knowledge or 'taste' ... Class is understood, not as a set of 'empty' signifiers (employment, housing, etc.) ... but as also something we are (p. 797, original emphasis).

Therefore, the thesis relies on this more advanced definition of class to inform aspects of the study, and in doing so, utilises an eclectic theoretical approach.

The thesis can be divided into five main sections. First, a systematic overview of literature focusing on nationalism, Scottish identity politics, and sport is provided. This contextualises the whole study, highlighting current theories and contemporary understandings of the sport and national identity relationship with particular emphasis on Scotland. Second, a comprehensive overview of theoretical approaches to the study of sport is provided, charting the major theoretical developments in relation to the sociological study of sport. Emphasis is placed on the cultural representation of sport with particular attention paid to the work of Pierre Bourdieu, Erving Goffman and Norbert Elias, as their theoretical influences inform the present study. Third, the methodological section outlines the ontological and epistemological framework adopted in the thesis. Data collection occurred through semi-structured interviews, carefully seeking to explicate fans' relationships with, and attitudes to, aspects of Scottish national identity and sport. This section then provides an in-depth discussion of interviewing as an ethnographic tool, focusing on the philosophical considerations of the method, the possible typologies of interviews and questions, and the analysis and interpretation of interviews. The section concludes by outlining the procedures informing the selection of interviewees, demonstrating the complexities and challenges the ethnographer faced whilst engaged in the planning, gatekeeper managing, and interviewing stages of the research. Fourth, a biographical account of the six sport clubs used is presented in order to contextualise each selected club within the overall research project. The sociological significance of individual clubs is outlined. Fifth, the empirical data is presented on a club by club basis before the final chapter further analyses the data in
order to theorise, discuss and summarise the findings. These final two chapters draw together the most significant findings from the data, providing sociologically informed explanations. The thesis concludes by acknowledging limitations before summarising the major findings and providing recommendations for future research.
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Nationalism: Theories and Applications

1. Introduction

The following chapter will attempt to set out the main paradigms in the study of nationalism, paying particular attention to selected theorists within each paradigm. The central features of each theory of nationalism will be discussed and the chapter will conclude with a brief discussion on the future of nationalism.

The study of nationalism is problematised by the use of various terms by different writers to describe similar or identical concepts. For example, Kellas (1998) divides the study of nationalism into two main paradigms which he describes as 'instinctive' and 'contextual', the former relating to human nature and the latter to specific cultural, historical and economic factors. Meanwhile Smith (2001) breaks the paradigms into perennialism, primordialism, ethno-symbolism and modernism. Cronin (1999) categorises them in relation to primordialists, statists, political mythologists and modernists. Each of these paradigms can be broadly categorised as either 'ethnic' or 'modernist'. The ethnic and modernist views of nationalism differ mainly as to "the date of commencement" with ethnic nationalists believing nations to have been present since before the late eighteenth century and modernists seeing nationalism as having commenced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Hastings, 1997).

Writers from the competing paradigmatic fields of nationalism provide their own theory-specific accounts of the development and definition of the concept and its associated terms. Kellas (1998) provides a reminder of the multi-faceted nature of nationalism:

Nationalism can take psychological, cultural or political forms: usually all three. Nationalist ideology can be left-wing, right-wing, constructive of new states or destructive of existing states. It can destroy freedom, establish peace or lead to war. It is little wonder that it is difficult to tie down as a general phenomenon, and it is partly different in different periods of history (p. 41).
Hugh Seton-Watson, (1977) who greatly influenced Benedict Anderson’s (1983, 1991) *Imagined Communities* and has been described by Anderson as providing “the most comprehensive English language text on nationalism” (p. 3), concludes that “no ‘scientific definition’ of the nation can be devised; yet the phenomenon has existed and exists” (p. 5). Cronin and Mayall (1998) suggest that “the starting point for anyone interested in issues associated with nationalism and national identity must be with the now standard and seminal texts by Eric Hobsbawm, John Breuilly, Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson” (p. 2). In discussing these four contributors, the perennialist theorist Adrian Hastings writes “I have found it sensible to link the four, while recognising their differences where necessary. Together they represent what has come to be known as the ‘modernist’ view” (p. 2). The present study will look at the modernists Hobsbawm, Gellner and Anderson, and will also include the ethnic nationalists Hastings, a perennialist, and Anthony Smith an ethno-symbolist. The major aspects of each type of nationalism will be discussed.

2. Competing Paradigms of Nationalism

2.1 Ethnic nationalism

The ethnic paradigm can be divided between ‘perennialism’ and ‘primordialism’, two closely related theoretical positions within nationalism. Primordialists emphasise the historical blood lineage in nations. Geertz (1973) highlights six major foci around which primordial ties exist, blood, race, language, religion, region and custom. The organic and essentialist nature of nationalism is claimed by primordialists and the primacy and ease with which it is often accepted is highlighted by Geertz (1973) who notes “these congruities of blood, speech, custom and so on, are seen to have an ineffable, and at times, overpowering coerciveness in and of themselves” (pp 259-60). The naturalness and spirituality associated with the nation for primordialists is emphasised by Smith (2001) who adds:

> What is so important about the primordialist contribution, is that we, as individuals and members of collectivities, feel and believe in the primordiality of our ethnies and nations – their naturalness, longevity and power – and that if we ignore these beliefs and feelings, we evade one of the central problems of explanation in the field of ethnicity and nationalism (p. 54).
It would seem from this statement that for primordialists, the naturalness and longevity of the nation requires a certain degree of belief and imagining to occur.

The other primary ethnic form of nationalism is perennialism. Perennialists, according to Anthony Smith (2001), claim that “nations had always existed from time immemorial” (p. 49). Within the perennial paradigm exist two sub-categories, ‘continuous’ and ‘recurrent’ nationalism (Smith, 2001). Continuous perennialism asserts that nations can trace their history back to the Middle Ages and sometimes further while recurrent perennialism advocates that “though particular nations may come and go, the idea of nationhood itself is a universal, disembedded phenomenon, and as such could apply to many cultural or political communities in every age and clime” (Smith, 2001: 51). Whilst demonstrating the similarities between primordialism and perennialism, Smith warns that there are important distinctions between them:

Perennialism should not be confused with a naturalist conception of the nation, which is the basis of latterday ‘primordialism’. Perennialists may subscribe to a ‘primordial’ conception of the nation, but equally they may not. All that is necessary for perennialism is a belief, founded on some empirical observation, that nations – or at least some nations – have existed for a long period of time, for whatever reason. (p. 50).

Hastings (1997) writes from a perennialist position. As Cronin and Mayall (1998) note, Hastings suggests that “the origins of nationalism should be located in the fourteenth century and not seen as products of the period of modern history which began with the French Revolution” (p. 2). Hastings, however, recognises the importance of the French Revolution in studying nationalism, stressing that “nationhood was not created by the Revolution but existed prior to 1789, even if it needed the Revolution to fully actualise itself” (p. 27). Hastings sees no necessary connection between nationalism and the nation-state, claiming that nationalism derives “from the belief that one’s own ethnic or national tradition is especially valuable and needs to be defended at almost any cost” (p. 4). With regard to the nation-state, he adds:

A nation-state is a state which identifies itself in terms of one specific nation whose people are not seen simply as ‘subjects’ of the sovereign but as a horizontally bonded society to whom the state in a sense belongs... In most cases this is a dream as much as a reality. Most nation-states in fact include groups of people who do not belong to its core culture or feel themselves to be part of a nation so defined (p. 3).
There can, therefore, be more than one nation or nationalism within a nation-state. Hastings recognises that nationalism became a central feature in western political thinking in the nineteenth century, linked to the formation of modern nation-states but adds "it (nationalism) existed as a powerful reality in some places long before that" (p. 4). Hastings claims that England provided the major prototype for nationalism and the nation, reinforcing Greenfield's (1992) claim that "the birth of the English nation was not the birth of a nation, it was the birth of the nations, the birth of nationalism" (p. 23). Hastings claims that much of what we understand today as nationalism existed in England by the end of the tenth century but that its major impact – in England and elsewhere – occurred in and after the sixteenth century. He stresses the frequency and consistency of the use of the word 'nation' in England from the early fourteenth century.

Central to Hastings' perennial account of nationalism is the place of Christianity, specifically linked to the production of the Bible in vernacular language.

The Bible provided, for the Christian world at least, the original model of the nation. Without it and its Christian interpretation and implementation, it is arguable that nations and nationalism, as we know them, could never have existed...Religion... provided a crucial ingredient for the particular history of both nations and nationalism (p. 4).

Hastings argues that the point at which specific vernaculars move from oral to written usage in the production of literature marks the point when ethnicities turn into nations. He suggests that this is particularly true of the production of the Bible. Claiming that the Bible has ensured a standard use of the word 'nation' from the fourteenth century onwards, Hastings demonstrates the intersection of religion and vernacular literature:

It is indicative of the central way in which the clergy simply by doing their job enhanced national consciousness through the widespread diffusion of vernacular literature. It was, I believe, this process going on all across Europe, which, far more than anything specifically political, stabilised the main national identities, as societies separated by their literatures (p. 193).

Perennialists attach great importance to the relationship between nation, ethnicity, nationalism and religion, and for Hastings, these are so intimately linked "that it is impossible... to write the history of any of them at all adequately without at least a fair amount of discussion of the other three" (p. 1).
Although perennialism and primordialism are often considered the major ethnic paradigms, ethno-symbolism, associated with John Hutchinson, John Armstrong and Anthony Smith, has also been described as an ethnic approach (Kellas, 1998). The following ethno-symbolist account is based on the work of Smith. Ethno-symbolists place great emphasis on subjective elements of memory, value, myth, symbol and sentiment (Smith, 2001). Smith stresses that “what matters for an explanation of the power and durability of nations and nationalism is that the narratives and images of the nation strike a chord with the people to whom they are designed to appeal” (p. 82). The proponents of the ethno-symbolist approach attempt to avoid exclusively elite-oriented analyses characteristic of much of the modernist approaches, preferring instead to present nationalism as a two-way relationship between elites and non-elites involving the mobilisation of cultural traditions (Smith, 2001). Ethno-symbolists stress the importance of history to the development of nations and nationalism and are concerned with analysis over “la longue duree” (Smith, 2001: 58). This is evident in Smith’s concern for ‘ethnies’ to be included within national analyses frameworks. “Nationalism and nations... far from being tied exclusively to modernity, are part of a wider ethno-cultural ‘family’ of collective identities and aspirations” (Smith, 2001: 58).

For Smith, ethnies represent these ‘wider’ collective identities. Ethno-symbolists regard the attachment and collective passion for nations as a “key problem for understanding ethnicity and nationalism” (Smith, 2001: 58). Smith adds:

By relating national identities to prior ethnic ties, and showing the influence of subjective dimensions of shared symbols, myths and memories, ethno-symbolism throws light on the continuing hold exercised by modern nations over so many people today (p. 59).

Stressing that ethno-symbolists have evolved no theory, Smith notes that his approach has “focused on the way that prior, and often pre-modern, ethnic ties and ethnies have influenced, and in some cases formed the basis for, subsequent nations and nationalisms” (Smith, 2001: 60 original emphasis). The ethno-symbolist approach to nationalism aims to illuminate the ways in which ethno-symbolic representations of the nation – myths, memories, destiny, territory, golden ages –
are presented and revered by large sections of nations, whilst understanding and charting their historical development.

2.2 Modernist nationalism

The advocates of a modernist interpretation of nationalism link the nation to the consequences of modernity, especially the emergence of modern capitalism and the destruction of the feudal age. The technological advances and development of more sophisticated infrastructures broke down the traditional power of religion, with nationalism providing a basis around which social unity can be built (Kellas, 1998; Cronin, 1999). The three modernist contributors to the field being considered here are Ernest Gellner (1983) and Eric Hobsbawm (1990, 1992) who both argue that nationalism was an inevitable consequence of capitalism and industrialisation, and Benedict Anderson (1983, 1991) who explains the rise of nationalism as a consequence of the growth of print capitalism — “a new way of linking fraternity, power and time” (p. 36) together at a time of the declining power of the existing religious and administrative vernaculars - and the decline of religion in Europe from the late eighteenth century onwards.

Gellner’s central claims include viewing nationalism as a special kind of patriotism that became dominant under certain social conditions prevailing in the modern world and nowhere else. These conditions, primarily related to the Industrial Revolution, involve the creation of a homogeneous, literate and sustainable mass culture able to allow individuals to be produced from the emergent mass educational system for economic purposes.

Its economy depends on mobility and communication between individuals, at a level which can only be achieved if those individuals have been socialised into a high culture, and indeed into the same high culture, at a standard which cannot be ensured by the old ways of turning out human beings, as it were on the job, as part of the ordinary business of living, by the local sub-communities. It can only be achieved by a fairly monolithic educational system (Gellner, 1983: 140).

Gellner provides the following description of the development of nationalism:
Nationalism is, essentially, the general imposition of a high culture on society, where previously low cultures had taken up the lives of the majority, and in some cases of the totality, of the population ... codified for the requirements of reasonably precise bureaucratic and technological communications. It is the establishment of an anonymous, impersonal society, with mutually substitutable atomised individuals, held together above all by a shared culture of this kind, in place of a previous complex structure of local groups, sustained by folk cultures reproduced locally (p. 57).

Gellner describes nationalism as a form of ‘self-deception’, appearing as a manifest and self-evident principle based on Volk traditions, when the opposite is often the case.

Nationalism usually conquers in the name of a putative folk culture... It revives, or invents, a local high (literate, specialist-transmitted) culture of its own, though admittedly one which will have some links with the earlier local folk styles and dialects (p. 57).

For Gellner, nationalism’s myths invert reality, actually replacing existing folk cultures, rather than protecting them – with the exception of “token and cellophane-packaged” folk forms – creating an anonymous mass high culture.

It is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way round. Admittedly, nationalism uses the pre-existing, historically inherited proliferation of cultures or cultural wealth, though it uses them very selectively, and it most often transforms them radically ... The cultural shreds and patches used by nationalism are often arbitrary historical inventions ... But in no way does it follow that the principle of nationalism itself, as opposed to the avatars it happens to pick up for its incarnations, is itself in the least contingent and accidental ... Nationalism is, essentially, the general imposition of a high culture on society, where previously low cultures had taken up the lives of the majority ... It is the establishment of an anonymous, impersonal society, with mutually substitutable atomized individuals, held together above all by a shared culture of this kind, in place of a previous complex structure of local groups, sustained by folk cultures reproduced locally and idiosyncratically by the micro-groups themselves. That is what really happens. But this is the very opposite of what nationalism affirms and what nationalists fervently believe. Nationalism usually conquers in the name of a putative folk culture (pp. 54-57, original emphasis).

The modernist approach advocated by Gellner stresses the primacy of material conditions and resembles a Marxist analysis of nationalism. Its critics include Kellas (1998) who highlights Gellner’s lack of explanation of the development of nationalism in areas which were not industrialising societies. Kellas cites Scotland in the Middle Ages and England in Elizabethan times as examples. Kellas claims that many nationalist movements in Europe have been inspired by nationalism irrespective of the condition of the economy. “The appeal of nationalist ideology
was intellectual and emotional as well as functional in an economic sense" (Kellas, 1998: 40). Kellas also claims that contemporary nationalism is unexplained in Gellner's theory. Citing the lack of recognition of primordial roots, and the emotional appeal of nationalism, Kellas asks "why would people be prepared to die for what is in this analysis an imperative of a rational economic and social system of industrialisation" (p. 53)?

Another modernist writer is Eric Hobsbawm, (1983; 1990; 1992), whom Cronin (1999) describes as a 'statist'. Hobsbawm provides a classic Marxist analysis of nations and nationalism as bourgeois constructions in social engineering and invention for the purposes of social control. His central concept is 'the invention of traditions', of which there are three main types in modern nation-states. These are 'group membership', 'legitimising institutions' and 'inculcating beliefs and value systems' (Hobsbawm, 1983). Three major innovations are particularly relevant to the development and sustaining of invented traditions and these are represented by the development of a secular equivalent to the Church, the invention of public ceremonies (derived from Bastille Day 1880), and the mass production of public monuments (Hobsbawm, 1983).

Hobsbawm (1990, 1992) argues that there is class and regional disparity in how national identity develops and he claims to differ from Gellner by seeking to understand nationalism from 'below', from bottom-up as opposed to top-down. His central claims are that official accounts of nationalist ideology do not necessarily correspond to public opinion reality, that even if national identity is felt to be important to people, it may not be the most important identity marker, and finally that national identity changes quickly over time (Hobsbawm, 1990, 1992). He believes nationalism in the late twentieth and early twenty first century will be 'subordinate' and 'rather minor' in their roles in the making of history (Hobsbawm, 1992: 191).

It is not impossible that nationalism will decline with the decline of the nation-state, without which being English or Irish or Jewish, or a combination of all these, is only one way in which people describe their identity among the many others which they use for this purpose, as occasion demands... The owl of Minerva which brings wisdom, said Hegel, flies out at dusk. It is a good sign that it is now circling round nations and nationalism (Hobsbawm, 1992: 192).
Although predicting the demise of nationalism and the nation, Hobsbawm does concede that “it would be absurd to claim that this day is already near” (p. 192).

Hobsbawm criticises his fellow modernist theorists Gellner and Anderson for assuming the success of nationalism means that it is rooted in people’s thoughts and behaviours (Hobsbawm, 1992). Hobsbawm attracts criticism from Hastings (1997) for being unable to explain adequately the impact of nationalism in central and eastern Europe which, at the time, lacked the levels of industrialisation associated with modernist accounts of nationalism. He has also been criticised for his apparent ‘dupe thesis’ account with Smith (2001) arguing:

> Some nationalist intellectuals no doubt deluded themselves, or even manipulated mass sentiments … but their [nationalisms] frequent success suggests a different interpretation, one that emphasises the need for popular ‘resonance’ and ‘appeal’. Since, on the whole, large numbers of people will not respond over the long term to pure invention (pp. 118 - 119).

The competing accounts of Smith and Hobsbawm share important similarities, however. Hobsbawm agrees with Smith’s assertion that the masses are not simply duped, that they cannot be forced against their collective will. This is emphasised by Hobsbawm’s third category of invented tradition, ‘inculcating beliefs and value systems’. This category helps the ‘idea of the nation’ to resonate with, and appeal to, the masses, thus reducing the need for any force to be applied against a ‘collective will’. Meanwhile, Hobsbawm’s primary claim about the ‘invention of tradition’ is echoed to a degree by Smith (2001) who argues that not only do some forms of invention occur, but in constructing the nation-state, they are necessary:

> Political solidarity requires that some myths of origin, historical memories and collective symbols be cultivated. Such myths, symbols and memories need to resonate among large sections of the population included in the designated nation or national state if people are to feel a sense of collective belonging and engage in common action (pp. 128 - 129).

It would appear that the major disagreement between Smith and Hobsbawm is one of degree centred on which collective symbols, memories and myths can be ‘cultivated’ or ‘imagined’.

The final modernist theorist of nationalism being considered here is Benedict Anderson (1983, 1991) the widely cited author of *Imagined Communities*. Anderson
shares the modernist conception of the development of nations – that nations are a product of industrialisation and modernisation emerging in Europe during the late eighteenth century – but he places greater emphasis on exploring the psychological and emotional appeal of nationalism. As Kellas (1998) observes, “Anderson stresses the character of nationalism, not as a political ideology self-consciously followed, but as a cultural system with religious characteristics” (p. 57). Anderson points to the Enlightenment weakening the historic linkages of power, fraternity and time, and argues that with the dawn of European nationalism came the dusk of religious modes of thought, so that European nationalism, to a large extent, replaced religion as a major cultural unifier (Anderson, 1983, 1991). He highlights the power of national monuments, and drawing upon his religion-influenced explanation of nationalism, suggests that nations do not have the tomb of the unknown Marxist, because unlike nationality, Marxism (or other ideological conceptions) is not concerned with immortality and death.

Anderson’s ‘imagined communities’ are culturally and emotionally attached primarily as a result of what he terms ‘print capitalism’. He emphasises the importance of language to nations and how commercial printing spread the ideology of nationalism and the idea of the nation throughout the world. Vernacular languages are strengthened by the publishing of literature and the widespread, often simultaneous, reading of it. Commenting on the production and consumption of daily newspapers, Anderson stresses “each communicant is well aware that the ceremony he performs is being replicated simultaneously by thousands (or millions) of others of whose existence he is confident, yet of whose identity he has not the slightest notion” (p. 35). Anderson (1991) proposes the following definition of the nation:

It is an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion (p. 6).

Anderson draws a distinction between himself and Gellner who, he believes, is so anxious to show that nationalism masquerades under false pretences that he assimilates ‘invention’ to ‘fabrication’ and ‘falsity’, rather than to ‘imagining’ and ‘creation’ (p. 6). For Anderson, ‘communities are to be distinguished, not by their
falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined” (p. 6). It is the style in which nations are imagined communities that allows Anderson (1991) to answer the often cited question of why are people prepared to die and to kill for their nation?

The nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings (p. 7).

Smith (2001) criticises Anderson’s description of limited imaginings by asserting that:

It is because our identities and interests, our very survival, are felt to be bound up with, and dependent upon, those of ‘our’ family and ‘our’ nation, that we feel such devotion to them and are ready to sacrifice so much for them. This makes nations as much communities of emotion and will, as of imagination and cognition (p. 80).

However, these two positions appear closer than Smith acknowledges. Smith’s notion of ‘our nations’, for which people are ready to sacrifice, is not so dissimilar to ‘horizontal comradeship’, which Anderson stresses, people kill and die for. The main problem for Smith appears to be Anderson’s description of this horizontal comradeship being based on ‘limited imaginings’. It remains unclear, however, why the emotions and will or horizontal comradeship cannot, as Anderson suggests, be based on ‘limited imaginings’. Smith does not justify why having emotional attachments based on limited imaginings is necessarily a contradictory concept.

Anderson has also been criticised by Kellas (1998) and Hastings (1997). Kellas believes that Anderson’s definition of a nation and his account of the emergence of nationalism is ambiguous and he adds “nations are no more ‘imagined’ than other social categories and identities, such as class” (p. 59). The perennialist, Hastings accuses Anderson of claiming that the English nation only emerged in the late nineteenth century, and describes this as “totally implausible” (p. 6).

3. The Future of Nationalism

The future of nationalism has been subject to discussion with some predicting its demise (Fukuyama, 1992), others predicting its continued and future success (Billig,
and some suggesting that it will continue in a less virulent or
dominant fashion than before (Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm, 1991). Central to much of
the discussion are two primary aspects of the modern supranational world –
increased globalisation or global tendencies and the superseding of localised
patriotic military defence by the overriding ‘non-national, global’ ‘war on terror’. On
the one hand, increased interdependencies in a globalised world together with
‘non-national’ military action (or threats of action) are seen to reduce the primacy of
the nation-state. Meanwhile on the other hand, the increased global organisation of
nation-states, described by Smith (2001) as “the internationalisation of nationalism”
(p. 138), contributes to the ‘normalisation of nations’ and “far from diminishing the
influence of nationalism or dissolving the fabric of nations ... actually disseminate
that influence and encourage nations to become more participant and distinctive”
(Smith, 2001: 139).

A recurring problem exists in the theorising of the future of nations and nationalism.
This relates to the problem of collective attachment and passion to the extent of
killing or dying for a country. At the present time, one does not have far to look in
order to witness the killing and sacrifices made by ‘soldiers’, ‘terrorists’ and
‘innocent civilians’ in various conflicts around the globe. Billig (1995) states that
"all societies that maintain armies maintain the belief that some things are more
valuable than life itself" (p. 1). Smith (2001) discusses this type of collective
attachment and sums up the various schools of nationalist thought:

Where modernists usually fail to address this problem, or only touch on it in
general terms, and where perennialists simply fail to treat it as a problem, because
they assume the continuity or recurrence of nations everywhere, ethno-symbolists
regard it as a key problem for understanding ethnicity and nationalism. Unlike the
primordialists who had at most a metaphysical answer, ethno-symbolists propose
historical and/or sociological explanations which address the reasons for the
continuing emotional attachments of so many people to their ethnic communities
and nations, and for their capacity for fanatical terrorism and self-sacrifice on
their behalf (pp. 58 - 59).

Billig (1995), while recognising the construction of a global order that claims to
“talk for the whole world” and “appear as the interests of universal reason” (p. 88),
reminds us that “right from its earliest times, nationalism used a ‘syntax of
hegemony’ by which the part claimed to represent the whole” (p. 88).

A nation that seeks international hegemony must deny that it is nationalist. It must
claim to speak with the voice of universality, whilst protecting its own particular
interests. Thus, the familiar syntax of hegemony slides together ‘our’ different identities (p. 92).

Using the central concept of ‘Banal Nationalism’, Billig argues that in established, mainly Western nations, there is a continual reproduction and ideological numbing of nationalist sentiment. He adds “nationalism, far from being an intermittent mood in established nations, is the endemic condition” (p. 6). He claims that the Western nations’ leaders are not typically labelled as ‘nationalists’, ascribing this title to ‘others’. Billig stresses that banal nationalism is so familiar and continual that it has ceased to be seen as nationalism at all. “The metonymic image of banal nationalism is not a flag which is being consciously waved with fervent passion; it is the flag hanging unnoticed on the public building” (p. 8).

For Billig, the banality of nationalism, which he reminds us is far from ‘benign’, helps provide the answer to why so many are prepared to kill and be killed for ‘their nation’. “Nationalism is the ideology by which the world of nations has come to seem the natural world – as if there could not possibly be a world without nations” (Billig, 1995: 37). At the same time, a sociological amnesia occurs in the West with established nations forgetting their nationalism and only being sensitive to the nationalism of the ‘fanatic’, ‘extremist’ or ‘terrorist’ other. As Billig reiterates:

This rhetoric suggests that those nations that oppose ‘us’ are more than parochial competitors: they can be transformed into enemies of international morality. Thus, Libya and Iraq, in US rhetoric, are not merely rivals or strange foreigners with different folkways. Like the Soviets before them, they are demonised as threats to the moral order of the world itself (p. 92).

Billig’s account suggests that banal nationalism not only reinforces a twenty-first century national patriotism, but further, that it reinforces and perpetuates a global nationalist ideology based on the rights of nations, grounded in the belief and advancement of the naturalness and inevitability of nations in the global world. Billig suggests that the advocates of Fukuyama who predict the end of nationalism only address the “hot” varieties, the nationalism of ‘extremists’ and ‘terrorists’, while overlooking the banal varieties. The extent to which nationalism is in demise or, indeed, so entrenched in the global order, appearing as natural, inevitable or invisible, is a question of our time and is likely to provoke future debate.
This section has attempted to provide an explanation and understanding of the two major paradigms within nationalism theory, those of ethnic and modernist nationalism. Each paradigm has been discussed drawing upon some work of some of the major contributors in the field in order to situate subsequent discussion within the context of theories of nationalism. The central features relating to each paradigm and theoretical sub-division within them have been outlined, and some of the major points of departure between them have been discussed. The extent to which nations are so universally accepted by large masses of populations willing to kill and die in their name, and the material and historical developments relating to the emergence of nations and nationalism are two of the major points discussed.

Scottish Identity Politics

5. Introduction

Jim Sillars’s description of the Scots as ‘ninety minute patriots’ following his electoral defeat in Govan in 1992, illustrates, however contentiously, that sport and national identity in Scotland can intersect. Pittock (2001) demonstrates the supporters’ political awareness by observing that Scotland football fans sang “Gi’e us an Assembly, and we’ll gi’e ye back your Wembley” (p. 131) after invading the Wembley pitch in the aftermath of a 1977 match against England – significantly, a time in Scottish and UK identity politics when Scottish nationalism was at a heightened state (Brown et al, 1998; Harvie, 1998). The Sillars remark together with the Scotland supporters’ political chants were indicators of the use made of sport by politicians and supporters, as a symbol of Scottish political identity.

In attempting to map the relationship between sport and national identity, in addition to providing evidence of the efficacy of the cultural in the realm of the political, a closer analysis of the political identity of Scotland is provided.
Any discussion of Scottish sport ... must turn at some point to an examination of
the historically structured relations and conflict between Scottish society and the
British state, and in particular the ways in which a distinct civil society and distinct
cultural identity have developed alongside political control through Westminster
(Jarvie, 1992: 174).

It is important to examine these ‘historically structured relations’ and, in so doing,
illuminate the ‘gap’ between civil and state identity which Nairn (1977) identifies as
crucial, and which remains central to our understanding of contemporary Scottish
national identity. This may prove to be a timely addition to the literature if Paterson
et al (2001) are correct in their assertion that Scotland “is going through the closest
(thing) to a social revolution that can be found in a developed western democracy”
(p. 167). Understanding this (alleged) revolution requires analysis of the political
and cultural nexus because as McCrone et al. (1995) state, “the relationship between
culture and politics has always been a key one in Scotland” (p. 26) and ask “is
Scottish heritage deeply flawed and alienating, helping to keep Scots politically
within the British State?” (p. 26) It is essential, therefore, in answering questions on
Scottish national identity and its relationship to the cultural spheres of rugby union
and football, to reveal the extent to which Scottish heritage may be flawed or
alienating and / or reinforcing of the political constitution of the United Kingdom.

May Day 2007 marked the tercentenary of the Treaty of 1707, whilst the May local
elections witnessed the Scottish National Party becoming the largest party in the
Scottish Parliament. These provide a contextual background against which to
further analyse the issues in the thesis.

6. The Origins of Scottish National Identity

6.1 The seeds of Scottish national identity

Ferguson (1998) claims that it was “from early Gaelic tradition, that the first
glimmerings of a Scottish identity arose” (p.304) and Broun et al. (1998) argue that
“in many ways, the middle ages are the crucible in which Scottish identity was
forged” (p. 1). Ferguson (1998) notes that Scotland has never been exclusive in
ethnic terms and, in relation to medieval Scotland, states:
There can be little doubt as to who supplied the real unifying impulse ... it was the Scots of Dalriada, an Irish tribe who settled in Argyll in the sixth century AD and gradually extended their sway over most of Scotland north of the Forth, who gave their name to Bohemia and then vanished from history, the Scots of Dalriada contributed to and, to a large extent, shaped the subsequent kingdom of Scotland (p. 301).

Ferguson further notes the Irish origin of the word Scot as “originally a Latin term to signify what would now be called Irish; but in the strictest sense it really denoted a Gael” (p. 305). Broun (1998) terms the Irish tribe ‘Dal Riata’ and suggests that with the crowning of Cinaed mac (Kenneth) Alpin, King of Dal Riata, as king of the Picts, around 843 AD, the kingdom of Scotland was formed by the uniting of the Scots and the Picts. Broun states that although Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) in 1005-34 is sometimes referred to as the first Scottish king, Scottish kings are numbered from Kenneth I onwards. Broun states that the Picts subsequently vanished after being overwhelmed by the Scots (p.4). Ferguson demonstrates the historical assimilation of different ethnies by suggesting that the Picts had probably been Gaelicised long before the Scot and Pict union under Kenneth mac Alpin (p. 305).

The task of charting the historical development of a national identity is problematised by paying insufficient attention to contemporary definitions as Broun (1998) warns:

The use of ‘Scots’ by modern historians to refer both to the kingdom’s inhabitants in the time of Wallace as well as the people from Argyll who (we are told) overwhelmed the Picts, threatens to obscure how the meaning of Scoti changed fundamentally in this period, and actually meant ‘Irish/Gaels’ ... Indeed, ‘Scots’ as a general term for the kingdom’s inhabitants does not appear to have gained universal acceptance in written sources until the late thirteenth century (p. 5, original emphasis).

Broun (1998) adds “it was not until the thirteenth century that people saw themselves as ‘Scots’ in something closely resembling modern usage” (p. 9). Enunciating the periods of the ninth and the thirteenth century as critical periods of change in Scotland’s identity formation, Broun adds that “Scots’ before the thirteenth century, therefore, is as difficult a term to the modern mind as ‘Scotland’ in the same period. Moreover, it is surely rather misleading to talk in English of the ‘Scots’ before the tenth century” (p. 9). Accusing the majority of historians of failing to explicitly situate themselves within a clear theoretical framework,
therefore fundamentally ensuring that key concepts such as 'nation', 'nationalism' and 'national identity' remain unexamined, Davidson (2000) argues we should be reluctant to think of the Scots – as in a Scottish nation or Scottish nationhood – existing before 1707.

The historical events that are supposed to prove the existence of Scottish nationhood before 1707 were in fact presented in this way only after that date, when they were retrospectively assimilated into the national myth (Davidson, 2000: 4).

Nevertheless, Broun shows that around 900AD Gaelic had replaced Pictish with the Gaelic word for Scotland – Alba – appearing in official recorded history in 918. He adds that the Gaelic speakers at this time were the first people to think of themselves as Scottish in any ancestral sense to today. They also made clear distinctions between Gael (Irish) and Albaniag (Scot) representing early ethnic sensitivities (Broun, 1998). The replacement of Pictish by Gaelic and the subsequent national identity formation was to prove ironic in later centuries with the eventual superseding of Gaelic by the English language. This starting point for charting the development of Scottish identity provides historical antecedents for the duality of Scottish identity with Broun (1998) claiming “it is not, in fact, until the wars of independence that an account of Scottish origins can be found which makes Scotland, not Ireland, the Scottish homeland” (p. 10). Broun further demonstrates the reinforcing of older ethnic identities and how the national identity of Scotland has been inextricably linked to Ireland through the ages:

Not only did accounts of Scottish origins continue to repeat the umbilical link with Ireland, but there were two accounts – one certainly and the other probably written in the thirteenth century – which actively sought to make the Irish connection more emphatic (p. 10).

Broun argues, therefore, that a key point in charting Scottish identity is that:

Scotland and the Scots are, first-and-foremost, images which have been adapted and recreated according to the experience and aspirations of the society to which they relate. It would not be a surprise, moreover, if a more detailed examination of what Scotland signified in this period revealed that different aspects were emphasized by different groups (p. 11).
Devine (1999) devotes most of his study to the period between 1760 and 1914 arguing that "that was the era of massive transformation in society and economy which above all else forged the nation of Scotland as we know it in the twentieth century" (p. x). Finlay (1998) and Broun et al (1998) agree with Devine about the importance of the massive changes in society at this time with Finlay linking these to the existence of "a plethora of Scottish identities" (p. 144), and Broun et al highlighting the importance of the socio-economic forces sweeping Scotland at the time providing historians with the views and opinions of more than a small elite (p. 2). The Union of 1707, the subsequent development of a British (state) identity, commercial and urban development, and the emergence of democracy are major factors in the development of Scottish national identity for much of this period (Finlay, 1998).

In order to contextualize these developments and to analyse Scottish identity, one must examine the extent to which the Union of 1707 allowed much of Scotland to remain autonomous (Paterson, 1994; McCrone et al., 1995; Devine, 2006), maintaining and developing a distinctive national identity and contributing to the 'gap' between civil and state society that Nairn (1977) identified. Broun et al (1998) agree "the Union did not necessarily compromise Scottish national identity" (p. 3), while Devine (1999; 2006) reveals an insight into the strength of the various Scottish institutions and their importance to the existing ruling elites pre-Union by highlighting:

They (the English) were willing to concede ground ... In fact several of the clauses of the treaty (Union of 1707) were devoted to safeguarding the vested interests of those social groups who mattered in Scotland ... As well as the rights of the Kirk, the privileges of the royal burghs and their merchant elites were guaranteed (Devine, 1999: 12).

Devine (1999) adds that after the Union "Westminster was sovereign in theory, but in practice the real business of running Scotland was the responsibility of institutions inherited from the period before 1707" (p. 23). This circumvention of Anglicisation contributed to the development and maintenance of modern Scottish perceptions of identity and provides a reference point for contextualising Scotland's
dual identity as a nation within a state. As Devine (1999) notes, "Life in Scotland was still conditioned and fashioned by intrinsically Scottish institutions: the proudly independent Presbyterian church, civil law, the parish schools and the five (sic) universities" (pp. 29 - 30). Finlay (1998) demonstrates the autonomous nature of Scotland by stating:

The Union barely impinged on the ordinary Scot. Indeed, in the first half of the eighteenth century there were only three major pieces of legislation which had a major impact on Scottish society. The truth of the matter is that life went on much the same as it had always done. The people who governed Scotland were the same, the legal system was the same and the Church maintained its pervasive role in Scottish society (p. 145).

Nairn (2000) claims that the problem the Scots pose to Great Britain, even today, does not lie "in their status as a persecuted or unjustly assimilated national minority" (p. 11), but "is located in Scotland's status as an imperfectly absorbed state" (pp 11-12). The 1707 Treaty of Union "was a treaty between states, and not an act of conquest, subjugation, or colonisation" (p. 12).

The extent to which the Scottish institutions were autonomous is questioned, however, by Smout (1994) who also describes, as ambiguous, the Scottish identity(ies) being transmitted through the institutions of church, law and education in Scotland. He argues that the Presbyterians being protected by the Union settlement "threw the Kirk into the defensive arms of the Hanoverians" (p. 110). Smout claims that the Scottish law and education systems have remained Scottish, in part due to the Union of 1707, and partly due to accommodating British state demands. The jobs of Scottish advocates were secured by the Union, with the majority of lawyers being Hanoverian, pro-English supporters with Unionist sympathies. Meanwhile, in education, Smout adds that no one can:

doubt that educational establishments have remained distinct in Scotland partly by a process of continuous accommodation with the demands of the British state. For example, the Scottish universities since 1981 have avoided compromising on the principle of the four-year degree, but have yielded on everything else demanded of them by the UGC and its successors (p. 110).

MacInnes (1992) questions the extent to which these institutions affect the personal consciousness of Scotland's people (p. 172), while Morton (1998) believes that "chanting the mantra which is the 'holy trinity' of kirk, law and education is not
enough" (p. 161). Emphasising as the key, the 'gap' between state and civil society, which Nairn (1981) identified, Morton (1998) adds:

the British state was importantly distant from Scottish life. This 'gap' legitimated Scottish civil society and empowered it in a way many new nationalisms in the late twentieth century have literally died for. It created a dual identity of Scottishness and Britishness which sat astride notions of multiple identity (p. 160).

Noting that Scotland's civil society was not state-created, Morton adds:

It was a civil society whose strength lay in the 'gap' between it and its (shared) state. In this sense civil society really did manage its everyday affairs to a remarkable extent. This is one of the central conceptual reasons why no demand for a Scottish parliament was made (p. 167).

Smout (1994), though sceptical as to the actual autonomous nature of Scotland's institutions, does allow for the perception of autonomy to have contributed to a sense of Scottish identity:

Both mythic popular history, and the legacy of the distinctive Scottish institutions inherited from an independent past have operated in such a way as both to preserve a sense of Scottish identity and prevent it from coinciding with identification with the state (p. 111).

However, demonstrating a degree of scepticism as to the success and clarity of these identities, Smout (1994) adds "but in each case their message is as ambiguous as that of popular history" (p. 110). A central feature, therefore, in Scottish identity discourse is the relationship Scotland has with England, the powerful partner, and the United Kingdom as a whole, and the complexity and efficacy of competing or complementary identities within civil and political societies.

7. The Complex Construction of Scottish National Identity

7.1 Post-Union duality of Scottish national identity

Morton (1998) highlights in his analysis of nineteenth century Scotland that "the insidiousness of the language of imperialism can be found in all important events and ceremonies in Scotland's civic and cultural life" (p. 162). Speaking specifically about the second half of the eighteenth century moving into the first half of the nineteenth century, Morton (1998) notes:
[the] pervasive influence of notions of essentially English traditions but presented as British ones. From this argument could be sustained by contemporaries that a fresh start was being made and a fresh identity was being created. This was an important part of the explanation for why the doctrine of revolution was not embraced in Scotland at this time, but instead couched within a mixed duality and even multiplicity of identities (p. 164).

Demonstrating the importance of Empire building during this period, Morton suggests that many Scots had little choice in expressing forms of identity. “There was no alternative for Scots than to regale themselves in Britishness when focusing their identity through Empire ... In popular consciousness Scots made the Empire flourish” (Morton, 1998: 162). Devine (1999; 2006) also notes the central role that Empire played in shaping Scottish identity, and agrees that Scots did indeed help make the Empire flourish. Departing from Morton’s hegemonic account, Devine (1999) argues that the Scots were extremely successful in Empire building, and adds that this factor together with the resultant ‘Scottophobia’ (p. 27) within the English establishment contributed and led to the development of a dual identity for many Scots. Describing Scottophobia, Devine says:

It also made the Scots elite even more aware of their Scottishness. They were gradually developing a dual allegiance, a political loyalty to Britain which not even the most vitriolic abuse from the south could undermine, and at the same time they were maintaining a continuing sense of identity with their native land (p. 30).

Smout (1994) agrees with Devine and Morton as to the emergence of Scottish dual identity out of Empire building, though provides a differing rationale to Morton’s ‘little choice’ hypothesis and Devine’s ‘Scottophobia’ account. Smout argues:

A very good case can be made for arguing that the Scots invented Britain: and that they have always been keener on the notion than the English, who misconstrue it as a synonym for England (p. 112).

Smout claims that some Scottish institutions, and the processes associated with them, actually reinforce rather than challenge the Union. He adds:

In the nineteenth century, men like Rosebery found nothing incongruous in demanding a Scottish Secretary and pursuing their careers as Imperialist politicians ... In the later eighteenth century, virtually every Scot of note from Adam Smith to Robert Burns expressed at one point or another a sense of belonging both to Scotland and to Britain (p. 111).

It should be noted that Ferguson (1998) interprets Burns’s sympathies to be a little less pro-Union (p. 313) - perhaps this differing account can be partly explained by Smout’s lack of precision in elucidating exactly how to define and distinguish a
preferred identity from an expressed one. Finlay (1998) discusses Scottophobia too but stresses the impact of the Scottish Enlightenment in relying on the status quo for patronage and the maintenance of middle class livelihoods. Finlay claims that although the intelligentsia "fomented intellectual revolution, they did not promote political change ... The Enlightenment in Scotland rested on the most unenlightened foundation of a corrupt system of patronage which permeated the whole of society (pp. 146 - 147). Echoing Smout's claims, Finlay (1998) adds, "the construction of a new British identity was one that was pursued with vigour by Scottish intellectuals, more so than their English colleagues" (p. 146). Considering the levels of Scottophobia and the gains to be made for Scottish middle-classes within the Empire-building project, it seems unsurprising that Scottish identity, though somewhat insulated by Scotland's semi-autonomous institutions of church, law and education, witnessed major changes – particularly an increased duality in being Scottish and British - in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Devine (2006) reminds us that "the Empire came as a godsend for the genteel but often impoverished landed gentry of Scotland" (p. 7) and that "the material benefits of Union were paralleled by a developing consensus among the nation's intellectual leaders that progress and unionism were closely associated" (p. 8). Sections of the Scottish intelligentsia favoured 'North Britain' to Scotland in their quest for an identity that would be Scottish and British simultaneously (Finlay, 1998). McCreadie (1991) links these changes to a wider process of "English hegemony" (p. 39) which ignored or caricatured Scottish history in favour of an English-oriented 'British' history "which portrayed Scotland – if indeed it was portrayed at all – as a poor, underdeveloped country whose achievements since the Union of 1707 were in large measure due to English influences" (p. 40). McCreadie argues further that the Scottish middle classes began to increasingly frown upon the Scots language in the eighteenth century and states:

Given the importance of language in maintaining national identity, it is hardly surprising that when linguistic antipathy combined with historical neglect, it caused generations of Scottish people to believe that their culture was, and indeed always had been, a provincial and somewhat inferior version of English culture (p. 41).

Whether due to a genuine inferiority complex or class or financial aspirations, certain manifestations of Scottish identity were eschewed by many Scots during this
period, as McArthur (1994) demonstrates when highlighting how Caledonian ancestry could prove embarrassing to the politically ambitious.

7.2 The religion factor

The eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century was the period when for some (Colley, 1996; Devine, 1999) Britain as a nation with a national identity was forged. Religion played a major role in helping to shape and define Scottish national identity before and after the Reformation (Smout, 1994). McCreadie argues that the Church of Scotland had been the dominant influence in Scottish life between the Reformation and the Disruption of the Church in 1843 when the Church was split by internal feuding, ultimately leading to the forming of the Free Church. The contemporary legacy of the Church's close relationship to the identity of the Scottish nation was demonstrated in 1989 when the Scottish Convention's first inaugural meeting took place in the Church's Assembly Hall in Edinburgh. McCreadie states the venue was "deliberately chosen for its historic significance as the meeting-place of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland" (p. 51). The rights of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland were guaranteed by an Act of Security of the Church of Scotland in 1706 and was integral to the 1707 act of Union (Smout, 1994; Devine, 1999). Previously, the Kirk had been against the union but guaranteeing their rights "was a master stroke which severely weakened one of the key elements in the anti-union campaign" (Devine, 1999: 12). This master stroke ensured that the Church of Scotland became a focus for a Scottish national identity and a British protestant identity (Colley, 1996).

Devine (1999) reinforces the central role the Church of Scotland played in Scottish identity formation by referring to Scotland as a "stateless nation" which "derived its collective identity from Presbyterianism" (p. 488). Drawing church, nation and state together in such a way had repercussions for non-Presbyterian faiths, particularly the most common faith of the large Irish immigrant population, Catholicism. Devine (1999) and Smout (1994) highlight that sections of the Church of Scotland campaigned against the effects of Irish immigration up to the 1920s. Devine reports that:
Church and Nation Committee in 1923 approved the notorious report, *The Menace of the Irish Race to Our Scottish Nationality*, which accused the Irish Roman Catholic population of taking employment from native Scots, of being part of a papist conspiracy to subvert Presbyterian values, and the main source of intemperance, improvidence, criminality and much else besides (pp. 498 - 499).

Smout adds that “sections of the Presbyterian church ... made a determined effort to keep the label Irish on the Catholics, and to suggest their disloyalty to Scotland” (p. 106). Thus, the intersecting of religion, nationality, race and culture can be seen, and significantly, with the notion of the ‘outsider’ (the Irish race) posing a threat to the ‘established’ (the Scottish nation). Equally important to note is the willingness of the Church to treat Presbyterianism and Scottishness as being synonymous. The close links between the Church of Scotland and a dual Scottish and British identity helped cement the hegemony of an English speaking protestant Scottish identity (Colley, 1996).

### 7.3 Crisis of confidence

The Scots’ ‘crisis of confidence’, which has recently been investigated by Craig (2003), has it roots in the period between the eighteenth and nineteenth century. It has been associated with various terms throughout the years, from Jim Sillars’s (1992) ‘ninety minute patriots’ to McIlvanney’s (1988) ‘frightened lion’, each highlighting the division between the Scottish romantic heart and the realistic head, unrestrained fantasy and dour realism (Nairn, 1977: 150). Craig (2003) asserts that this division can be traced back to G. Gregory Smith’s concept of antiszyzygy, which claimed to demonstrate the ‘combination of opposites’ within Scottish literature. Smith called this ‘the Caledonian antiszyzygy’ (Craig, 2003). The Caledonian antiszyzygy influenced subsequent Scottish writers from Hugh MacDiarmid to Edwin Muir (Craig, 2003). Ferguson (1998) demonstrates the historical legacy of this viewpoint by observing that Shakespeare’s Macbeth has Ross replying to MacDuff “alas, poor country, - almost afraid to know itself” (p. 314). By analysing the development of Scotland’s identity in this period and its forming of a relationship with the rest of the United Kingdom – particularly England – Scotland’s ‘crisis of confidence’ can be historically contextualised.
McCrone et al (1995) state that Walter Scott is often held responsible by many for the deformation of Scottish culture. Phillipson (1969) highlights Scott's lambasting of the English during the Scottish bank note incident in 1826 (p. 186) but suggests Scott merely provided a passive ideology for focusing national attention on peripheral issues. Phillipson states that "by validating the making of a fuss about nothing, Scott gave to middle class Scotsmen and to Scottish nationalism an ideology – an ideology of noisy inaction" (p.186). Scott also contributed to what Nairn (1977) terms "cultural sub-nationalism" (p.173) by helping to lay the foundations of the cult of tartanry beginning with the stage management of George IV's visit to Edinburgh in 1822. Devine (1999), perhaps drawing from Hobsbawm and Ranger's (1983) "invented tradition", claims that "what ensued was a 'plaided panorama' based on fake Highland regalia and the mythical customs and traditions of the clans" (p. 235). Jarvie (1992) notes:

the royal visit was soon to be superseded by the Balmorality of Queen Victoria, which helped to maintain not only the mystique of royalty but also the hegemony of the Scottish ruling class in general and the Anglo-British establishment in particular (p. 171).

These events marked significant symbolic and ideological shifts in the relationship between Highland iconography and the ruling elites within the United Kingdom dynasty, shifts that had been gradually occurring from the time of the Jacobite defeat of 1746. Devine (1999) notes the contemporary songs and poetry of the time, adding:

This and other similar airs of the time expressed in popular form the transfer of loyalty from the Stuarts in the '45 to the Hanoverians in the later eighteenth century. In this way Jacobitism was redefined as an ideology committed to monarchy (p. 237).

Radical Jacobitism had finally disappeared (Calder, 1989). Devine (1999) notes the irony in the turnaround in ideological connotations attached to a form of dress which had been banned by the London government in the Disarming Act between 1746 and 1781:

This strange development was a part of a wider process, which was all but complete by the end of the Napoleonic Wars, through which (mostly) imagined and false Highland 'traditions' were absorbed freely by Lowland elites to form the symbolic basis of a new Scottish identity. This 'Highlandism' was quite literally the invention of a tradition. What made it deeply ironic was not simply the actual historic Lowland contempt for ancient Gaelic culture that existed well into the
eighteenth century but the fact that Highlandism took off precisely at the same time
that commercial landlordism, market pressures and clearances were destroying the
old social order in northern Scotland (p. 233).

The modern day legacy of these developments is identified by McCrone et al (1995)
who, while agreeing on the distorted history of tartanry, state:

Such is the power and influence of tartanry and Highlandism ... that it has to be
confronted and understood for the powerful discourse that it is. Scotland has been
the subject of an intense 'tourist gaze' at least for the last 150 years (p. 60).

Some reject these legacies as "retrospective invention" (Trevor-Roper, 1983)
whereas McCrone et al (1995) dismiss as unimportant, the status of authenticity,
arguing:

Being able to show that heritage is not 'authentic', that it is not 'real', however, is
not the point. If we take the Scottish example of tartanry, the interesting issue is not
why much of it is a 'forgery', but why it continues to have such cultural power.
That is the point which critics like Hugh Trevor-Roper (1984) miss" (p. 207).

Jarvie (1992) disputes the 'invented tradition' hypotheses, suggesting that:

Various social factions by virtue of their power selected, interpreted, and attributed
different meanings to various Highland traditions. The Balmorality of Queen
Victoria represented not so much a link with the traditions of the past but more a
process of cultural transformation whereby selected traditions from the past,
divorced from their original social context, were in fact attributed with different
meanings over a period of time (p. 170, original emphasis).

One does not have far to go to see the modern-day legacy of some of these
developments whether it is the Braemar Royal Highland Games, Scottish regiments
in the British army or members of the British royal family patronizing and
supporting Scottish sports teams. To what extent these legacies provide a "glamour
of backwardness" (Nairn, 1988: 214), concealing socio-political structures remains
to be seen, as does whether or not Craig (2003) is correct when she states "a culture
of conformity and mediocrity flourishes in Scottish life and there is a tyranny of
public opinion" (p. x). McCrone et al. (1995) suggest that heritage does not
necessarily carry a one-dimensional social message:

The appropriation of tartanry by the Victorian monarchy and its strong associations
with the landed elite in Scotland, does not prevent its having possibilities for a
radical interpretation of a more populist kind (p. 208).

In order to investigate these assertions, it is helpful to analyse the social and
political context from the 1960s onwards as this period marked the beginning of

7.4 *Frightened lion or lion rampant?*

Even although at various stages after the Act of Union, radicalism in Scotland contained a separatist dimension, notably in the early nineteenth century and the 1920s and 1930s, (Devine, 1999), there was little pressure on Westminster for a Scottish legislature until the 1960s. This was due to a number of factors ranging from a strengthening British identity after two world wars, economic prosperity and advancement within the Empire, and the UK wide dominance of the Labour Party which put class struggle ahead of national struggle (McCreadie, 1991; Devine, 1999). Low unemployment, a booming post-war industrial sector and high levels of foreign investment combined in effect to lead Harold Macmillan, the prime minister to comment in 1957 “let’s be frank about it, most of our people have never had it so good” (cited in Devine, 1999: 570). As Devine also notes, this was particularly relevant to Scotland which “had endured a good deal of pain for much of the inter-war years” (p. 507). Although accepting the importance of the economic argument in stifling political Scottish nationalism, Devine (1999) highlights “the other remarkable trend of the first decade of peace was a revolutionary extension in the power and influence of the state” (p. 556). The Labour Party had introduced the Beveridge Plan with compulsory insurance and the introduction of the National Health Service. The post-war boom, however, concealed many of the problems which had been developing up to the 1960s (Ferguson, 1968; Devine, 1999) leading Ferguson (1968) to claim that the nation was living in a “fool’s paradise” (p. 387). McCreadie (1991) sums up the lack of pressure on Westminster up to this point by stating:

The fact is that they (the Scottish public) had no particular concern for democratic self-government as long as the Union offered the best prospect of continuing economic advancement (p. 42).

Perhaps this increase in (British) state involvement in everyday life in Scotland played a part in invigorating the political courage of the ‘frightened lion’?
The Scottish National Party (SNP) gained its first seat in a 1945 by-election, losing it a few weeks later in the general election and then proceeded to make little or no impact for the next fifteen years partly due to in-fighting and also to its being a narrow and exclusive party (Brand, 1978; Levy, 1989; Devine, 1999). The SNP’s real arrival on the British political map was Winnie Ewing’s 1967 by-election win, beating Labour in one of their safest seats (Devine, 1999). Demonstrating the political shift, Mitchell (1990) cites Ted Heath’s 1968 comment prior to committing the Conservatives to a Scottish Assembly – itself, a reversal of a hundred years of Conservative opposition - “nationalism is the biggest single factor in our politics today” (p. 55).

Labour were not far behind the Conservatives in outlining a Devolution proposal, three months after seeing the SNP achieving 30% of the Scottish vote in the second 1974 general election, pushing the Conservatives into third place, and more importantly, perhaps, coming second in 42 constituencies (Devine, 1999). The discovery of North Sea oil was also an obvious contributory factor to the SNP’s rise in popularity at this time. Devine notes:

In the final analysis, however, the rise of the SNP and the new centrality of the Scottish question in national politics by the early 1970s was based not so much on the party’s intrinsic attractions as on the broader historical context of the times (p. 577).

He adds:

A basic cause of the growing prominence of the SNP in Scottish politics in the 1960s and 1970s was the decline in the Tory party as the most effective challenge to the hegemony of Labour in Scotland ... For decades it had been a powerful vehicle north of the border for the expression of British patriotism. Now the decay of the party gave Nationalism its chance (p. 581).

Pittock (2001) says that 1977 witnessed the “high water mark” (p. 131) for SNP support and then draws linkages between Scottish national political and football fortunes by comparing the 1974 electoral successes with an undefeated national football side in the World Cup, and the post-1977 fall in SNP support with the 1978 football World Cup “disaster” (Pittock, 2001: 131). He adds “such comparisons are slick and unscholarly ... but are nonetheless appealing, even compelling. The 1970s was the period in which Scottish nationality’s link to football seemed closest and most uncontroversial” (p. 131). Rosie (2002) criticises this comparison as “rather
limp” and football-centred” (p. 132) and states “there is little here on the role of gender, or, indeed, class or ethnicity, in the development, maintenance and expression of Scottish nationalism or Scottish identity” (p. 146). Rosie is correct to seek out explanations of gender, class and ethnicity roles and to be wary of drawing conclusions on national identity from markers of one source – irrespective of how well (or not) this source appears to capture a wide cross-section of Scotland. One is left wondering, however, if Rosie’s criticism is purely based on a lack of wider social material, or if it is simply an outright rejection of using football as a useful barometer of political opinion.


The road to the re-opening of the Scottish parliament was preceded by a period of dramatic events in British social and economic circles. Devine (1999) claims that:

in the 1980s ... Scotland went through an economic revolution which, if not as fundamental as that of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, still left a deep mark on the country’s historical development (p. 597).

More than an economic revolution was taking place in this period. Pittock (2001) shows how 77% of the electorate in Scotland described themselves as ‘Scottish’ rather than ‘British’ in 1999, compared with only 38% in 1979, the year Mrs Thatcher came to power. Bond and Rosie (2002) contextualise this finding by noting that since 1992 there have consistently been more people who feel that they have more in common with Scots of a different class than with English people of the same class. They state that this pattern was not evident in 1979. These findings correlate with Paterson et al (2001) who found that in 1979, 44% identified first with class and 38% with nation. In 1992, 24% identified more with class and 43% with nation. In terms of nationalist politics, these findings were supported by McCrone and Paterson (2002) who show that in 1979 only 7% of Scotland’s electorate supported independence compared with 25% in 1992, after more than a decade of Conservative rule. An increasing unease about being governed by a right-wing party with no Scottish mandate combined with a general rise and shift in the importance of nationality contributed, therefore – along with other factors such as the 1980 and 90s cultural revival (Devine, 1999) – to the conclusion that the Scots
were being ruled by an alien government. Thus, as Canon Wright, the later chair of the cross-party Constitutional Convention, would note, this led to the conclusion that “our central need, if we were to be governed justly and democratically was not just to change the government but to change the rules” (cited in Devine, 1999: 603-604). For a government which sought low state involvement in citizens’ lives as a political goal, it is ironic that rather than decreasing personal dependence on the state, as Devine (1999) notes, Mrs Thatcher’s government had governed Scotland at a time when state dependence became a way of life for many working-class families. The miners’ strike of 1984 and the introduction of the Poll Tax were contributory factors during this period. The introduction of the Poll Tax in Scotland, which occurred a year before its introduction in England, was one of the defining moments in modern Scottish political history (McCreadie, 1991), reinforcing a commonly held view of Thatcherite policies being ‘un-Scottish’ (Paterson et al., 2001). It is ironic and revealing that in the 1997 Scottish referendum on devolution, the (losing) fate of the ‘no’ campaign was effectively sealed when Mrs Thatcher decided to publicly endorse it, thus providing a reminder of how Scotland’s electorate valued her views.

As previously mentioned, Rosie (2002) claimed that football was a poor marker of Scottish political opinion. Perhaps the 1988 Scottish Cup final, the year after the Poll Tax introduction, when thousands of Celtic and Dundee United supporters showed Mrs Thatcher – who was presenting the trophy - the red card and told her to “get tae fuck iii” is an example of one instance when football did provide an accurate barometer of Scottish political opinion, particularly the seeds of a national discontentment with the Conservative government which would govern throughout the next decade despite Scotland’s electorate largely voting non-Conservative. Brand et al. (1994) and Brown et al. (1999) have demonstrated the links in Scottish belief systems between class and nationality and Paterson et al. (2001) suggest that to neglect the working class in Scotland is often to be seen to be anti-Scottish (p. 57). Was this the period when the antiszyzyggy disappeared, when the political nationalism of Scotland finally matched the cultural nationalism?
8.1 The Parliament re-opens

Paterson et al. (2001) state that “issues of national identity have been at the forefront of Scottish politics, notably during the last two decades or so” (p. 101) and ask “is Scotland’s ‘new politics’ driven by a growing sense of Scottish national identity?” (p. 101). Bond and Rosie (2002) show that between 1992 and 2001, those claiming an exclusive Scottish identity almost doubled from 19% to 36% (p. 37), and they, too, ask to what extent do national identities matter in terms of how people think and act politically?

Paterson et al. (2001) demonstrate that from data analysis of the 1997 referendum surveys, it is clear that “Scottish national identity in itself did not explain support for a Scottish parliament” (p. 102), showing that 62% of those professing a Scottish identity and 50% a British identity voted yes to devolution. They add:

We find that national identity is a weak predictor of vote in the election for the first Scottish parliament. One interpretation of these findings ... is that national identity does not in and of itself explain constitutional and political attitudes. This is not because it is unimportant, but because it is pervasive, colouring how politics operates in Scotland, and is thus shared by those with different political and constitutional beliefs (p. 102).

Thinking of oneself as Scottish, therefore, does not guarantee support for independence. McCrone and Paterson (2002) demonstrate these complexities by highlighting that “in the past decade, at least half of independence supporters have not supported the SNP” (p. 63). These factors highlight the complex relationship between national identity, attitude to constitutional developments and party identification in Scotland. Paterson et al (2001) add, “the fact that party choice, national identity and constitutional preference do not overlap in any neat way suggests that there are different ways of ‘being Scottish’” (p. 115). These claims are echoed in McCrone et al. (1995) who discussed Scottish heritage and found that although many strong supporters of Scottish heritage – defined for the purposes of their small sample as members of the National Trust for Scotland - have a strong sense of being Scottish, they were unsupportive of the SNP and nationalist politics. They add that “clearly their political identity does not deny their cultural or national one” (p. 181). Bond and Rosie (2002) conclude:
Perhaps the most interesting conclusion, however, is that once again we have discovered that national identity does not map on to the political perspective as neatly as we might suppose. ... National identity still matters, but not to the extent and in the manner that we would perhaps expect (p. 52).

It would seem, therefore, that national identity perceptions and constitutional preference are not related in any straightforward or simple manner, nor does national identity matter to the extent we would expect. There are, it seems, different ways of being Scottish. Craig (2003) claims that "it is no exaggeration to say that for many people in Scotland 'a man's a man' as long as he is not English, a homosexual, an asylum seeker, or kicks with the wrong foot" (p. 149). Given the diverse and sometimes contradictory nature of Scottish national identity, it would appear that there are alternative versions of Scottishness, and perhaps one can have a Scottish national identity while being a gay left-footed English born woman.

McCrone (2006) reminds us of the importance of analysing Scotland in order to make sense of "the fissiparous tendencies in the modern world, a world in which the correspondence of states, societies and nations is far less clear-cut (p. 22). It is hoped that this thesis contributes to answering some of these questions regarding Scottish identity in relation to rugby union and football in this 'new Scotland, new politics' world of post-devolution Scotland. The SNP has become the largest party in the Scottish Parliament and in one survey nearly half of those respondents asked wanted more powers for Holyrood (McCrone, 2005). With Devine (2006) predicting it is now less a choice between independence or unionism but rather "when, how far and how fast the pragmatic transfer of powers from London to Edinburgh will progress" (p.17), a timely reminder of the relevance of these issues is provided.

**Sport and National Identity**

It has been suggested that the modern phase of the nationalism and sport relationship chrystalised and took off between the 1870s and 1920s (Maguire and Tuck, 1998). Sport and nationalism's symbiotic relationship is widely recognized (Nauright and Black, 1996) and "sporting competition arguably provides the
primary expression of imagined communities; the nation becoming more ‘real’ in
the domain of sport” (Maguire and Tuck, 1998: 106, original emphasis). Morgan
(1999) states that sport plays a major role in “reminding us who we are and who we
might yet hope to become” (p. 51), and adds that international sport helps “articulate
the distinctive moral identities, beliefs and values of the nation that make it up” (p.
62).

Hargreaves (2002) recognises that previous analyses have demonstrated an
awareness of sport’s global reach and the significance of nations and nationalism,
though to date, he claims there is a lack of “sociologically informed” (p. 33) work
on their relationship with much of it lacking in quality. Bairner (2001) agrees that
much research has been done on sport, nationalism and nation-states, but this has
tended to focus on political or ideological factors overlooking questions relating to
national identity, and lacking precision in the use of certain concepts.

It has been noted that even though there is much discussion – both popular and
academic – of nationalism, little attention is paid to the role of sport (Allison, 2000;
Hargreaves, 2000). Hargreaves claims that in nationalism discourse religion and
language are often given attention (2000) while Allison (2000) blames the lack of
attention afforded sport on “a ‘myth of autonomy’ about sport which simply
assumes that the activity is somehow inert in relation to other social and political
phenomena” (p. 351). It is claimed that much of the existing research oversimplifies
the sport and nationalism relationship by treating sport “as a mere reflection of
politics” (Hargreaves, 2000: 3).

In order to highlight and discuss some of the key claims made about the sport and
national identity relationship, a brief overview of a selection of the previous work
will be provided.
9. Brief Synopsis of Previous Work

Hargreaves (2000) discusses a variety of theories of nationalism and their relationship with global processes (Olympic Games) within the context of political and ideological struggles and concludes that the sport and nation dynamic is not a zero-sum power game with clear winners and losers. Other contributions have varied from media analyses (Blain and O'Donnell, 1998; Carrington, 1998; Crolley, Hand and Jeutter, 1998; Maguire and Tuck, 1998) to the effects of globalization (or global processes) on sport and national identity (Maguire, 1999; Bairner, 2001; Hargreaves, 2002). Examples of particular nations' and nation-states' use of sport for a variety of purposes from nation(state) building, social control, national prestige, and ideological protest has been provided (Sugden and Bairner, 1993; Bairner and Darby, 1999; Harvey, 1999; Allison, 2000; Hargreaves, 2000), and the links and associations which nation-states and nations have with particular sports has been documented with Archer and Bouillon (1982), Claassen (1985), Andrews (1996) and Nauright (1996) all providing accounts of rugby union's place in the nations of South Africa and Wales.

Much of the media analysis has found that newspaper coverage reproduces national stereotypes. Blain and O'Donnell (1998) found that the British / English press is almost unique in Europe in reducing sports reporting to war-imagery and political metaphors. Maguire and Tuck (1998) make similar claims about military imagery. Crolley et al (1998) question Blain and O'Donnell's claim that Britain was almost unique by stating that France, Germany and Spain produce similar stereotypical reports including political and war-time metaphors. Carrington (1998) concludes that Euro 96 was juxtaposed with Britpop and characterised by war-time imagery to the exclusion of non-white Britons.

With reference to particular countries and their use of sport within a nation or nation-state, football in the north of Ireland has been found to exacerbate division rather than forging unity among opposing communities (Sugden and Bairner, 1993; Bairner and Darby, 1999). In Spain, it has been claimed football provides a focal point for Catalan and Basque national identity (Ball, 2003; Burns, 1998) while the

Demonstrating a degree of overlap, others have stressed the important role of specific sports or events in the making of national identities. Gruneau and Whitson (1993) have written on Canadian sport (particularly hockey), highlighting the symbolic appeal the 'national' sport holds to particular forms of Canadian national identity. Riordon (1991) has analysed the Soviet Union and its national identity links in Olympic sport. Booth (1999) highlights the symbolic importance of rugby union in South Africa as a marker of Afrikaner identity – to Afrikaners themselves and to the non-whites in South Africa – and how ultimately rugby union was utilised by Nelson Mandela to legitimise both the sport, to non-whites, and the sharing of power between non-whites and whites. Grundlingh (1996) has charted the development of rugby union in South Africa too, suggesting the national identity it reveals is primarily a patriarchal and middle class one, while, in England, cricket has often been used to metaphorically express notions of English national identity (Hargreaves, 1986; Holt, 1989; Searle, 2001; Williams, 2003).

The linkage between sport and national identity has witnessed a number of watershed moments which have illuminated the relationship and led to debate around the importance and role of sport in the national project. It is widely accepted that the 1936 Olympics in Berlin marked a key moment when the Games were politicised. Another obvious defining moment when sport and national identity were fused occurred during the 1995 rugby union World Cup final when the then President of South Africa, Nelson Mandela wore the Springbok jersey, once a symbol of Afrikaner identity and white majority rule. This act, together with the Springbok victory, led to the black newspaper, The Sowetan, displaying 'Amabokoboko' (the boks, the boks) on its front page the following day in an unprecedented show of support for the Springboks, demonstrating just how important the relationship between sport and national identity can be (Booth, 1999).
The relative importance of sport to wider societal trends has been debated. Allison’s “myth of autonomy” has challenged the view that sport is separate or autonomous from society (1986, 2000). Maguire et al. (2002) claim sport might allow for a more precise analysis of society due to sporting events being more visible arenas of non-sporting passions too. They caution, however, that “in reality these identities are never homogeneous and are quite often forgotten shortly after the sporting event is finished” (p. 154). In terms of national identity, it has been suggested that sports fans may well indulge in the national sporting event (face painting, singing of anthems) without being attracted to nationalist politics (Bairner, 2001), indulging in a nationalism of the ‘banal’ type discussed by Billig (1995). This would not necessitate Maguire et al.’s ‘forgetting of identities’ to occur given they never existed in the first place. Drawing from Kellas (1991), Grundlingh (1996) warns against overstating the links between sport and national identity and reminds us that people have different and varied reasons for supporting and watching national sporting encounters.

The reasons people indulge in national sporting contests (to whatever degree) do indeed vary, as do the functions commonly associated with sport. Maguire et al. (2002) repeat many of Jarvie’s (1993) claims in relation to the uses and functions of sport, claiming that sport is often conservative, has inherent uniting properties, provides outlets for frustrated peoples, reinforces national consciousness and contributes to the ‘quest for identity’. Allison (2000) stresses the setting of sports events as being ‘easy’ and ‘appropriate’ for expressions of collective identities (p. 351) and Hargreaves (2000) demonstrates how easily “sport can be made to map national struggles” (p. 13) with contest, struggle, drama, endurance and speed contributing to allow nations “to compete equally by proxy” (p. 14). Allison highlights several nations being “denied national sports representation” investing their sporting national identity in particular sports clubs; Barcelona football club being a signifier of Catalan sporting identity in the absence of a Catalan national team (2000: 347). As Bairner (2001) observes:

in most nation-states there exists a hegemonic national identity that is not necessarily inclusive. In such instances, some citizens may well choose to celebrate
an alternative national identity, with sport playing an important part in their activities (p. 169).

Grundlingh (1996) shows that in post 1930s South Africa, Springbok rugby “carried a thinly disguised anti-imperialistic message” (p. 187) while Booth (1999) demonstrates the shifting dynamics of Springbok rugby by highlighting how the national rugby team failed to provide Errol Tobias, the first black player of the Springbok side, with a sense of national identity, and then subsequently became a major rallying point for black activists within South Africa who were trying to create a united national identity. The central and critical role of sport in national identity discourse is demonstrated by Nelson Mandela’s comments to South African rugby captian Pienaar on the day of the rugby World Cup final in 1995; Mandela spoke of his “admiration for the role you and your team are playing in nation building” (cited in Booth, 1999: 189).

In addition to providing a focal point for national struggles in a political or ideological sense, sport has been claimed to enhance and contribute to national identity in general. Although sport may not be wholly successful in uniting disparate sections of any given society and can “perpetuate” divisions (Bairner, 2001: 168), political elites still promote sport as “important instrument(s) for the creation of a sense of national identity and as a way of enhancing their nation-state’s prestige and influence internationally” (Hargreaves, 2002: 32) “International team sports bind people to dominant I/we national identities” (Maguire, 1999: 205). The extent to which the dominant bind people to dominant identities is debatable. For present purposes it is sufficient to note the intense associations some people have in relation to sport and national identity; that is, how important sport is to their feelings of self-worth and closely linked to their national identity. One Scotland football fan’s “personal worth is bound up with Scotland’s success or failure” (Archer, 1976: 76) thus providing the type of statement that has led Allison (2000) to claim that “it is this intense feeling of identification which is the kernel of the relationship between sport and nationality” (p. 345). This intense feeling of identification in the fusing of sport and identity is demonstrated by Nauright (1996) who shows that the Springbok symbol was more important to white South African identity than even the white Afrikaner anthem or flag, while Andrews (1996) notes that the Welsh
national anthem 'Hen Wlad Fy Nhadau' was first aired publicly in a rugby context aiding the acceptance in Wales of both rugby and the anthem. Bairner (2001) stresses the symbolic sport and national identity links in Canada, explaining that the maple leaf was first used publicly to symbolise Canadian identity during a series of lacrosse tours in Britain during the latter period of the nineteenth century.

If one accepts the important and central roles - symbolic, ideological, political - that sport provides in many nations, one must be aware of the double-edged nature to this relationship. It has been noted that in addition to providing 'the nation' with an increased sense of national pride sport can also contribute to a national sense of humiliation (Maguire, 1999; Allison, 2000). The obvious question at this juncture is - to what extent the sport and national identity relationship is a symbolic or potently political relationship? Are the majority of citizens of sporting nations simply 'ninety minute patriots' (Jarvie and Walker, 1994) or can the fusion of sport and national identity help provide the impetus for political and social action?

Jarvie and Walker's (1994) collection provides one of the major contributions to the debate on the extent to which Scottish sporting nationalism is almost purely symbolic or symptomatic of political or ideological action. For present purposes, it is helpful to provide a working distinction between a nationalist and a patriot. Put simply, a nationalist is either involved or interested in being involved in ideological or political action regarding his or her affection for his/her nation while a patriot may not be at all interested or attracted to ideological or political change or action but will harbour deep emotional attachments to his or her nation. This basic distinguishing feature has been central to many debates about sport and national identity with some believing sport to have the power to 'divert the masses' (Chomsky, 1989; Maguire and Tuck, 1998) and others recognising the political or ideological power of action that sport can provide (Andrews, 1996; Grundlingh, 1996; Bairner, 2001). Of course, this is not to suggest that some simply believe sport to either divert the public's attention or act as a mass rallying point of action because in many analyses there appears to be the acceptance that both positions are potentially compatible; what appears important is the specific context of the sport and national identity relationship. Andrews (1996) observes for example, that Welsh patriotism and British nationalism were fused in Welsh rugby union by the
governing body rejecting the leek as their national symbol in favour of the Prince of Wales’ three feathered insignia, and motto ‘Ich Dien’ (I serve) emblazoned across the scarlet shirt. This represented the Welsh administrators’ loyalty to Britain. “Rugby played a major role in reinforcing the British imperial identity of Wales” (Andrews, 1996: 64). In this way, the patriotism of the Welsh – their love of their Welsh nation – was fused and actually reinforced by their civic nationalism to the United Kingdom.

Allison (2000) also discusses the Welsh sport and national identity relationship and highlights that although the Welsh appear anti-English in sport, they voted four to one against devolution in 1979. “It was precisely the industrial valleys of South Wales where the support for the Welsh rugby team was massive which were overwhelmingly against political change” (p.351). This would testify to the Welsh being more patriotic than nationalistic. Attempting to rationalise this situation, Allison claims that “this suggests at least the possibility that the ‘mimetic’ emotions of sport can act as a ‘safety valve’ in politics, that they would express and deflate nationalist sentiment rather than enhance it” (p. 351). Allison, however, confuses the actual process – the economically reliant southern Welsh eschewing political nationalism by voting against devolution – with the outcome – sport being simply the mimetic safety-valve expression of nationalism. This ignores the wider everyday implications involved in agreeing to devolution for industrial South Wales and her citizens, such as the jobs and housing markets, and local infrastructure, and seeks to invoke the mimetic function of sport to conclude that sport acts as a safety valve, and therefore, attracts and contributes to the potency of non-political (symbolic) nationalistic expression. It also overlooks the lengthy experience that the Welsh people have of living with but not as the English.

The potential of sport to act as a nationalistic or patriotic rallying point is well documented. Grundlingh (1996) demonstrates that in South Africa the centrality of rugby union to the dominant identity group was reinforced by the Basil D’Oliveira incident where the South African prime minister Voster refused to allow the former South African and black cricketer D’Oliveira into South Africa to represent England at cricket. This was despite allowing three Maoris and one Samoan into the country to play rugby union for New Zealand. Grundlingh argues:
What is revealing is that Vorster was apparently more concerned about the stature of rugby, the premier Afrikaner sport, in the international world, than that of cricket, a game played mainly by the English speakers, and one in which few Afrikaners excelled at international level at that time (p. 196).

The centrality of rugby union to the Afrikaner identity in South Africa has contributed to the sport being used for counter-hegemonic struggle by the blacks of the country (Nauright and Black, 1996). This manifested itself originally in the black population supporting every opponent of the Springboks. However, in the build up to, and subsequent victory in, the rugby World Cup of 1995, the ANC and Nelson Mandela attempted to make political and cultural changes by targeting rugby union and the Springboks, showing the whites of South Africa that they could survive and flourish in the new democratic nation, and retain their cultural symbols like the Springbok. Mandela sought to show the black population also that their democracy could be guaranteed without ridding the country of previous dividing symbols (Nauright, 1996).

Maguire and Tuck (1998) make similar claims as Nauright and Black (1996) about the capacity of rugby union to challenge the cultural hegemony of the dominant national identity. They assert that English cultural hegemony has been challenged by Celtic nations’ use of rugby union. To what extent this ‘cultural challenging’ is merely symbolic as opposed to political remains to be answered, particularly when the challenge itself is demonstrated by symbolic reminders of the United Kingdom. The Prince of Wales’s motto and fleur de lys insignia on the Welsh jersey, helping to reinforce a British identity hardly allows one to assert that counter hegemonic processes are at work in anything other than the most superficial level. Maguire and Tuck (1998) believe that other ‘counter-cultural trends’ also occur at regional and ethnic levels as a result of a resurgence in folk games. Using the Scottish Highland Games as one example, they claim the Games “help in the process of reaffirming ethnic identity” (p. 111). The Games may also be good exemplars of the British / Scottish dialectic.
The work on sport and national identity has not escaped the types of discussion that have characterised much of nationalism and national identity work generally with disagreement ranging from the type of nationalism being displayed, and the extent to which sporting nationalism is an extension of perennial ethnic ties. Hargreaves (2000), although appearing to promote a 'perennial' interpretation of nationalism, warns of the dangers of exclusive reliance on either perennial or modern conceptions of the nation and drawing from the work of nationalism theorists Armstrong (1982), Smith (1986; 1991) and Hastings (1997), writes "nations cannot be constructed, invented or imagined out of thin air, as modernists and post-modernists seem to imagine" (p. 12). In a later essay, Hargreaves (2002) adds:

if the perennial aspects of nations and nationalism, i.e. their deep historic, ethnic origins, is neglected, we will never understand the significance of the nation and the power of nationalism, the capacity of nations to endure through the most profound changes and terrible traumas, and the current revival of nations and nationalism in the modern world... Nations, and the deep sense of belonging they generate, cannot be merely imagined, invented or conjured out of nothing, or imposed on people willy nilly (p. 31).

On the other hand, in his discussion of media discourse relating to sport and national identity, Maguire (1999) states:

Indeed, both the monarchy and sport appear to be based on foundational myths. Myths of this type seek to locate the origins of the nation, the people and/or national character much further back in time and place than the evidence supports (p. 179).

Maguire (1999) explains media discourse of this nature as:

an active construction of ‘fantasy group charisma’, that is based on both the ‘invention of tradition’ and, at a deeper and more enduring level, the habitus codes that underpin the ‘national character’ of European nations (p. 183).

Although Maguire rejects an entirely ‘imagined community’ explanation, his approach to nationalism and national identity appears to differ quite markedly from that of Hargreaves. Hargreaves (2000) criticises Maguire and those who "mistakenly rely on Anderson’s idea of the nation as merely an ‘imagined community’" (p. 36), stating that they “seem to be totally unaware of the importance of ethno-nationalist elements” (p. 36). Drawing heavily on Smith’s (1995; 1998) ‘ethno-symbolist’ nationalism framework, Hargreaves adds, “thus, as
characterized by Maguire, English national identity constitutes nothing more than a ‘fantasy shield’, a ‘dream’ – ‘wilful nostalgia’ for a great lost past” (p. 36).

Hargreaves’ basis for criticising Maguire, however, is flawed. Hargreaves overlooks Maguire’s ‘habitus codes’ which, according to Maguire (1999), occur “at a deeper and more enduring level” than that of ‘invented traditions’ (p. 183). This represents a major flaw in Hargreaves’s argument. Maguire highlights Giddens’ (1986) terms ‘Practical’ and Discursive’ consciousness and states:

The level of ‘practical consciousness’ (everyday actions that are intuitively performed) is more taken for granted, yet finds expression in and is influenced by the two-way traffic conducted with the ‘discursive consciousness’ (actions that are based on cognitively based decision-making) of an individual. While the concepts of invented traditions and imagined communities are also fruitful in exploring European identity politics, such concepts appear to be dealing only with the level of ‘discursive consciousness’, to ignore the level of ‘practical consciousness’ and to overlook the interplay between the two (p. 185).

‘Practical consciousness’ therefore seems to be similar to habitus code – everyday actions intuitively performed; second nature – and it is these which Hargreaves ignores when criticising modernists like Maguire. As Maguire has stated, the two-way traffic means both levels of consciousness are vitally important, and he states that the practical (habitus-like) level is more important to understanding national identity. Perhaps Jarvie (1993) who agrees that one cannot simply invent tradition out of thin air can provide part of the solution. In describing the Highland tradition of Scotland, Jarvie states that “Scottish cultural identity is not so much an invention of tradition but a selection of tradition” (p. 74). But who does the selecting and how does this resonate so deeply with the masses?

12. Simply Duped?

A major question throughout the literature centres around the extent of cultural duping or manipulation that occurs, and in analysing this issue, it is helpful to illustrate the two competing polar positions. Home at al. (1999) claim “there is nothing ‘natural’ about national identities, which are always products of social construction involving complex forms of identity formation and imagining” (p.
Theorists sympathetic to this view often draw influence from Giddens' (1991) 'reflexive self' – identity is largely a matter of choice for individuals albeit within the framework of societal pulls and constraints – and Hall's (1990) 'constant transformation' – people can transform aspects of their identity to suit. Meanwhile, Bairner (2001) suggests that although national identities are partially imagined, some have limited choice in this imagining. Sugden and Tomlinson (1998) agree and add “identities are not always there for the taking or making” (p. 178). Using Northern Ireland as an example, they suggest that constant transformation is not even an option for the expression of some national identities.

Identities are theoretically open to negotiation and renewal, and might provide the possibilities of effective contestation, but they remain practically constrained by the contexts of their initial production, and the flexibility or rigidity of their social setting (p. 186).

Describing groups of people as ‘a nation’ is “a complex and elusive matter because in the final analysis it rests on the shared beliefs of their members that they belong together, that they do indeed make a nation” (Morgan, 1997: 1). To simply claim that the nation is invented or imagined would be false, would “place too much weight on artifice and assign too large a role to the fabricators” (Smith, 1998: 130), and would beg the question, that Smith asks, why would the masses accept and allow complete invention of their traditions and national identity? Why would the masses be prepared to make great sacrifices if they were being so easily manipulated by elites? Indeed, why would elites be prepared to make many of these same sacrifices?

Morgan (1999) sheds light on this continual problem. Drawing from Taylor (1989), Morgan suggests that:

Nations morally matter, when they do, because they belong to the class of what Taylor calls strongly valued goods, and it is the mark of such goods that they ‘are not seen as good by the fact that we desire them, but rather ... are seen as goods which we ought to desire, even if we do not, goods such that we show ourselves as inferior or bad by our not desiring them’ (p. 51)

Morgan adds that the moral significance of ‘us’ “becomes so much part of who ‘we’ are, of our conceptions of ourselves” (p. 51). Larmore (1996), meanwhile, adds that “to imagine them as objects of choice would be to imagine ourselves as without a guiding sense of morality – and so not only ill-equipped to actually choose them,
but also lacking the right sort of identification to them” (p. 130). In this way, even when sections of a ‘nation’ do deviate from the dominant national identity, alternative national expressions become negated apriori. This is what Marqusee (2001) had in mind when criticising elements within the English cricket fraternity for “the belief that Englishness is a fixed cultural attribute deeply implanted in those who are deemed English” (p. 129).

Fixed cultural attributes and strongly valued goods, therefore, are vital elements in national identity discourse and may provide a framework for bridging the dichotomy between real and invented notions of national identity. As Billig (1995) states in relation to popular conceptions of national identity, “these themes are widely diffused as common sense” (p. 4), and Horne et al. (1999) claim:

In this process of construction audiences are characteristically positioned as patriotic partisan subjects. National belonging-ness is inscribed in the discursive practices that seek to mobilize national identities as part of the way in which our attention is engaged with a narrative hermeneutic (pp. 177 - 178).

Common sense, taken-for granted conceptions of national identity by their nature are part of the dominant notion of national identity and for Maguire and Tuck (1998) “the dominant notion of identity tends to ‘invent’ traditions, recall ‘common’ events and stress those who ‘belong’ and those who do not” (p. 104). This is not to suggest that invented traditions necessarily equate to an inauthentic or unsustainable identity as critics like Hargreaves would claim. As Maguire and Tuck add:

The symbolic historical ritual of this narrative (of the nation) is consequently loaded with connotations which constitute the ‘shared experiences’ ... of a people which, by reference to an ‘imagined community’, imparts meaning on to the nation. Yet, this representation can also become part of a person’s habitus and become ‘real’ rather than just invented (p. 105).

Allison (2000) suggests that there are aspects of ethnic and modern nationalism in many national identity formations, and he agrees that these identities must be treated as real:

Much of what makes a modern national consciousness or determines the identity of a given individual is the product of the invention and selection of tradition which has occurred in a modern and organized way ... Nevertheless, nationality must be treated as real whatever our theory of the role of mythology in its formation (p. 350, original emphasis).
It does indeed seem useful, as Bairner observes, to use the broad distinctions of ethnic and modern nationalism and the overlapping 'social' nationalism described by Kellas (1991) while understanding the various strands of nationalism theory such as civic, secessionist, unificatory and expansionist (Bairner, 2001). Maguire et al. (2002) highlight the multilayered and overlapping nature of the sport and nationalism relationship:

The nationalism that is connected to sport may be constructed by many different forces, be manifested within and between different types of nationalism, be real and imagined, be a creative or reflective force, be both positive and negative, transient and temporary, multifaceted and multilayered and be evolutionary in its format (p. 153).

Considering the possible complexity of sport and nationalism's relationship, it is also useful to draw upon Cronin's typologies of nationalism. Cronin provides distinctions between primordialists, modernists, statists and mythologists, allowing for more comprehensive distinctions to be made than simply civic or ethnic nationalism. The complex nature of the sport and national identity relationship is undeniable and each case must be analysed carefully. "There is no reason to suppose a normal, let alone universal relation between national sport and political nationalism. Each case is different and context is all-important" (Allison, 2000: 351).

13. Context Specific

Pierre Bourdieu (1988) asserts that "to understand a sport, whatever it may be, one must locate its position in the space of sports (p. 153). The space of sports includes the (dynamic) social, cultural and political contexts in which sport is situated. "The specific understanding of the relationship between sport and nationalism needs to be analysed in terms of time and place" (Maguire et al., 2002: 156). This is clearly demonstrated by the shifts that took place in South Africa in the 1990s. Indeed, Springbok rugby for the Afrikaners in South Africa is itself part of a shifting dynamic which embraced the 'English' sport and, in utilising their own version of English Muscular Christianity, made rugby symbolic of Afrikaner identity (Grundlingh, 1996). Welsh national identity is another case in point; as previously
noted, "rugby played an important part in creating a new Welsh identity, so much so that some twentieth-century nationalists have conceded that the only thing that unites all Welshmen is the support for 15 men in scarlet jerseys" (Allison, 2000: 349, original emphasis). As Andrews (1996) has shown, however, in the latter period of the nineteenth century rugby was a middle-class sport associated with anglicisation. "The Welsh populace – somewhat conveniently – lost their short-term memories as rugby rapidly became Welsh" (p. 55). Andrews adds “it is dangerous to apply arbitrary cultural significations across the dynamic continuum of history” (p. 54). The dynamic continuum of history is presently debated in terms of globalisation or global tendencies and the sport and national identity literature has discussed the possible implications and outcomes that global tendencies have for national identity.

14. Global Tendencies and National Identity

Maguire at al. (2002) argue that there has been an increase in the globalisation of culture, including sport, and that since the 1950s the nation-state has been undermined due in part to a more complex division of labour and the impact of transnational organisations. Some have been led to ask whether national identities – and their linkages to sport - are being weakened in times of increasing global tendencies (Bairner, 2001; Maguire, 1999). For Bairner (2001) “nationalism’s death ... has been greatly exaggerated” (p. 16) and rather than eroding national identities, globalising tendencies are leading to a “resilience of national sentiment” (p. 6). This resilience is closely related to sporting identities:

Sport continues to play a greater role in the maintenance of distinctive national identities than in the construction of some uniform global identity ... Sport and globalisation have become accomplices in a process whereby the importance of national identity has been ensured despite, or arguably because of, supranationalist tendencies (pp. 175 - 176).

Hargreaves (2000) agrees and states “far from being eroded, nationalism can be stimulated by global developments such as Olympism” (p. 56). Hargreaves criticises uncritical modernist theories and those who over-rely on globalisation theories as underestimating “the power of the nation and nationalism to resist and counteract the effects of globalization” (p. 36). He adds:
It is time that nations, national identity and nationalism came to be seen as potentially major bulwarks against domination by the globally powerful, and not simply as bogey men responsible for so much of the world’s ills (p. 42).

Exactly how this bulwark works, and the reasons why one should see national identity (as opposed to, or alongside, any other criteria) as potentially useful in this function, is unclear and not outlined. For Marqusee (2001) the “ever-increasing exposure to global competition (sporting and otherwise) is only adding to the potency” of the myth of national identity being a fixed cultural attribute, “an identifiable personal characteristic, something existing in a realm more substantive than that of technical criteria relating to birth, parentage or residence” (pp. 128 - 129). The difficulty of conceptualising national identity as a bulwark against globalising tendencies (or indeed as anything meaningful), is reinforced by the difficulty of agreeing on the concept of the nation and national identity. Multiculturalism within most modern nation-states makes it extremely difficult to sustain the claim that there is a single national identity within ‘the nation’ (Jarvie, 1993; Maguire et al., 2002). “People in complex nation-states, have multiple identities that are many-layered – local, regional, national, global” (Maguire, 1999: 185). And as Bairner (2001) adds, other affinities such as locale, town, region, may take precedence over the nation.

Marqusee (2001) highlights Nick Tate, ex-National Curriculum chief and Chris Woodhead, former Chief Inspector of Schools who called for a clearer sense of national identity and a common culture, and claims neither of them “could grasp the underlying truth that the unresolved conflicts within the nation are the nation, and the only vigorous nation is one that is in formation, merrily borrowing from all and sundry” (p. 130). He adds “when people seek certainty in a realm of ambiguity, their attempts to impose standards merely reveal their own prejudices” (p. 130).

Relating these questions of national identity back to sport, Allison’s (2000) claim becomes relevant – “It is often legitimate to question which nation a national team represents where there are different conceptions of national identity” (p. 347).
When analysing issues around sport and national identity in a Scottish context it is beneficial to familiarise oneself with the main body of literature and to attempt to highlight some of the most recurring and contentious issues. There are a small number of well respected and informed academic contributors to this field and the analyses they continue to provide greatly enable us to understand not only the range and depth of arguments, but also the theoretical difficulties faced within such work. The following sections attempt to provide a concise account of the major themes and issues which are pertinent to the present study.

15. Complex Construction of ‘Scottishness’, ‘Englishness’ and ‘Britishness’

What constitutes ‘Scottishness’ or Scottish national identity and to what extent do concepts of British identity affect notions of Scottish national identity? Bairner (2001) touches upon the ambiguous nature of Scottish identity when he states “being Scottish, however that is to be defined” (p. 46). He argues that previous analyses have suffered from over-simplified discussions of the relationship between sport and Scotland and, in criticising these, attempts to critique “the simplistic nature of their arguments which lead inevitably to equally naïve assumptions concerning Scottish national identity” (p. 46). Avoiding naïve assumptions leads Bairner to cite Jarvie and Walker from their own influential edited collection. They state that “while Scottish sport has both contributed to a sense of nation, class and even community it is important to ask the question whose nation? Whose community?” (Jarvie and Walker, 1994: 3) Although he does not use the term naïve assumptions, Bradley (2002) clearly endorses Bairner’s views. “A significant amount of references continually use the discourse of ‘we’, ‘our country’ and ‘all the nation’, in a way that ignores the variety of ‘Scotlands’ that exist.” (p. 194) Bradley (1998) has previously noted the multi-layered possibility of identity construction when analysing Scottish identity. He states that “people can have one dimensional affinities, they can inhabit a multi-layered set of identities or they can
lie at any point in between” (p. 145). The problem of Scottish identity definition is complicated further for as Bradley adds, “in addition, no point is fixed and is subject to a number of influences” (p. 145). It should be highlighted that the problem of identity manifests itself in media discourse too:

We noted that during Barcelona 1992, English commentators referred to English athletes uniquely as British, and to Scottish athletes as both British and Scottish. Scottish commentators, on the other hand, also referred to English athletes uniquely as British, but to Scottish athletes uniquely as Scottish. Scottish identity at Barcelona was therefore maintained by both sides whereas English nationality had seemingly disappeared... we speculated that for English commentators, Britishness and Englishness are presumably identical (Blain and Boyle, 1994: 137).

Issues surrounding Scottish identity often involve the notion of ‘the other’ and, in international terms this often manifests itself in a symbiotic relationship with England. Much of the literature focuses on perceptions of identity amongst supporters. Giulianotti (1991), for example, cites the relationship between Scotland and England, demonstrating the post-80s shift in the constructed image of Scotland football fans – by Scotland’s media and the fans themselves - as “instrumental ambassadors” rather than exponents of “violent machismo”. This constructing of positive images of the tartan army during Italia 90, juxtaposed the “ambassadorial bonhomie” of the Scotland fans with “the ‘problems’ of English soccer” (p. 504). Dimeo and Finn (2001) highlight the inter-connected nature of Scottish, English and British national identity observing that English national identity has become re-awakened, noting, “the establishment of a devolved Scottish parliament has been one of the catalysts for this rediscovery of England” (p. 44). Bradley (2002) points to “the weakening of British identity in Scotland” (p. 194) as but one of the continual processes reflecting the contested nature of Scottish identity. As Bradley suggests, however, “these questions are not particularly Scottish ones and have a global significance” (p. 194). Nevertheless, when analysing Scottish sport and national identity, even though there appears to be “no single idea of what ‘Scottish’ is and how it should be reflected or demonstrated” (Bradley, 2002: 194), one should bear in mind that in sporting terms at least, there is evidence of a Scottish national identity transcending local and ‘other’ divisions to produce a Scottish national identity. To what extent this occurs is unclear:

The Scotland (football) support has contributed to the construction of an image of being Scottish and how being a fan of the Scottish team is distinct from other identities that can be tainted by perceptions of sectarianism, allegiances and
Bradley further notes “numerous ‘other’ identities in Scottish football and society are often excluded in a range of acceptable manifestations of Scottishness” (p. 195). He highlights those “communities within Scottish society that have little affinity for things Scottish, especially national symbols and the Scottish international football support” (p. 194). Bairner (2001) also draws attention to the Scots who “were not sufficiently enthralled by the dominant interpretation of what being Scottish actually means” (p. 50), and he stresses how important it is “to discern” (p. 50) what unites and divides them.

Football in particular and sport in general provide a lens through which the concept of national identity and Scotland can be viewed. “The Scottish international football environment displays the reality of numerous identity narratives, despite the supporters’ and much of the media’s homogeneity in terms of ‘the idea’ of Scotland.” (Bradley, 2002: 194) It is this ‘idea of Scotland’, part of the title of Bairner’s (1994) chapter to which we now turn and, in doing so, we can consider the impact of Scotland’s two most prominent team sports, football and rugby union on ideas of Scotland.

16. Symbolic National Role Played by Scotland’s Football and Rugby Union Teams

Rugby Union

Despite the existence of the celebrated Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players, (Dunning and Sheard (1979; 2005) which helped develop the sociology of sport within Britain, the academic literature on the relationship between rugby union and Scottish national identity is sparse, further reinforcing the need for the present study. Massie (2000) reviews literature on rugby union within Scotland in his chapter ‘Rugby’ which is included in Jarvie and Burnett’s (2000) edited collection, Sport, Scotland and the Scots. It is worth noting that this contribution is mostly a potted history of Scottish rugby which charts the development of the Scottish
governing bodies, provides a welcome but brief insight into the class elements surrounding the sport in Scotland, and records some of the important statistical facts in relation to the Scottish game. This is intertwined with some opinions on previous players and on rule changes.

Massie writes that rugby was adopted by the Scottish fee-paying schools - which were based on the English model - which were established in Victorian Scotland. Mangan (1998) discusses this at length, acknowledging the relationship between (Anglicised) education and 'The Games Ethic' in Scotland, which for him, resulted in a 'cultural cloning' process:

Here the concern is with the diffusion of the Cult into the schools of the Scottish middle classes where, as some have put it, it played a fundamental (and disgraceful) part in the 'Anglicising' of their male offspring. However, this 'Anglicisation' in fact, on closer scrutiny, certainly welcomed and supported by the Scottish (and Northern Irish and Welsh) middle classes, was as much an assimilation into a British middle-class cultural identity ... making the 'British' boys of Scottish middle class parents virtually indistinguishable in values, dress and behaviour, if not accent, from the larger community of middle and upper middle class boys in English public schools (p. 190).

Massie (2000) adds that the Scottish Rugby Union (SRU) "kept long a reputation for staunch conservativism and rigid adherence to the principles of the amateur game" (p. 253). Massie further states that as late as 1971 there was opposition within the SRU to the appointment of a coach to the national team, noting that even when "the Union grudgingly gave way ... he (coach) was coyly described as 'advisor to the captain'" (p. 253). One could suggest that this attitude enhanced the public perception of the SRU as being middle-class, eschewing any obvious taint of professionalism in favour of the traditional middle class values of amateurism, duty and self-discipline. Massie highlights that the Scottish game was only "truly a game for all classes" (p. 251) in the Borders of Scotland, with the principle clubs in the cities being mostly associated with certain schools, ensuring that their membership was restricted to former pupils or teaching staff. This remained the case well into the twentieth century (Massie, 2000), and has presumably affected the contemporary demographics of players and fans of the sport to at least a degree. Kowalski (2004) suggests that historically at least, rugby union in Scotland "with the exception of the textile and farming communities of the borders, for long was the domain of the more Anglicised middle-classes of Edinburgh and Glasgow" (p. 67).
Bogle and Smith (1998) chart the development of the game in the Borders town of Hawick. They demonstrate the linkages between Hawick Rugby Club, the wider community, local industry and local folklore. Drawing together the threads of the Common Riding tradition – with its legacy of fighting battles with the English - and the industrial woollen mills heritage, they suggest that “rugby football formed a common language” (p. 45) for many Hawick residents. Indeed, Bogle and Smith present a picture that characterises fans of Hawick Rugby Club as exclusively local born and bred ("Teri"). They demonstrate the ease with which born and bred Hawick locals are universally assumed to be rugby supporters, whilst neglecting to situate non-Teris within this framework. Bogle and Smith also inadvertently demonstrate the increasing parallels Scottish rugby union fandom has with football. It is shown that the Hawick rugby fans demonstrated “desperation to find tickets which would place the holder in the Teri section of the crowd” (p. 72). This was for a national cup competition, when traditionally of course, rugby union fans have not been segregated within the stadium in the same way as football supporters.

Speirs’s (2001) work highlights and reinforces the perceived camaraderie between the Borders clubs and supporters, often in the (equally perceived) belief that the SRU are biased towards the city clubs. Moreover, in describing the development of the Scottish game, he implies that a unique and inherited Border spirit exists. “It was a game which had engaged the Border spirit inherited from the days of the reivers” (p. 1).

Bairner (2001) discusses the relationship between rugby union and Scottish national identity and claims “rugby union has seldom been proposed as Scotland’s national game. But more than any other sport in recent years, it appears to have tapped into patriotic sentiment and as a result to have won support from every section of Scottish society” (p. 63). Bairner notes that the SRU adopted the song ‘Flower of Scotland’ for their Grand Slam match with England at Murrayfield, and asks “were the people who had traditionally supported the Union now revealing an enthusiasm for Scottish independence” (p. 63)? He then adds:

Rather, as Jarvie and Walker (1994) (p. 4) suggest, “the adoption by such a conservative Scottish institution as the Scottish Rugby Union of the populist national anthem ‘Flower of Scotland’ at one level might seem insignificant and yet
at another level it was a profound gesture of sentimentality which in part encapsulated for a brief instant the mood of many Scots” (Bairner, 2001: 63).

The current and possible future relationship between rugby union and Scottish national identity is in need of analysis, especially considering the continued prominence the sport has in Scotland. Scottish rugby union’s place alongside Scottish football must be considered too, especially in an age when the football team does not regularly compete in the latter stages of world class competitions, and does not play England, ‘the auld enemy’ and significant ‘other’, on an annual basis as it did before the 1990s. When one considers that the national rugby union team does compete regularly in the latter stages of world class competition and that it also plays England annually, the necessity of a sociological study into rugby union and national identity is reinforced.

Football
In relation to notions of identity much more has been said about football than any other sport, perhaps reflecting football’s accepted position as the major ‘national sport’, although some have questioned this popularised status. Bairner (2001) for example argues that “Scotland has no truly national game” (p. 66), as a consequence of various divisions grounded in gender, race, ethnicity, religion, region and class. Bairner suggests that:

not only do major sports individually reflect differences and divisions, they may even reinforce them. As a result, it is difficult to see sport as a potential source for the emergence of a cohesive Scottish identity (p. 66).

Bradley (2002) suggests:

...for some people being part of an imagined community is less determined by place of birth, even residence, and can be partly informed by ethnicity reflected through sporting symbolism. It is also evidence that being part of a common territory does not necessarily translate into a shared identity (p. 182).

Bradley then refers to his previous work on the Scotland football support to claim that both ‘English born’ and ‘Irish descent’ Scots are under-represented in the tartan army bolstering his claims of imagined communities. Bradley draws links with Billig’s (1995) “banal nationalism”, adding:

popular culture has become the most obvious, even ideal way to demonstrate identity and football provides a public environment for such expression... we must recognize football as a popular reminder, of among other things, national identity (pp. 184 - 85).
Meanwhile, Giulianotti (1994) provides empirical evidence to suggest that Scotland’s “intermediary” football clubs – those clubs outwith Celtic, Rangers, Hibs, Hearts, Aberdeen and Dundee United - provide approximately four to six times more Scotland supporters in relation to their respective club supporter numbers. He adds, “the Scottish” support is drawn disproportionately from fans of intermediate and small League clubs, as well as retaining a significant number who support no club-level side” (p. 186).

Dimeo and Finn (2001) and Finn and Giulianotti (1998) have shown the important role that the tartan army plays in Scottish identity politics. They demonstrate how, for some, the tartan army has “been appropriated to become the definitive representation of being Scottish” which symbolises “the new Scotland to come” (Finn and Giulianotti, 1998: 199). Dimeo and Finn (2001) add that “It has been Scottish football that has, in different ways become the most prominent, popular representation of Scottishness” (p. 29). Forsyth (1992) shares these sentiments. “Sport can claim not only to have been the most popular manifestation of Scottishness within Scotland, but actually to have been its distinct assertion of nationality” (p. 334).

This ‘distinct assertion’ has not escaped the members of the tartan army themselves. As Esplin (2003) suggests, “it also appears that many of the TA feel their role has transcended that of merely being football supporters ... some fans believe they are, in fact, cultural ambassadors” (p. 86). He then quotes a fan who says, “I believe we should be used by the likes of the Scottish Tourist Board to promote Scotland abroad” (p. 86). This heightened sense of national representation displayed here as a potential tourist advertisement, has also been shown to manifest itself in a more blatant political manner. Bradley (2002) highlights the relatively high levels of support for the Scottish National Party among Scotland football supporters and states that this could be partly due to “the heightened degree of national identity and nationalist feelings found in the Scottish international environment” (p. 183). He too quotes a Scotland football supporter who states, “I use the Scottish team to project my nationalism, it goes hand in hand” (p. 183). Bradley says that this “was the most
explicit expression of the links between being a fan of Scotland and nationalist identity in particular and sport and nationalism generally” (p. 183).

Sport, therefore, has been shown to be important in “constructing a sense of Scottishness” (Bairner, 2001: 45), but as Bairner himself cautions, sport has a “dual role” which can “at the same time” reveal “fault lines along which Scots have been and remain divided” (p. 45). It is to these possible divisions that we now turn.

17. Sport Reflecting Deeper Divisions in Scottish Society

As Bairner (2001), Smout (1994) and McCrone (1992) have argued, there does appear to be something to which many people perceive as a shared form of Scottish identity even considering the problematic and apparently universally ambiguous nature of defining and categorising the concept of national identity. Aspects of this national identity have been shown in the previous section to manifest themselves, to varying degrees, in Scottish sport. Scottish sport has also, paradoxically, illuminated some of the fault lines along which divisions within Scottish society exist. “Scottish football, at a number of levels, reveals how sport can represent and enliven all kinds of divisions pertinent in society.” (Moorhouse, 1984: 286) The following section attempts to broaden out the concept of national identity and to highlight the divisions which have been shown to challenge claims of a shared ‘national’ identity.

Bairner (2001) states that “Scottishness ... consists of a multiplicity of identities, any one of which may on occasion threaten to undermine the claims of a unifying and transcendent national identity” (p. 51). He further states that his analysis:

reveals the extent to which sport reflects deep divisions in Scottish society and, in so doing, challenges the false premise that there exists a single, uniform Scottish identity that is influenced by sport and that, in turn, operates through sport either to promote nationalist demands or ... to weaken the support for political independence (p. 48).

Bairner’s cautionary note about the dangers of exaggerating the power of Scottish sport in nationalist political discourse is echoed by Jarvie and Reid (1999) who share Bairner’s scepticism about notions of a ‘single, uniform’ national identity,
arguing that sport "should not be used as a fallacious guide to undifferentiated Scottishness but rather as a subtle reflection of social, cultural and political diversity" (p. 22). In trying to avoid fallacious accounts of the divisions visible within Scottish sport, the major divisions analysed in the literature will be discussed in the following section.

18. Scottish Sporting Identity and Links with Protestantism, Unionism and Loyalism

Religion, ethnicity and political allegiance are some of the main, and by no means distinct, divisive lines cutting across Scottish society and affecting notions of Scottish national identity. In discussing his survey of Scotland football supporters, Bradley (2002) writes:

The survey shows that, rather than being a negligible factor in the social, cultural and political make-up of the Scottish international support, and whether fans are religious or not, religious identities, affinities and loyalties are all significantly affected by the religious nuances of Scottish society (p. 190).

A particular strand of Scottish national identity has consisted of strong elements of Protestantism, Loyalism and Unionism, sometimes interwoven. Rangers Football Club, perhaps more than other, has traditionally been perceived to represent these aspects of Scottish identity in the sport sphere. Walker (1990) has noted that "Rangers were part of 'a celebration of Scottishness which was underpinned by a strong unionism or loyalism'" (p. 146). Moreover, this 'unionism or loyalism' was very much intertwined with support for the national football team. Esplin (2003) states:

Traditionally, Rangers fans were synonymous with Scotland, with bluenoses perhaps forming as much as 60 percent of the attendances at Hampden ... There developed a strong club and country bond on the Ibrox terraces and indeed some Rangers fans would wear their club scarves to international games, almost as if the national team were an extension of their Ibrox side (p. 85).

Indeed, the common perception that Rangers fans' Scottish national identity represented a wider — perhaps most legitimate - Scottish national identity is reinforced by Jennings (2001), an Englishman, who concedes that Rangers Football Club is enmeshed in his perceptions of Scottish identity. Meanwhile, Esplin (2000)
in an earlier article, reinforces the overlapping nature of unionism and Protestantism, with support for Rangers and Scotland.

As the fans of the biggest club in Scotland traditionally formed the backbone of the Scotland support, unionist Protestant identity of the club and its followers tied with similar identities during a time when many Scots were as proud to be British as Scottish ... The Scotland support was overwhelmingly Rangers minded and symbols like the Union Jack and Rangers-type songs and paraphernalia were not uncommon among elements of the Scotland support (p. 82).

Scottish football support then, particularly the national side and Rangers FC, were among the most traditional and popularly perceived manifestations of a dual sense of national identity which continued to embrace Scottish and Ulster-British forms of national identity.

Bairner (2001) highlights that after the Union of 1707 even though Scotland was now an integral part of the United Kingdom, “a sense of Scottishness continued to exist” (p. 49). He further notes that this “is proof also, one might suggest, that at no time did Scotland’s more powerful partners seek to eradicate it (Scots identity) in its entirety” (p. 49). When one considers some of the most popular manifestations of Scottish national identity, bound up in unionism and loyalism co-existing comfortably with dual notions of Britishness, it becomes clear just how beneficial this approach was for unionists. As previously acknowledged, Scotland remained largely autonomous after the Union (Paterson, 1994; McCrone et al., 1995), and indeed, certain aspects of Scottishness became strengthened by it, including the rights of the Kirk, the privileges of the royal burghs and the power of the merchant elites (Devine, 1999).

One of the constants of national identity, however, is the contingent and fluid nature of its development and this is evident in more recent analyses of Scottish national identity. Bradley (2002) draws attention to those who have noted the “lessening of Protestant Unionism in Scotland in recent decades as well as the decline in British identity in favour of a more significant Scottish one” (p. 191). This appears to have affected the nature of the support for the Scottish football team with claims that there are fewer Rangers supporters and more “intermediary” clubs’ fans making up the numbers of those following the national side (Giulianotti, 1994). Esplin draws
upon the inter-connected ties of politics, nationalism and economic change to help explain this:

With a little help from Mrs. Thatcher and her apparent attempt to turn Caledonia into an industrial wasteland, Scotland became increasingly republican, nationalistic and anti-Tory – the antitheses of what, historically, Rangers Football Club had stood for (pp. 85 - 86).

However, the extent to which Scotland became ‘increasingly’ republican and anti-conservative during and after Mrs. Thatcher’s term in office should be balanced against pre-Thatcher republican and anti-conservative feeling in the Scottish political sphere. Allowing the reader to draw the obvious links between political and sporting nationalism, evident here in Rangers fans expressing their (loyal and unionist) Scottishness by beginning to distance themselves from the national football side, Esplin then reinforces these links by claiming that the ‘void’ created by the lack of Rangers fans was filled by “supporters from the other clubs in Scotland.” (p. 86) Esplin does not consider that the void may not have been totally filled and that fewer fans now follow Scotland. Reinforcing further the political and sporting nationalism relationship, Esplin (2003) claims:

fans of provincial teams like Dundee, St Johnstone and Inverness, who were fiercely patriotic but who struggled to enjoy regular European football, could indulge both passions by following the national team abroad (p. 86).

It is worth noting that Esplin does not provide a basis on which to claim that fans from these clubs were ‘fiercely patriotic’. He merely propounds the common belief that this is so. Being ‘patriotic’ then, is often seen as being synonymous with supporting Scotland at football and, as Esplin suggests, can allow the passion of patriotism to be ‘indulged’. One should be careful, however, to distinguish patriotism from nationalism, as it is possible to support Scotland in a patriotic manner without having nationalist sympathies and, inevitably there are nationalists who do not support the football team. Football is then, according to Esplin’s account, able to provide a vehicle for patriotic expression but, as evidenced in these accounts of Rangers fans’ relationship with Scotland, is also connected to nationalism in various ways. The possibility of more than one Scottish nationalism (being manifested through sport) is made explicit, with unionist, loyalist Scots and ‘fiercely patriotic’ (assumed to be less loyalist and unionist, if at all) co-existing and behaving differently with regard to their identity. Esplin notes that post-Thatcher
Scotland has witnessed "some Rangers fans who had renounced their Scottish identity. By the start of the new millennium, Rangers fans had for many become synonymous with England" (p. 85). Esplin does not allude to who the 'many' are, perhaps in the belief that this is so unquestionable as to be self-evident.

The Protestant, unionist and loyalist associations with a particular strand of Scottish sporting identity have also, to varying degrees, been associated with Heart of Midlothian Football Club (Hearts). Hognestad (1997) claims that supporters of both Hearts and Edinburgh rivals, Hibs, "are known for utilising sectarian songs and symbols as a means of constructing imagined differences" (p. 195). Citing Hearts historian Mackie (1959: 30), whose simplistic explanation of the Hearts and Hibs rivalry Hognestad, an anthropologist, uncritically accepts, he reiterates that "the established associative link between Hearts and Protestantism must first and foremost be considered as an element in the formation of a local rivalry" (p. 195). Although separate concepts in themselves, Protestantism and Unionism, often interacting with aspects of Scottish identity, are linked to Hearts, albeit in less conspicuous ways throughout their historical development. Central to Hearts' identity is a pride in their official club association to McCrae's Battalion, the First World War Edinburgh British army battalion (Alexander, 2003). McCrae's Battalion, which eleven Hearts players voluntarily joined in 1914 in response to official club requests, developed out of the remnants of the 3rd Edinburgh Rifle Volunteers (3rd ERV) Battalion (Alexander, 2003), the vehemently anti-Catholic, Protestant temperance volunteer company set up in 1874 by John Hope (Finn, 1994). As Finn demonstrates through the use of Hope's protégé David Jamie's biography, "Hope's involvement in anti-Popery was not some minor interest" (p.92). Finn adds that when elected to the Edinburgh Town Council as an unopposed Tory in 1857, Hope "had in his campaign made his views clear as 'an out-and-out Protestant, educationist, and abstainer', who would extend the franchise to Protestants, but not to 'Papists'" (p. 92). McCrae, who would eventually lead the twice re-named Battalion, joined the 3rd ERV at the age of eighteen (Alexander, 2003). The character of the 3rd ERV was unlikely to be ambiguous at the time. Finn (1994) argues:

it can be no surprise that the character of the 3rd ERV was Protestant ... Indeed, the necessity of maintaining the Protestant nature of political and civil life was a
common argument advanced by Hope. Any organisations or institutions that included Catholics had no place in Parliament, questioned their presence in the Edinburgh police force, and implied that they had no legitimate role anywhere within the power of the British State (p. 95).

In recent times, the interconnected elements of Protestantism, unionism and loyalism have arguably manifested themselves sporadically in Hearts spheres, ranging from match day supporters wearing scarves with Ulster loyalism symbols and aligning themselves with the British National Party (Jardine, 2002) to the disruption of the minute silence for the late Pope John Paul II during a Celtic and Hearts fixture (Stow, 2005).

Two of Scotland's leading and most famous football clubs have then had tangible club and supporter based linkages to the intersecting related factors of Protestantism, loyalism and unionism at various periods in their history. If Esplin is correct to assert that the "fans of the biggest club in Scotland" were now being gradually replaced in the Scotland football support by some of the more "provincial" and "fiercely patriotic" groups, partly due to the shifting dynamics of political nationalism, it remains to be seen how the major 'other' social-cultural identity groups within Scottish football were (and are) interacting with their sporting nationalism identity markers.

19. Irish-Catholic Diaspora's Relationship with Scotland Sporting Identity

The Irish diaspora communities have been most publicly represented in Scottish sport, to varying degrees, by a small number of football clubs with Irish names like Shamrock, Erin, Harp, Emmet, Sarsfield and Hibernian spread throughout much of Scotland (Lugton, 1999). Many of these clubs have folded or changed name. The two most successful and famous Irish clubs still in existence are (Edinburgh) Hibernian and (Glasgow) Celtic, with Celtic being formed after Glasgow based Irish immigrants had witnessed the success of Hibernian in Edinburgh. Although Hibernian pre-date Celtic and were the original successful 'Irish' club, most of the
literature focuses on Celtic and its supporters, which is reflected in much of the following section.

Prior to discussing Celtic FC in the Scotland context and widening the discussion to include issues such as ‘sectarianism’ and ‘racism’, it is important to stress Bairner’s (1994) assertion in relation to sections of Celtic’s fans:

... they (Celtic fans) are not alone in being excluded or excluding themselves from identification with the national football team and sectarianism is by no means the only social division which weakens the link between football and national identity in Scotland (p. 20).

Bairner then correctly highlights three possible non-sectarian categories of ‘division’; class, gender and immigrant communities within Scotland (Italian, Jewish and Asian are mentioned as immigrant communities). The acknowledgment that immigrant communities can constitute non-sectarian dividing lines serves to emphasise a key point with regard to the hegemonic construction of sectarian discourse in Scotland. In other words, the unquestionable inclusion of Irish Christians coupled with the exclusion of other immigrant communities from accusations of sectarianism illuminates a distinguishing feature of the ethno-religious signifying process in Scotland. Perhaps this is as a result of the ‘sectarian’ divisions in Scottish sport involving, almost exclusively, intra-Christian rivalry. Moving on to the discussion of Celtic FC and its fans, it becomes clearer why much of the Scottish national identity debate, and the wider issue of ‘sectarianism’ have focused on Celtic’s fans (and the wider Irish community within Scotland) in addition to Rangers FC. As Bairner suggests, the hegemonic construction of Scottish sectarianism is so well established that the possibility of Celtic fans, and the wider Irish catholic immigrant community, excluding themselves from identification with the national football team in a non-sectarian fashion is often overlooked or simply conceived to be implausible. However, it is plausible, perhaps probable, that sections of ‘other’ clubs’ fans, including perhaps, protestant Irish immigrants commonly associated with support for Rangers Football Club, may feel little for the national team’s fortunes for the equally non-sectarian reasons previously suggested. The multi-faceted nature is compounded when one considers why it seems less common for supporters of Rangers to actively support an alternative national team than it is for Celtic’s supporters.
As one of a select few academics to contribute to the study of Celtic FC, Bradley (1998a) claims that “Celtic’s ethnic and religious origins are less unique than is often thought the case” (p. 133). He draws parallels with Celtic’s fans and those of the Basque Athletic Bilbao and the Catalans of Barcelona. “The example of Spanish football shows how sport has a capacity to go beyond the mere aesthetic and entertaining and become socially and politically significant” (p. 128). He argues that sport is a vehicle “through which ideological associations can be reinforced, and has become a highly visible medium of Irish identity in Scottish society” (p. 128). Bairner (2001) adds that “the role of Celtic in helping to maintain a distinctive Irish identity in Scotland cannot be exaggerated” (p. 56).

“Ideological associations” and “distinct identity” are often discussed in relation to sections of Celtic’s fans either denying or reducing their perceived levels of Scottishness. In drawing attention to Bradley’s (1995) work, Bairner (2001) claims:

Celtic supporters ... are frequently lukewarm in their response (to questions of support of the national team) and, in some cases, positively hostile preferring instead to follow the Irish Republic’s team rather than that of their “native” country (p. 56).

Bradley (2002; 1998a; 1995) argues that Celtic supporters are far less likely to feel an affinity with “Scottish symbols” than other clubs’ fans. Corroborating Bairner’s claim, Bradley suggests that fifty two percent of Celtic fans class themselves as Republic of Ireland supporters (Bradley, 2002: 1995). He further states:

The greatest manifestation of Celtic fans’ lack of association with Scottish symbols is seen in a popular perception of their paucity of support for the Scottish international football team. Although identifying with the Scottish national team is seen by the wider football community (including the media) as being typical, this is not the view of Celtic fans... All other categories of Scottish football fan are significantly more likely to attend Scotland matches than Celtic fans (p. 130).

The accuracy of these claims requires further investigation, not least because of the multi-layered and dynamic nature of national identity. It appears true that at a particular moment in time, some Celtic fans will or will not support Scotland. This, however, is surely subject to change depending on many factors including the number of Celtic players in the squad, the recent history between Celtic and the other actors (SFA, Scottish League, other teams), and the current state of the
national team to name but some. Moreover, it seems safe to assume many of these factors are not exclusive to Celtic.

However, there are some elements, for example the political ‘Troubles’ in the North of Ireland, that are more pertinent to sections of Celtic’s fans than to most others (with the possible exception of a section of Rangers supporters) and, which are likely to affect their relationship with markers of Scottish national identity including the Scotland football team. These elements are often conflated with ‘sectarianism’ and ‘sectarian’ discourse and will be discussed in greater depth in the next section. Prior to that, however, it is worth noting Bradley’s (1998a; 1998b) work which partly contextualises the relationship between many Celtic fans and markers of Scottish identity. Bradley (1998a) argues that “since the Reformation, a strong anti-Catholic culture has existed in Scotland and infuses numerous aspects of social and political life” (p. 130). It should be highlighted that there remains much debate as to the extent and even existence of contemporary anti-Catholicism in Scotland (see Devine, 2000). In a Scottish football context, Bradley (1998b) adds:

politics, religion and ethnicity have also traditionally had a bearing on the character of the Scottish international support. ... the booing of some Catholic footballers (especially Celtic Catholic players) playing for Scotland remains an aspect of the overall support. ... Recent research focusing on the fans of the international team reflects that sentiments against Catholic and Irish manifestations in Scotland are not unusual (p. 205).

Bradley evidences this assertion by highlighting a letter sent to a Scottish newspaper complaining about the alleged booing of two ex-Celtic players by their own Scotland fans. Bradley also notes the castigation of a Celtic captain representing Scotland by a ‘small group of (Scotland) supporters’. The extent to which this represents sufficient evidence to furnish claims that anti-Catholicism and anti-Irish manifestations are not unusual in Scotland is questionable.

One must be careful when analysing the wider significance, in respect of these claims, as Celtic or Catholic players do not have a monopoly on being ‘booed’ by sections of the Scotland support. Esplin (2003: 85) provides an account of Rangers player Brian Laudrup being booed when playing in a Scotland versus Denmark fixture. It should be noted, however, that he was playing for the opposition. Nevertheless, the extent to which anti-Catholic or anti-Irish sentiments and
symbolism have been manifest in popular representations of Scottish national sport, together with the possibility of 'Catholic' or 'Irish' Scots being prejudiced, require further discussion, as does the extent to which other groups have been subject to negative treatment. When these issues have been discussed in the literature, they have often been discussed within the context of 'sectarian' discourse and it to these terms that the next section turns.

20. 'Sectarian' and 'Sectarianism'

A great deal of the literature on sectarianism within Scotland has involved conceptual discussion and debate as to the exact and precise meanings associated with the terms 'sectarian' and 'sectarianism', together with related and overlapping questions of the extent to which they influence Scottish society, and how institutional or intentional sectarian practices are.

Defining the Term

"'Sectarianism' is a coy, confusing term that can often obscure much more than it reveals" (Dimeo and Finn, 2001: 34). Bradley, (1995), Dimeo and Finn (2001), Finn, (1990; 1991; 1999a; 1999b), Moorhouse (1994), and Walker, (2000) have called for greater care when using these terms to help clarify debate, while Lynch, (2000) argues "what is clear ... is how little we know about sectarianism" (p. 253). What is equally clear is that the issues surrounding sectarianism are as potent and relevant today as in previous generations and these are often bound up in sport.

Central to any attempt to define and analyse 'sectarianism' is the "interlocking structure of beliefs" (Dimeo and Finn, 2001: 37) and "accepted belief structures" (p. 43) that underpin and shape dominant discourse. Dimeo and Finn argue in their work that these belief structures, products of power relations, obscure anti-Irish racism and ensure that the minority community (Irish, Catholic and Asian in their study) are equally to blame for racial or religious tension. The imprecise and careless use of the term 'sectarianism', irrespective of whether one accepts Dimeo and Finn's conclusions, does lead to what Willis (1982) calls a crippling ambiguity,
and it is precisely this crippling ambiguity that has helped shape and sustain much of the *prejudice* that is hidden within the ubiquitous term 'sectarian' and which has allowed it to be used indistinguishably to describe anti-Catholic / Protestant prejudice *and* legitimate labels of identity.

Bairner (2001) makes the following comment in relation to Moorhouse’s plea for academics to clarify and define terms like sectarianism:

> It was not gloomy academics who created the hate-ridden atmosphere at Celtic Park on 2 May 1999 when Rangers defeated Celtic and thereby won the Scottish Premier League or who fought in the streets of Glasgow into the early hours of the following morning (p. 57).

Indeed it was not. This only serves to necessitate further the clear, concise and consistent use of such terms within the literature. Sugden and Bairner (1993) provide one of the few workable definitions of sectarianism, albeit in an Irish context. They state:

sectarianism can be best understood in two overlapping ways: first as symbolic labelling process through which community divisions are defined and maintained, and second as an ideological justification for discrimination, community conflict and political violence (p. 15).

One can immediately see the value in this definition. It is not without problems, however, as Bairner himself has demonstrated elsewhere (2001) stating, “while the claim is made that Scottishness can transcend other identities, one cannot discount the possibility that even local or regional identities may posses the power to transcend Scottishness” (p. 59). *Symbolic labels of identity* are not necessarily sectarian; other factors must be at play.

Boyle and Haynes (2000) have commented on the level of disagreement existing in Scotland as to the extent that sectarianism continues to influence life in Scotland. In order to begin unpacking this problem, it may help to develop, in addition to conceptions about its definition, an understanding of the *use* and *application* of the term. It has been claimed that the “use of the imprecise term ‘sectarianism’ has long obscured the complexity of the inter-ethnic exchanges between Protestant Scot and Catholic Irish-Scot.” (Dimeo and Finn, 2001: 37). Bradley (1998a) reinforces this point:
... in Scotland, ethno-religious disputes are often viewed as matters of sectarianism, and many of the social and political attributes of Catholic and Irish identity are judged through a discourse of sectarian concepts and language (p. 144).

Drawing the strands of religion, nationalism, politics and football together, Bradley adds:

As a result, not only is Celtic Football Club and its support regularly seen as sectarian, but also Catholic schools, Irish symbols in Scotland, support for a united Ireland and occasionally, the historically strong links between Catholics and the Labour Party are viewed in a similar light (p. 144).

Bradley draws on the links with Scottish national identity when he states:

The consequences of this is that sectarianism in Scotland is frequently located among Irish Catholic immigrants, their perceived contributions to change in the socio-political constitution of the country, as well as their often lack of affinity for important elements of Scottish and British nationhood and the way their institutions, beliefs and practices are perceived as impeding Scottish progress. In a football sense, this is evident in the criticism levelled at the many Celtic supporters who do not give allegiance to the Scottish team, criticism which has long been a feature of Scottish sports writing (p. 144).

Finn (2000) provides examples of the 'frequent location' of sectarianism among Irish Catholic immigrants (and their descendents) by sections of the 'majority' population, adding:

Identification of a visible Catholic presence – whether that is defined geographically or in terms of social institutions, such as Catholic schools, or social or leisure activities, such as football clubs – has become associated with the belief that these displays of difference are the root causes of social division (p. 55).

Distinguishing between 'sectarian' and 'non-sectarian' attitudes towards the Scotland national teams is perhaps more difficult than it often appears, with a variety of possible attitudes, identities and social divisions playing a role, sometimes in a sectarian fashion and sometimes not. Bairner's previous comments that Scottishness can be transcended by other local or regional identities reinforces this point. Bairner appears to accept that 'transcending Scottishness' is possible in a non-sectarian fashion. The problem remains, however, as to the distinction and justification of when local and regional identities are sectarian and when they are not. Much of the literature to date appears to only allow rigid definitions of local or regional when accepting identity perception as 'non-sectarian' whilst failing to adequately justify why these, and not others, are legitimately accepted as 'non-sectarian'. This problem remains.
There are other important features within Scottish sport and national identity analyses which require attention including the possibility of cultural nationalism hindering political nationalism, the role of England, the 'other' in the construction of Scottish national identity, and the manifestation of kitsch and stereotypical national identity markers. Scottish sport continues to provide a site for the demonstration and consumption of a variety of Scottish identities, with rugby union and football representing the two highest-profile team sports. For some, supporting Scotland at sport is the most popular representation of their Scottish national identity, while for others, their Scottish national identity remains polarised or antithetical from the commonly perceived manifestations of Scottish national sporting identities. The range of other possible identities manifested in the sport consumption arena and their impact on Scottish national identity markers remains to be seen.
3 THEORETICAL APPROACHES

1. Introduction

The following section begins by asserting the importance of understanding localised meaning – “signifying systems” (Williams, 1981: 207) - whilst being careful to avoid any “retreat to the present” (Elias, 1978) by remaining sensitive to historical contexts. There then follows an outline of two of the theoretical contributions utilised at a secondary level in the present study – Norbert Elias’s “established and outsider relations”, and concept of “habitus”, together with Erving Goffman’s “dramaturgical model” and associated concepts of “staged front” and “impression management”. The chapter then considers a variety of theories derived from Marxian writings, looking firstly at orthodox Marxism before discussing the development of the Frankfurt School. The Marxism section then turns attention to “overcoming the ‘dupe thesis’”, looking at the use of the concept of ‘hegemony’ before charting the development of cultural studies. This allows us to see the common ground between perspectives reinforcing the value of an eclectic approach whilst avoiding any occurrence of a “violence of abstraction” (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994: 112). The chapter concludes by outlining the work of Pierre Bourdieu, whose influential book, Distinction, provides the primary theoretical contribution for the present study.

2. Towards a Sociological Imagination

Sage (1998) provides a reminder that in analysing the qualitative aspects of sport one must base one’s analysis “on an understanding of its societal moorings” and he adds that “sociology provides the appropriate framework for this type of analysis” (p.2).

Maguire and Young (2002) argue that theory allows us:

- to know which questions have to be asked and which questions are worthwhile asking. It also enables us to put such questions in the right order or sequence – thus allowing us to conduct ‘good’ sociological craft and practice (p.4).

Raymond Williams (1981) adds:
it would be wrong to suppose that we can ever usefully discuss a social system without including as a central part of its practice, its signifying systems, on which, as a system, it fundamentally depends (pp. 206-07).

The present framework, while basing the analysis on ‘societal moorings’, values the importance and emphasis placed on ‘meaning’. Hall (1991) cites Althusser (1969) and demonstrates the importance of meaning:

Knowledge, whether ideological or scientific, is the production of a practice. It is not the reflection of the real in discourse, in language. Social relations have to be ‘represented in speech and language’ to acquire meaning. Meaning is produced as a result of ideological or theoretical work. It is not simply a result of an empiricist epistemology (p. 95).

If an analysis of sport is to move beyond the descriptive then it cannot content itself with “empirically obtained” results which are themselves socially predetermined (Rigauer, 1981: 2 - 3). This is not to suggest that empirically obtained results are inconsequential or secondary. As Sage (1998) highlights:

Sport is a set of social practices and relations that are structured by the culture in which they exist, and any adequate account of sport must be rooted in an understanding of its location within society (p. 14).

In moving beyond the mere descriptive phase, one has to be sensitive to the possible differences within and between societies over time and space. As Gruneau (1988) notes when critiquing the ‘general theory of industrial society’, ‘taken for granted’ assumptions “need to be examined critically” (p.10). He adds:

people forget that they are simply working with an analytic model. The model tends to be taken at face value as an essentially ‘known’ set of conditions. In such cases, all that remains is for historians and sociologists to track the passage of social development from the one apparently known state to the other – for example, from traditional to modern sport. This approach often lends itself to an overemphasis on the descriptive ‘mapping’ of changes rather than their explanation (p. 17).

Some exponents of neo-Marxian or neo-Marxist thought have attempted to overcome this problem. For example, Willis’s (1982) ‘analytic cultural criticism’, in an attempt to discover the place and importance of meaning, values and social explanations within sociological analyses, proposes that the:

analytic socio-cultural task is not to measure these differences precisely and explain them physically, but to ask why some differences, and not others, are taken as so important, become so exaggerated, are used to buttress social attitudes or prejudice... Why do people think a particular difference is important, how do they use the difference, is this use related at all to a general system of attitudes and beliefs: to ideology (p. 120)?
In generating theory towards a sociological imagination, there is a need, therefore, to critically examine, as well as to understand, 'societal moorings' and the values and norms of society, and to avoid overlooking the potential for alternative moorings to exist.

C. Wright Mills (1959) stressed that "no social study that does not come back to the problems of biography, of history and of their intersections within a society, has completed its intellectual journey" (p. 6). If one is to understand as well as measure and map differences then one also requires a careful historical account of developments. This 'historical perspective' is shared by different schools of thought ranging from figurational work (Elias, 1939 / 1978; Elias and Dunning, 1986; Dunning, 1999; Maguire and Young, 2002) to neo-Marxist works (Gruneau, 1983; Hargreaves, 1986: Horne et al., 1999; Sugden and Tomlinson, 2002). Maguire and Young (2002) reiterate the need for historical work:

Students would be well advised to avoid what Norbert Elias described as the 'retreat of sociologists to the present'. Elias was referring to the tendency of sociologists to view their subject matters as concerning the 'here and now' - without reference to how it has emerged out of the past (p. 4).

Horne et al. (1999) clearly agree, adding:

Too often a sociological approach has nodded in tokenistic fashion in the direction of the historical, given some space to the portrayal of an historical backcloth, and then proceeded to offer sociological analysis detached from that historical basis. A critical analysis concerned with history as process and society as product must avoid this (p. 73).

They stress the danger of historically insensitive work being theory-led and predetermined, thus possibly misinterpreting historical complexities, but they also recognise the need for theory by adding "history without adequate conceptualisation or theorisation can be little more than a form of antiquarianism" (p. 77). Demonstrating their preference for linking history to the present while avoiding a "retreat to the present", Sugden and Tomlinson (2002) suggest that:

reporting of history can and should be concerned with a sociology of the present... In order to make full sense of what happens today we must come to understand why it happened, at least in part, in terms of yesterday's events. Thus, it is vital to give research into contemporary phenomena a dynamic historical dimension ... Any interpretation and theory of the present that does not account for history is bound to be seriously weakened (p. 10).
3. Approaches to Studying Sport and National Identity

3.1 Eliasian perspectives on sport and national identity

The figurational approach emphasises the importance of historical processes and draws heavily upon the work of Norbert Elias. In national identity discourse, it relies to a large degree upon Elias's work on the Germans (1996), personal pronouns (1987 / 1991) and established / outsider relations (1994).

Elias and Scotson's (1994) *The Established and the Outsiders*, originally published in 1965, was developed from schoolteacher Scotson's study of a Leicestershire community (given the pseudonym Winston Parva) in the late 1950s. The community was claimed to serve as an "empirical paradigm" (p. xvii) which could be used to understand other micro and macro group relations (figurations) as established and outsider relations have a universal aspect. The established and outsider dynamic is reinforced by the use of "praise" and "blame" strategies:

The established group attributed to its members superior human characteristics; it excluded all members of the other group from non-occupational social contact with its own members; the taboo on such contacts was kept alive by means of social control such as praise-gossip about those who observed it and the threat of blame-gossip against suspected offenders (p. xvi).

The established groups tend to accentuate their positive aspects ("nomic") over the most negative ones ascribed to the outsiders ("anomic") (p. xix).

This *pars pro toto* distortion in opposite direction enables an established group to prove their point to themselves as well as to others; there is always some evidence to show that one's group is "good" and the other is "bad" (p. xix, original emphasis).

It is important to note that according to this theory, individuals from one group cast slurs on individuals from another group based not on their qualities as an individual person but because that person belongs to another perceived inferior group. Dominant groups attribute superior attitudes to themselves ("group charisma") but in return, their individual members must submit to group-specific norms. "The gratification received through one's own share in the group charisma makes up for the personal sacrifice of gratification in the form of submission to group norms" (p. 87).
Elias and Scotson describe the following as "one of the most significant aspects of established-outsider relations" (p. xxii):

To preserve what they (established group) felt to be of high value, they closed ranks against the newcomers, thus protecting their identity as a group and asserting its superiority. This situation is familiar. It shows very clearly the complimentarity of the superior human worth – the group charisma – attributed by the established to themselves and the "bad" characteristics – the group disgrace – attributed by them to the outsiders (p. xxii).

The power dynamic within this theory contains a certain self-fulfilling aspect, with it being claimed that where power differentials are great, outsiders measure their worth in terms of oppressors’ norms and thus find themselves to be inferior. Therefore, the established group regard their power as a "sign of higher value" whilst outsiders regard their inferiority as a "sign of human inferiority" (p.xxvi, original emphasis). Quoting Whitaker’s (1972) study, Elias and Scotson add, “one finds that outcast children are more prone to aggressiveness and in a sense they do actualise the stereotypes attributed to them, at least in some measure” (p.xxviii). The potential for explaining the self-actualising of the ‘national’ stereotype becomes apparent.

Maguire (1999) and Tuck (2003) have discussed national identity and sport from a figurational perspective. Maguire (1999) stresses that national identity construction involves invoking historical legacies, emphasising past glories and attempting to maintain invented traditions, noting that although his framework is guided by Elias’s work, he also utilises Anderson’s imagined community (1983) and Hobsbawm and Ranger’s invented tradition (1983). Tuck (2003) relies on a similar Eliasian framework ascribing sport a central role in the construction and maintenance of national identity discourse:

The close bind of sport with national identification has made it an important conduit for a sense of collective, and popular, consciousness. For example, the health of Wales as a nation is perceived as inseparable from the success / failure of the national rugby team. Sports can also become metaphors for national character – for example, cricket is the embodiment of a ‘quintessential Englishness’, imparting meaning to the nation (p. 180).

Tuck (2003) notes that “Elias (1991) argued that habitus was one of the conceptual keys to the dissolving of the false dichotomy between the individual and society
Tuck explains the concept of habitus by noting that Elias (1996):

found that the fortunes of the nation became sedimented, over many years, into the habitus of its citizens – individuals and the nation become interlinked. This emotional bond between individual and nation has been described as a series of ‘sleeping memories, which tend to crystallize and become organized around common symbols’ (Maguire and Poulton, 1999: 19). These memories form the very building blocks of the ‘narrative of the nation’ which, through the ‘remembering’ of shared collective experiences and ‘invented traditions’, defines I / we relations which, by reference to an ‘imagined community’, imparts meaning to the nation. Yet, through the actions of members of social groups, these traditions can also appear ‘real’ rather than just invented or imagined (p. 180).

Habitus helps to bridge the gap between ‘invented’ or ‘imagined’ and the ‘real’ within national identity discourse. Hargreaves (2002: 36), however, has been critical of over-relying on Hobsbawm’s (1983) ‘invented traditions’ and Anderson’s (1983) ‘imagined communities’, suggesting that commentators such as Klein, (1991), Maguire (1999) and Miller et al. (2001), who utilise these concepts, over-emphasise the “dupe thesis” and allow too little (or no) room for human agency except in the role of being tricked by “a bogey man”. This criticism appears to miss the important point made by Maguire (1999) and Tuck (2003) who, while using the invented tradition and imagined community concepts, avoid the reductionist descent into a “cultural dupe thesis”. Maguire (and Tuck who draws heavily from Maguire, 1999) uses Giddens’ “Practical Consciousness” and “Discursive Consciousness” (Giddens, 1984: 41 - 44) to avoid the dupe thesis. Practical consciousness – deeply rooted, unnoticed memories, collective experience and knowledge – is involved in “two-way traffic” with discursive consciousness – consciously created images, mediated images, invented traditions - and, although allowing for some ‘inventing’ and ‘imagining’ to take place, reinforces the ‘real’ nature of identity discourse. Tuck (2003) makes this point explicit:

National communities are more than imaginary, notional collectives – they are not simply the products of ‘discursive consciousness’. Concepts such as ‘imagined community’ and ‘invented traditions’, while valuable, appear to neglect the interplay between these two levels of consciousness. Indeed, signifiers of national character ... are not wholly ‘imagined’, they provide a real and powerful emotional vocabulary for communities. These codes stimulate ‘mental traffic’ conducted between the two levels of consciousness which can reawaken sleeping memories and, through the practical actions of people, make the nation more ‘real’ (p. 181).

For Maguire, practical consciousness is more important than discursive consciousness. However, practical consciousness – although ‘real’ to the individual
– inevitably and necessarily draws heavily upon discursive consciousness. The practical does not occur in a value-free vacuum. Therefore, it may not be fruitful (or possible) to attempt an analysis of either of them in isolation. As Hall (1991) writes, "experience is the product of our codes of intelligibility, our schemas of interpretation ...there is no experiencing outside of the categories of representation or ideology" (p. 103, original emphasis). Thus, the value and efficacy of practical consciousness requires an analysis and understanding of discursive consciousness.

3.2 Erving Goffman

Goffman’s The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959) “not only announced his arrival as an important, if unorthodox social commentator, [it] also ushered in a new approach to sociology: a sociology of everyday life” (Birrell and Donnelly, 2004: 49). He contributed to linguistics, psychiatry, social psychology, anthropology and sociology, publishing eleven books, many of which still figure prominently in undergraduate courses. Having been supervised by Herbert Blumer at the University of Chicago, gaining his PhD in 1953, Goffman was associated with the emerging approach of symbolic interactionism. Birrell and Donnelly (2004) claim he “anticipated the major shift” (p. 58) in the sociology of sport in the 1990s towards media, textual, and discourse analyses in his later work with Frame Analysis (1974), Gender Advertisements (1979), and Forms of Talk (1981). Goffman was constantly ‘at work’ observing and taking notes, even stopping at an accident scene to observe human behaviour (Birrell and Donnelly, 2004). His most famous model is probably his ‘dramaturgical model’ (1959), which utilised a theatrical performance metaphor to explain social interaction. Birrell and Donnelly suggest “most researchers see Goffman as a generator of sensitising concepts and insightful interactional principles rather than a social theorist” (p. 50).

Application to sport

Birrell and Donnelly observe that “although Goffman has had limited direct influence on the sociology of sport, his indirect influence is widespread” (p. 53, Original emphasis). They add, “Goffman deserves renewed attention from sport
studies scholars because his work connects in exciting ways with the new climate of critical cultural analysis that increasingly characterises our field” (p. 55). Some of the more established work influenced by Goffman includes Ingham (1975), Carroll (1980), Hughes and Coakley (1991), Wacquant (1992) and Schmitt (1993).

Goffman’s ‘dramaturgical model’ provides a rich metaphor and a working set of illustrative concepts that can be insightfully applied to the study of sport supporter groups which engage in “standard maintaining routines” avoiding “destructive information”(Goffman, 1959: 81). For example, Goffman defines the concept of ‘front’ (1959) as “that part of the individual’s [or group’s] performance which regularly functions in a general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those who observe the performance” (p. 32). Given the interactive nature of supporter culture and its performative conventions, Goffman’s concepts heuristically inform our understanding of supporter behaviour and interaction. By linking these ‘fronts’ with his related concepts of ‘front and back regions’ – where the performance is staged (front region) and where suppressed activities occur (back region) - both ‘performer’ and ‘audience’ behaviour and the interchanging nature of these roles and their performances become apparent. The instructive ways in which supporters behave when playing certain teams, the contrasting behaviour exhibited against ‘other’ teams, and the ‘suppressed’ behaviour adopted when fostering the preferred impression in order to avoid providing “destructive information” are revealed.

In the aforementioned study of football supporter behaviour in Italy 90, Giulianotti (1991) applies Goffman’s concept of ‘impression management’, demonstrating that Scotland supporters rejected ‘violent machismo’ in favour of ‘instrumentally ambassadorial’ behaviour, attempting to foster their preferred definition of the situation. Demonstrating Goffman’s utility, Giulianotti presents supporter behaviour as situationally dynamic, with Scotland supporters fostering a particular definition of their own situation in light of the Scottish press juxtaposing the “ambassadorial bonhomie” of Scotland supporters with the “‘problems’ of English soccer” (p. 504). Giulianotti utilises Goffman’s team cohesion model to explain the ‘team’ cohesion of the tartan army, explaining, “through this Goffmanesque interpretive prism, the Scottish fans themselves constitute the performing ‘team’ in the ‘front regions’ of the Genoese and Turinese ‘stages’” (p. 506).
Goffman's metaphorical use of 'team' is particularly useful when applied to supporter 'group' behaviour. He writes, "we commonly find that the definition of the situation projected by a particular participant is an integral part of a projection that is fostered and sustained by the intimate cooperation of more than one participant" (p. 83). This "intimate cooperation" is widely evident among supporters of sports clubs, ultimately empowering individual supporters with the capacity to enhance their club / country and supporter group reputation (as Giulianotti found), or conversely, to 'disrupt the show'. Goffman stresses, "each team-mate is forced to rely on the good conduct and behaviour of his fellows, and they in turn, are forced to rely on him. There is then, perforce, a bond of reciprocal dependence linking team-mates to one another" (p. 88). Furthermore, new team members can function effectively almost immediately as a result of what Goffman terms 'familiarity'.

Among team-mates, the privilege of familiarity – which may constitute a kind of intimacy without warmth – need not be something of an organic kind, slowly developing with the passage of time spent together, but rather a formal relationship that is automatically extended and received as soon as the individual takes a place on the team (p. 88).

Goffman's insights are particularly applicable to supporters groups, helping us comprehend team performances whether performed by inexperienced or experienced team members. In addition to 'familiarity', Goffman adds:

It is to be noted that a given front tends to become institutionalised in terms of the abstract stereotyped expectations to which it gives rise, and tends to take on meaning and stability apart from the specific tasks which happen at the time to be performed in its name. The front becomes a 'collective representation' and a fact in its own right. When an actor takes on an established social role, usually he finds that a particular front has already been established for it (p. 37).

Thus, it is common when among sports supporters, to witness apparently spontaneous bursts of behaviour in which many fans (team-members) know how to "perform" (dress, dance, sing and chant) in successfully carrying out the performative conventions despite having never previously met and, in some cases, having never attended a game. Alternatively, in newly acquiring a position within the 'team', inexperienced supporters may be inconspicuously ignorant. "It may be necessary for the members of the team to learn what the line is to be, and take it, without admitting to themselves and to one another the extent to which their position is not independently arrived at" (p. 93). This may help explain those
supporters who behave in ways they feel they are supposed to and expected to in order to fulfil the role of team-mate ('authentic' supporter).

Goffman's concept 'discrepant roles' is particularly useful when applied to analysing team performances among supporters, illuminating the 'corporate' character of many supporters groups. Goffman stresses:

One overall objective of any team is to sustain the definition of the situation that its performance fosters. This will involve the over-communication of some facts and the under-communication of others ... There are usually facts which, if attention is drawn to them during the performance, would discredit, disrupt, or make useless the impression that the performance fosters. These facts may be said to provide 'destructive information' (p. 141).

As well as being methodologically important – ensuring we treat the responses to interviews / questionnaires as 'performances' in themselves – this demonstrates the legitimacy in treating supporter behaviour (team-member performance) as potentially representative of the wider supporter group (team). As Goffman recognises, there are some teams that have a corporate character and:

whose members are so closely identified in the eyes of other people that the good reputation of one practitioner depends on the good conduct of the others. If one member is exposed and causes a scandal, then all lose some public repute (p. 164).

Application to Current Research

The corporate character among supporter groups helps explain why their individual members might illuminate certain aspects of their group behaviour whilst suppressing others. The more individualised practices within supporter groups can on one level be viewed as representing the wider support base and this proves highly useful when applied to certain aspects of the supporter groups researched in the current study.

Audiences tend to accept the self projected by the individual performer during any current performance as a responsible representative of his colleague-grouping, of his team and of his social establishment ... In a sense these larger social units – teams, establishments, etc. – become committed every time the individual performs his routine; with each performance the legitimacy of these units will tend to be tested anew and their permanent reputation put at stake (p. 235).

If these groups "become committed" every time individuals perform (as members of that team), then the attitudes and behaviour of the respondents in the current study are potentially useful in gauging the values and norms of the wider supporter
groups. Goffman’s instructive potential for understanding sports supporters becomes clearer when applied further. In utilising Goffman at a ‘secondary level’, Giulianotti argues that Scotland supporters promoted a definition of the situation “which could generate an enduring conscience collectif” (p. 509). He adds, “this was achieved through the unanimous depiction of stereotypically English cultural properties, against which they could define themselves” (p. 509). This ‘conscience collectif’ demonstrates the potential for using Goffman to highlight other types of ‘conscience collectif’ among sport supporters in Scotland at both a local and international level, providing theoretical explanations for supporters defining themselves against certain ‘others’.

Goffman helps us explain potential behaviour exhibited by both performer and audience, proving beneficial to the present study which views the sport fans interviewed as both performers and members of an audience at specific moments during the ‘scenes’ discussed during interviews. In explaining the role of observers during a performance, Goffman notes:

> Instead of having to maintain a different pattern of expectation and responsive treatment for each slightly different performer and performance, he (observer) can place the situation in a broad category around which it is easy for him to mobilise his past experience and stereotypical thinking. Observers then need only be familiar with a small and hence manageable vocabulary of fronts, and know how to respond to them, in order to orient themselves in a wide variety of situations (p. 36).

This is highly instructive allowing us to understand more fully the “manageable vocabulary of fronts” and how these potentially become established stereotypes to which audiences (and performers) become receptive, perhaps to the detriment of alternative less manageable ‘vocabularies of fronts’. This may help explain situational behaviour by supporters in a variety of settings – varied reactions against different ‘others’ according to highly localised (mis)understanding of their ‘vocabulary of fronts’.

In addition to his concept of ‘vocabulary of fronts’, Goffman provides two related concepts that help explain the ‘dramatic’ and ‘idealised’ behaviours exhibited by sport supporters, offering the possibility of for understanding stereotypical behaviour. Goffman notes, “if the performer is to be successful he must offer the kind of scene that realises the observers’ extreme stereotypes” (p. 49). Thus, the two
related concepts, "dramatic realisation" and "idealisation" prove useful. Goffman explains dramatic realisation, noting that, "while in the presence of others, the individual typically infuses his activity with signs which dramatically highlight and portray confirmatory facts that might otherwise remain unapparent or obscure" (p. 40). Goffman explains 'idealisation', adding:

Thus, when the individual presents himself before others, his performance will tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society, more so, in fact, than does his behaviour as a whole. To the degree that a performance highlights the common official values of the society in which it occurs, we may look upon it ... as an expressive rejuvenation and reaffirmation of the moral values of the community (p. 45).

It seems clear that both from a methodological and theoretical point, the extent to which supporters engage in confirmatory acts, dramatically highlighting certain facts in order to confirm the moral values of that community – perhaps by reproducing the expected stereotype – can be better understood by utilising Goffman's dramaturgical model. Alternatively, the extent to which supporters under-play particularly negative aspects of behaviour and identity by eschewing the disdainfully viewed "discrepant role", engaging in "standard maintaining routines" and thus avoiding "destructive information", may also be understood more fully. The present research utilises Goffman at a secondary level to help explain the more localised (symbolically interactive) behaviours exhibited in the case studies of sport supporters.

3.3 Marxist Theories

3.3.1 Orthodox Marxism

Marx's base-superstructure model was concerned with the role of cultural institutions in analysing industrial societies. In recognising Marx's continuing influence within modern day political and social theory, Cuff et al. (1998) stress:

While we might now reverse the relationship between them which Marx posited and recognise cultural institutions as being more significant and powerful in shaping social life than they were in Marx's day, the fact remains that the problem continues to be defined in its most basic terms by reference to a model of society which originates in Marx ... Indeed, the base-superstructure model as a method of
analysis is as popular and widespread among contemporary social theorists as it has ever been (p. 10, original emphasis).

For Marx, economic activity is the base upon which institutions and the ideas generated within them are balanced. As Calhoun et al. (2002) state:

Marx provided a theory to understand the connection between the concrete relationships among people and the broad patterns of social order that emerge from them in specific eras – an argument now known as “historical materialism” (p. 19).

Marx was influenced by the work of Hegel – particularly his dialectical mode of logic, viewing history as a progressive development based on conflict and resolution - and although critical of Hegel’s non-materialist conception of reality, Marx adopted much from Hegel’s method. Marx believed that Hegel’s idealist philosophy provided the illusion that human inequalities were natural actualities of history grounded in consciousness rather than products of material conditions giving rise to economic inequalities. “For Marx, the real history of human development could not be a history solely of thoughts or ideas; it would have to be a history of human life in the real world, i.e., the world of economic and political being” (Cuff et al., 1998: 15). Therefore, rather than ideas coming first, as Hegelians believed, Marx posited that ideas were the historical outcomes of economic activity (Morrison, 1995). Moreover, Marx believed the aim of theory was to not merely interpret history but to change it (Marx, 1947). Calhoun et al. (2002) explain further:

For Marx ... ideas cannot be understood in isolation, but rather only in direct relation to the social context within which they were born. In the German Ideology Marx noted, “The production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness, is directly interwoven with material activity and material intercourse of men and appear at this stage as the direct efflux of their material behaviour.” In other words, it is not ideas that determine the material world, but rather the other way around. Marx called this “turning Hegel over on his head” (p. 21).

Marx stressed that in understanding human existence only as ideas and thoughts was to overlook the realities of human experience, presenting a distortion which serves to “misrepresent empirical reality by ‘turning it upside down’” (p. 44). As Morrison (1995) summarises:

Marx wanted to show that ideas were in fact expressions of material relationships ... Second, Marx wanted to show that he could provide a coherent link between ideas and material activity so that he could break with the philosophic tradition of ideology as an abstract representation of the idea. The importance of this point cannot be overestimated. In contrast to Hegelian thought that ideas came first historically, Marx took the view that ideas were historical outcomes of economic activity (p. 44).
One of Marx’s main concepts, ‘ideology’, first expressed in the first section of *The German Ideology*, entitled *Feuerbach*, plays a vital role. As Morrision (1995) explains:

Marx’s theory of perception hinges on the assertion that, in ideology, everything appears upside down and actively turns things upside down in imagination. This active turning of reality upside down in perception is directly linked to the fact that dominant conceptions always reflect the dominant material relationships, and this happens, Marx thought, when the ideas and beliefs reflect only the wills, intentions and interests of the dominant classes (pp. 46 - 47).

Ideas “take on the form of universality” (Marx, 1970: 39), allowing the dominant classes to represent their interests as the common interest and “the only universally valid ideas” (ibid: 41). Thus, as Morrison (1995) notes:

The real relations are represented by conceptions which ‘assume an independent existence over and against’ individuals and appear to them to be the legitimate system of ideas and social relations. This happens when the ideas and beliefs (distillates) reflect only the will and interests of a dominant class ... In this sense, ideology legitimates and justifies the reality of one class (p. 49).

Marx’s conceptualisation of ideology is expressed in his following description of property ownership and the wages / profit relationship:

Political economy starts with the fact of private property; it does not explain it to us. It expresses in general, abstract formulas the *material* process through which private property actually passes, and these formulas it then takes for *laws*. It does not *comprehend* these laws, i.e., it does not demonstrate how they arise from the very nature of private property. Political economy throws no light on the cause of the division between labour and capital, and between capital and land. When, for example, it defines the relationship of wages to profit, it takes the interest of the capitalists to be the ultimate cause, i.e., it takes for granted what it is supposed to explain” (Marx and Engels, 1975, Vol 3: 270 - 271).

The power (class) relationships directly linked to physical production and the existence of private property was, for Marx, reproduced in wider society. Cuff et al. (1998) explain this further:

Those who dominated within the process of economic production ruled the society; for example, the aristocrats who controlled the land also made up the ruling group within pre-industrial society. The key positions and relationships in society were those of class ... Hence, the concept of class is wider than the analysis of economic relations alone; it involves the analysis of the structure of society as a whole ... Economic structures are ‘basic’ to society for Marx, for it is in terms of the relationships established around a given form of economic production that social class is formed, which, in its turn, becomes the fundamental relation around which all other social activities are structured (p. 23).
Thus, the owning class retains an interest in the intellectual culture and ideas circulated in society. Moreover, as Morrison (1995) stresses, “Marx believed ... the terms under which we work for our livelihoods condition our perception of the world, and this means that our apprehension of reality is conditioned by our location in a social class” (p. 48). The hierarchical structure of class was reinforced by Marx who asserted that once a class begins the struggle against the class above it, it is involved in the struggle against the class below it (Marx and Engels, 1975, Vol 3).

Cohen (1978) summarises Marx’s theory of production within the class system:

First, non-owners produce for others who do not produce for them; second, the livelihoods of the non-owners depend on their relations with their superiors; third, the dominant classes have direct rights over the economic product of the producer; fourth, the owners of the means of production always receive more from the production process than the producer; and fifth, non-owners are subject to the authority of their superiors (pp. 69 – 70).

Marx’s writings have raised some important questions. First, in reference to his dialectical model, Marx inaccurately predicted that within the capitalist system the proletariat would become more unified and powerful and eventually engage in a revolutionary uprising transforming the entire capitalist mode of industrial societies.

At a certain stage of development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or - what is but a legal expression of the same thing – with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then occurs a period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed (Marx, 1859, 1977: 20 - 21).

Second, in relation to his conception of ideology, how does society distort our perception of reality and how are individuals deceived into accepting these perceptions as substitutes for reality? (See Smith, 1974; Larrain, 1983). Western Marxism became concerned to explain the failure of the proletariat revolution in industrial societies (Cuff et al., 1998).

This failure was treated as itself needing to be interpreted in Marxist terms rather than as disproving Marx, whose work was rethought in the light of this development. Here, a key element was the reflection that the working class had been unable to perceive the true nature of capitalist society and hence its own real interests, which, on Marx’s premises, required the overthrow of capitalist society. Marx’s basic model held that the development of capitalist society would make its own ruthlessly exploitative and dehumanising character ever more starkly apparent ... The problem was, then, to understand how working-class consciousness had actually been shaped, what had prevented the rise of revolutionary consciousness,
and how, if at all, such consciousness could be prompted among the working-class (pp. 184 - 185).

The Frankfurt School became prominent Marxist theorists trying to discover the reasons for these failures.

In moving beyond orthodox Marxist theory, Rigauer (2000) suggests that:

we need to distinguish between Marxian and Marxist theories, between orthodox and advanced concepts, between aspects of the Marxian and Marxist theories integrated into other academic theories and subjects, and the theory and practice of Marxism as a distinctive political ideology (p. 28).

It is to some of the “more advanced” concepts of Marxian interpretations that we now move in turning attention to the development of The Frankfurt School.

3.3.2 The Frankfurt School

The Frankfurt School, founded in 1923, continued to develop Marxist sociology in Western Europe (Rigauer, 2000) and “sought to broaden the terms of Neo-Marxist debate decisively” (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994: 100). They were committed to human emancipation and stressed “the repressive effects of bourgeois thought and culture” (Hargreaves, 1982: 6). Rigauer (2000) claims that they “rejected any form of economic determinism and assumed dynamic relations and interdependencies between the economy and the culture of a society” (p. 41). They were critical of orthodox Marxism, abandoning the traditional economic base-superstructure explanations in favour of analyses of ideology and politics (Marshall, 1998). The Frankfurt School Marxist approach has been described as critical theory and as an attempt to integrate Marxist and Freudian methodology (Rigauer, 2000). Gruneau (1993) explains:

The critical theory of Adorno, Horkheimer, Marcuse, and their colleagues in the so-called Frankfurt School of German Marxism was a hybrid of diverse philosophical and theoretical influences. But despite this mélange of influences, The Frankfurt School theorists always saw themselves as extending Marx’s critical legacy (p. 94).

They attempted to analyse and interpret social relations and meanings in a non-positivistic way (Rigauer, 2000). Such theories have been criticised for being overly deterministic and pessimistic, overlooking possible liberative tendencies in cultural
forms (Hargreaves, 1982). Gruneau (1993) makes this criticism in relation to sport research:

There was no way to argue, even in its most commodified and administered form, sport might prove to be a contested area of social life or that certain practices in sport might take on an oppositional or emancipatory character for certain groups in certain times (p. 96).

There was a need, therefore to develop Frankfurt School critical theory to incorporate the possibility of a non-totalising concept of power which rejected ideological determinism. Gruneau (1993) notes that although they have been widely criticised, the Frankfurt School’s concerns have continued to be raised in other intellectual schools and traditions.

In moving beyond orthodox Marxism, Sage (1998) urges that a distinction be made between “Marxism as a body of knowledge providing insights into society, politics, and economics, and Marxism as ideology guiding so-called Marxist countries” (p. 8). Rigauer (2000) suggests that ‘Marxian’ refers to Marx’s writings, ‘Marxist’ to social theory, and ‘Marxism’ to political ideology, adding “in a nutshell, the academic development of Marxist theory has always been overshadowed by controversies about Marxism as an ideology” (p. 30). Hall (1991) claims that Marx did not, in the end, conceptualise society by ‘mode of production’ only and adds:

one can no longer think of the State in that way. The State is a contradictory formation which means that it has different modes of action, is active in many different sites: it is pluricentred and multi-dimensional ... but it does not have a singly inscribed class character (p. 90).

This move away from traditional base-superstructure Marxist conceptions of economic reductionism and determinism within cultural studies has been charted by McDonald and Birrell (1999) who discuss the Marxist inspired works of Althusser and EP Thompson whom they describe as a ‘structuralist’ and ‘culturalist’ respectively.

While structuralists focus on the overdetermined ideological structures and apparatuses of (class) power, culturalists turn their attention to the significance of human agency in the construction of oppositional working class cultures. Culturalists critique Althusser’s notions of ideological power as ahistorical, overly deterministic, and largely devoid of human agency. In turn, structuralists view the culturalist emphasis on working class agency in the making of oppositional cultures as hopelessly romantic and regressively humanistic (p. 287).
As Jarvie and Maguire (1994) note, Marxist inspired work began shifting attention to understanding how the relations of production are maintained – in light of poverty, unemployment and so on – and Gramsci’s hegemony concept was influential in much of the culturalist work seeking to avoid deterministic explanations. The structuralist writers were heavily influenced by Althusser’s essay ‘Ideological State Apparatuses’ (Althusser, 1971). Although criticised for being “rigorous but wrong” and of being a ‘super-structuralist’ by Hall (1991), (1992), Althusser’s central concern with the reproduction of State ideology is maintained in much of the work within the Marxist tradition with Gruneau (1988) suggesting:

Marxist perspectives on sport emphasise how the dominant class that came into being with the advent of industrial capitalist processes was able to extend its influence over all other areas of life. This not only included such areas as education, philosophy, politics, science, and the arts; it also included ‘leisure’ activities such as games and sports (p. 23).

The potential for national identity to be included as an area of this sort is made obvious by Gruneau when he adds “the obsessive pursuit of leisure can be viewed as a manifestation of a society where work has lost all meaning and the desire for political discourse has been replaced by the desire for escapist entertainment” (p. 25).

### 3.3.3 Overcoming the ‘Dupe Thesis’

As mentioned, Hargreaves (1982) and Gruneau (1983, 1988) highlight the shift away from overly deterministic and one-sided accounts of sport, reminding us not to overlook the potential role of sport as an oppositional movement or form of resistance. Hall (1980) believed it possible to reconcile structuralist theory and cultural studies through the use of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony. As Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) state, “hegemony theory provided the potential for understanding both the liberative and controlling features of culture” (p. 51).

Hall (1992) argues that “the notion that Marxism and cultural studies slipped into place ... is entirely mistaken” (p. 280) and adds “the encounter between British cultural studies and Marxism has first to be understood as the engagement with a problem – not a theory, not even a problematic” (p. 279). Hall states that Marxism
was ‘imprisoned’ by its orthodoxy, its doctrinal character, its determinism and its reductionism, and suggests that Gramsci allowed certain questions to be asked.

I personally think cultural studies in the British context, in a certain period learned from Gramsci: immense amounts about the nature of culture itself, about the discipline of the conjunctural, about the importance of historical specificity, about the enormously productive metaphor of hegemony... While Gramsci belonged and belongs to the problematic of Marxism, his importance for this moment of British cultural studies is precisely the degree to which he radically displaced some of the inheritances of Marxism in cultural studies” (Hall, 1992: 280 - 281, original emphasis).

In a passage which Crehan (2002) describes as “one of the most frequently quoted glosses of hegemony” (p. 138), Gramsci (1971) explains the concept as a relation of:

‘s spontaneous’ consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group; this consent is ‘historically’ caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production (p. 12).

McDonald and Birrell (1999) demonstrate the important contribution that Gramsci’s concept of hegemony has played in North American sociology of sport circles claiming that its use could provide a bridge from Marxism to cultural studies. Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) agree and state that hegemony is used as a conceptual tool in order to avoid the reductionism of orthodox Marxist thought. Hegemony became such an important conceptual tool in the cultural studies armoury that Jarvie and Maguire (1994) describe it as cultural studies’ “most significant concept” (p.108) while Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) believe it to be the “specific character and meaning of the cultural studies project” (p. 54).

Gramsci’s concept of hegemony has been used by John Hargreaves (1986) in Sport, Power and Culture. Gruneau (1993), one of the book’s critics, even admits that it was “a remarkably insightful and extremely ambitious work, perhaps the 1980s best book-length piece of sport and social criticism” (p. 102 - 103). Using hegemony as the central conceptual tool, the book deals primarily with the notion of hegemonic struggle in British society from the eighteenth century to the mid-1980s, detailing the emergence of modern sports forms. As Stuart Hall, in the book’s foreword noted, “Hargreaves’ study has the considerable merit of treating sport as a social phenomenon and setting it in the context of power and culture where it properly
Gramsci's concept of hegemony, as Hargreaves explains, involves power relations functioning largely in terms of voluntary compliance, where both dominant and subordinate groups can gain. Hargreaves argues that increased state intervention occurred in British sport since the 1960s to provide a cathartic effect and to foster a stronger sense of national identity. Hargreaves draws attention to state and national ceremonies like the opening of Parliament, Remembrance Sunday and F.A. cup final day, and demonstrates, through hegemonic processes, how they became national symbols designed to invoke working-class loyalty. For Hargreaves, the national identity being invoked represented a "national unity in a manner more consistent with the dominant class's preferred view" (p. 155), but voluntarily adopted.

The book has been criticised for using a Gramsci conceptualisation of hegemony and integrating it with a Foucauldian notion of power (Gruneau, 1993). Nevertheless, Hargreaves manages to provide one of the best Gramsci-inspired analyses of sport available in the academy providing an excellent example of British cultural studies work in the field of sport and culture.

A hegemonic framework allowed for Marxist-inspired analyses of institutions but also provided the opportunity to go beyond Marx "to analyse the ways that political, cultural, and ideological institutions and practices are integrated with the economy to form the whole" (Sage, 1998: 21). Hegemony rejected simple class-based concerns, encouraging theories to recognise the 'incomplete', 'unfixed' and 'diverse' nature of power relations (Hargreaves, 1982; Hargreaves and McDonald, 2000; Sugden and Tomlinson, 2003).

The traditional base-superstructure distinction was rejected by this concept. "On the contrary, there are dominant social groups whose intellectual members – both in the ruling and subject classes – develop, define and negotiate values, norms and class fractions" (Rigauer, 2000: 43). Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) claim that hegemony "resists the idea that people are passive recipients of culture and keeps intact what is arguably the inherent humanism of Marxism ... it allows for cultural experiences such as sports to be understood as both exploitative and worth while" (p. 50). The term 'praxis' has been used to describe the human agency within the
making of history, and it is this praxis which allows for the establishment and support of particular structures of power, rather than overly deterministic ideological mechanisms (Gramsci, 1971; Williams, 1977). Hegemony:

involves a struggle for cultural leadership. Leadership is secured only to the extent that particular ruling ideas or ideologies are made to appear natural, that is, as commonsense. Power relations are never merely imposed from above but involve the active consent of subordinate groups and the taming of resistance through accommodation (MacDonald and Birrell, 1999: 288).

However, sport can also offer (perhaps in equal measure) various forms of resistance and opposition to ideological discourses (Hargreaves, 1982; Gruneau, 1983; Gruneau, 1988).

Weber (1968) notes that “every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of voluntary compliance, that is, an interest (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience” (p. 212). Weber (1968) defines authority as ‘legitimate forms of domination’. Subordinates consider this authority to be legitimate – not necessarily rational, right or natural (p. 214). Legitimate domination requires the willingness and support of subordinates for its survival. Weber’s ‘Traditional Authority’ – one of three types he outlines – represents a means by which inequality is created and preserved. For Weber, commonly accepted customs and traditions constitute the underlying source of this authority and he argues that ‘rational’ and ‘legal’ authority are hindered from development by ‘traditional’ forms (Weber, 1968). Where people develop uniform types of conduct, Weber refers to this as ‘usage’. Long established usages become customs, with conformity becoming ‘convention’. Convention carries with it mild or informal sanctions of disapproval including possible ostracism. As Hall (1991) claims, however:

the critical question in developed liberal democracies is precisely how ideology is reproduced in the so-called private institutions of civil society – the theatre of consent – apparently outside of the direct sphere of play of the State itself (p. 98).

Hall believes that the central problem of hegemony is deciding where the state / civil society boundary line lies. To what extent are national identities structured, layered and inscribed by civil society and how little or how much of national identity discourse is part of what Taylor (1989) calls “strongly valued goods” (p. 120)? As Morgan, (1999) highlights, these matter because “they are not seen as good by the fact that we desire them, but rather... are seen as goods which we ought
to desire, even if we do not, goods such that we show ourselves as inferior or bad by our not desiring them” (p. 51).

3.3.4 Cultural Studies and the Study of Sport

British cultural studies traces its main origins to the work of Hoggart (1957), Williams (1958) and EP Thompson (1963) and the opening in 1964 of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at Birmingham University, under the guidance of Raymond Williams and then Stuart Hall (Hargreaves, 1982; Horne et al, 1999; Hargreaves and McDonald, 2000). Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) describe cultural studies as “concerned with the social significance and systematic analysis of cultural practices, experiences and institutions” (p. 48). It is concerned with feelings and meanings of the lived reality of everyday life (p. 48).

Andrews (2000) draws attention to the close relationship between cultural studies and post structuralism. “I believe the practice of post-structuralist intellectualising is closely allied to that of cultural studies (which itself has increasingly been informed by post-structuralist theorising)” (p. 131). Andrews calls for cultural studies to define itself more clearly and suggests that cultural studies work “by implication” refers to post structuralist work (p. 131), thus demonstrating the ambiguity of any clear dividing line between the two traditions and perhaps reinforcing the need for clear definitions.

Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) highlight that cultural studies began to be introduced into mainstream sports degree courses, and suggest that the 1982 publication of Hargreaves’s edited collection ‘Sport, Culture and Ideology’ “marked a watershed in the development of sports sociology” (p. 52). As Hargreaves (1982) explained in the opening section of that collection:

Our concern is for a more open, less incomplete and biased social analysis of sport than is at present being provided by the major institutionalised sources of theory... The potential for such an intervention has been enhanced by the recent growth in another area of research – cultural studies” (pp: 4 - 5).
Hargreaves and McDonald also demonstrate that some work does not fit neatly into a cultural studies paradigm and has been specified under the umbrella description ‘critical theory’, which itself subsumes variants of neo-Marxism, feminism and cultural studies. Jarvie and Maguire (1994) summarise some of the general aims of a cultural studies of sport. These include a consideration of the relationship between power and culture, demonstrating the extent to which sport (or leisure) has been consolidated, contested, maintained or reproduced within society, and they highlight the role of sport and leisure as a site of popular struggle (p. 124). Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) summarise cultural studies work as being receptive to and engaging with different theoretical traditions, linking theory to real world empirical investigation, and being politically interventionist exposing (often hidden) power relations.

McDonald and Birrell (1999) suggest that cultural studies sports scholars are “seeking to move beyond the confines of particular disciplinary boundaries” (p. 286) and describe cultural studies as “anti-disciplinary” in nature (p. 285). They cite Nelson et al (1992) who claim “cultural studies is not merely interdisciplinary; it is often ... actively and aggressively anti-disciplinary – a characterisation that more or less ensures a permanently uncomfortable relation to academic discipline” (pp: 1 - 2). McDonald and Birrell (1999) provide a definition of cultural studies:

A cultural studies perspective suggests that subjectivity and social life are always already embedded in particular relations of power that produce particular knowledges. The world has been made to mean according to which particular groups have access to the important cultural signifying systems (like the media) to proclaim a particular world view. People shape knowledge, and this knowledge is linked to relations of domination and subordination (p. 292).

This would negate any claim to a completely objective social account of reality. The structuralist legacy, of analysing the reproduction of (dominant) power relations, within cultural studies is made obvious in this statement.

### 3.3.5 From Structuralism to Post Structuralism

As highlighted previously, good sociological analysis can involve applying theoretical concepts from more than one school of thought or theoretical perspective
Work within the cultural studies tradition is “never a pure or distinct theoretical or methodological approach” (McDonald and Birrell, 1999: 287). Indeed, some analysts have described it as less of a discipline and more of a combination or intersection of disciplines (Hall, 1980; Hargreaves, 1982; Hargreaves and McDonald, 2000). McDonald and Birrell (1999) suggest that in North America, cultural studies, poststructuralist, postcolonialist and postmodernist insights have increasingly combined. They admit that their goal:

is to join the interdisciplinary and political commitments of cultural studies and critical theories with recent developments within qualitative methodology, especially the poststructuralist-inspired ‘linguistic turn’ (p. 285).

Poststructuralists give primacy to language, meaning and representation (Weedon, 1987; Andrews, 2000) and recognise that language is not only expressive – expressing ideas – but is constitutive – “experience is constituted through language” (MacDonald and Birrell, 1999: 290). Sage (1998) writes that “the principle significance of meanings is that they shape how people behave. That is, they are real in their consequences” (p. 3). This claim has special significance for the present study if Sage is correct to claim that meanings “are socially constructed, and certain norms, values, and behaviours will become mobilised around the meaning that an idea, object, or event has come to have” (p. 4). It would be important, therefore, to unpack meanings in and around symbols of Scottish national sport, including flags, colours, songs, jokes, and historiography, and the processes by which these meanings materialised and were sustained. It may be particularly important to discover exactly what these meanings are and how they materialise and become sustained within and by agents themselves.

It was against this linguistic backdrop together with the events of May 1968 in France which witnessed large-scale protests from students, writers, academics and artists that led to the development of poststructuralism. Poststructuralism “emerged as a loosely aligned series of philosophical, political and theoretical rejoinders to the unrest and turbulence that engulfed modernising France during the late 1960 and early 1970s” (Andrews, 2000: 106). If existentialism was too subjective and unscientific, structuralism was too limited and constraining (Andrews, 2000). For Andrews, the ‘intellectual journey’ made by Roland Barthes from Mythologies
(1972) to The Pleasure of Text (1975) "provides a neat summation of the shift from structuralism to post-structuralism" (p. 113).

Post Structuralism and Sport

One of the catalysts in the shifting nature of the study of culture and interpretation within the field of sport occurred with Geertz's (1973) study of the Balinese cockfight (McDonald and Birrell, 1999). Geertz's 'thick description' provided deep insights into Balinese (male) culture through the rituals and practices of the cockfight. Realist ethnographies were being challenged, leading to what has been described as "the crisis of representation" within social research (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998: 19).

At issue now is the author's presence in the interpretative text, or how the researcher can speak with authority in an age when there are no longer firm rules concerning the text, its standards of evaluation, and its subject matter (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998: 19).

McDonald and Birrell (1999) add that "fieldworkers realised that absenting themselves from the narrative accounts they were producing was not just a polite fiction; it was bad science" (p. 289). These methodological issues, central to cultural studies frameworks, are discussed in the methodological chapter.

Marqusee uses the term 'fixed cultural attribute' (p. 129) to describe the belief by some in the naturalness and inevitability of national identity and its signifying practices. Saussure (1959), Barthes (1972) and Hall (1991) have demonstrated the necessity for a code of 'common understandings' in the fields of linguistics, semiotics and culture respectively. "Every means of expression used in a society is based, in principle, on a collective norm – in other words, on convention" (Saussure, 1959: 68). Barthes (1972) adds that culture can be understood as a "signifying system through which necessarily ... a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced and explored" (pp: 109 - 110). This social order is guided by 'patterns of action' (Morgan, 1994: 66) which are:

modulated by rules, resources, traditions, and organizations. Each of these sets out limits that constrain, rather than absolutely determine (given their rootedness in human agency), what we can and cannot do. They induce us to act in certain ways and impress upon us that social actions have to be done in accordance with what is
regarded to be the 'normal,' 'expected,' and 'official' way to do and value them (Morgan, 1994: 66 - 67).

Taylor (1989) refers to these as 'strongly valued goods'- the way one ought to behave, act value and so on. Gruneau (1988) draws upon Hall (1981) to describe the history of modern sport as a history of cultural struggle where:

some cultural forms and practices are driven out of the centre of popular life, actively marginalized, so that something else can take their place. In sport, the focus of these struggles has been the monopolistic capacity to define the dominant forms and meanings of sports practices (p. 20).

As McDonald and Birrell (1999) note “an event (re)creates diverse meanings across time periods, while certain preferred readings become institutionalised or formalised as 'history’” (p. 294). Ideologies, identities and meanings are never fixed but are ‘articulated and ‘rearticulated’ according to the ‘closures’ and ‘constraints’ that ‘determine’ them (Hall, 1991).

But they cannot determine in the harder sense of fix absolutely, guarantee. People are not irrevocably and indelibly inscribed with the ideas that they ought to think; the politics that they ought to have are not, as it were, already imprinted in their sociological genes. The question is not the unfolding of some inevitable law but rather the linkages which, although they can be made, need not necessarily be (Hall, 1991: 93 original emphasis).

Post-structuralists view national identity discourse, therefore, as neither simply 'imagined' nor 'inevitable' but to some extent, a combination of both, the result being a form of reality involving some reinforcement of and some challenge to popular or dominant reference points.

3.4 Multi theoretical approach?

There are commonalities across the theoretical spectrum as demonstrated by figurationalists and various traditions of neo-Marxists sharing a concern with historical developments and the linkages between theory, history and power (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994). When linking theory and history to the empirical, it has been suggested that cross-theoretical commonalities must be welcomed and developed to widen our understanding of sport (Horne et al, 1999). For example Rigauer (2000) argues "the claim for dominance of one theory would necessarily lead to a dogmatic
reductionism of the sociology of sport and all scientific development would come to a standstill” (p. 46).

It would, of course, be theoretically exhilarating to pick and choose the ‘good’ and discard the ‘bad’ parts of various schools of thought in the pursuit of the perfect theory. The danger is the development of an unattainable hybrid theory which is epistemologically and ontologically at odds - unworkable, paradoxical, and contradictory. Sage (1998) has suggested, however, that in developing a theoretical framework it is wise to be reflexive and to avoid sticking unnecessarily to one framework if it enables better research. Sage claims:

Although it is difficult to read and listen to points of view that problematise or criticise our own cherished attitudes, values, and beliefs, as long as we unquestionably hold our own points of view absolute while interpreting other views as merely misguided, the most important step has not been taken (pp. 11 - 12).

In their criticism of American anthropologist John MacAloon, who had previously been critical of British cultural studies (MacAloon, 1992), Hargreaves and Tomlinson (1992) argue:

MacAloon tends to view theoretical frameworks as incommensurable, a stance whereby one either accepts a framework in its entirety or nothing at all ... It is perfectly possible for one to abstract certain insights while critically distancing oneself from other aspects (p. 212).

Jarvie and Maguire (1994) have warned of the dangers of a “violence of abstraction” occurring in some of the Gramsci inspired work by sociologists of sport, claiming that they have used it in a ‘simplistic’ and ‘out of context’ way (p.112). By turning attention to the development of cultural studies it is possible to witness the formation and continuing development of a theory which relies heavily on aspects of the Marxian legacy (Hargreaves and McDonald, 2000) but rejects other aspects of Marx. Some writers describe cultural studies as less of a theory and more of an approach which draws upon various theoretical positions (McDonald and Birrell, 1999; Hargreaves and McDonald, 2000). Although not a cultural studies advocate, Giddens (1987) agrees that it is possible to accept and reject various aspects of Marx’s writings. “To declare sympathy with certain of Marx’s conceptions does not imply accepting his views, or those of his self-professed followers, in their entirety” (p. 24). The approach taken in the present study is sympathetic to Horne at al (1999) and Rigauer (2000), who welcome and encourage cross-theoretical commonalities. One should avoid, however, taking aspects of
theoretical concepts out of context in order to avoid any violence of abstraction occurring.

What do they know of rugby who only rugby know?

Examining any text in isolation from the larger historically specific concerns is therefore an ill-conceived focus, as signs are always incomplete without their contexts or interpretants ...[Thus] as meanings collect under an ideological canopy, unpacking them becomes more complex and problematic, and knowing the culture becomes essential (Manning and Callum-Swan, 1998: 294).

It was CLR James who famously asked “what do they know of cricket who only cricket know” (James, 1963: 8)? Hargreaves and McDonald (2000) suggest that “in more recent years, the character of cultural studies has changed further with the development of global politics and economics, and with postcolonial questions of nationhood, identity and power” (p. 51). It is clear to see that the further development and integration of European politics together with post-devolution provides pertinent questions of nationhood, identity and power in a Scottish (and British) context. In developing research in the field of identity, Sugden and Tomlinson (2002) reiterate similar sentiments as those made by Gruneau (1983) to suggest that “interpretations and theorisations benefit greatly from research that is grounded in the lived experiences of those engaged in the area of cultural production under scrutiny, including a sensitivity to life histories” (p. 12). They add that, “gaining a sense of space, place, character and culture ... sharpens a researcher’s critical gaze, helps the formulation of questions and enhances interpretations and theorisation” (p. 12).

The present study aims to generate theoretical claims, that are grounded in the real ‘world’ being explored. In attempting to understand social and cultural issues surrounding rugby union and football, we should not only know rugby union and football. Furthermore, the theorising must be sensitive and true to the historical processes which have preceded them and must be ground in empirically obtained evidence.

In adopting a realist and interpretive approach, the present study utilises the work of a small number of theorists in a systematic and complimentary fashion. Central to
this theoretical eclecticism is the work of French social theorist Pierre Bourdieu to whom we now turn.

3.5 Pierre Bourdieu

Influential social theorist Pierre Bourdieu was unusual among many of his peers in that he specifically discussed the place of sport in the social world, publishing sport specific articles (Bourdieu, 1978; 1988), and devoting a section of one of his most distinguished works to the sociological significance of sport (Bourdieu, 1984*).

Despite being one of the major influential theorists of his generation, Bourdieu routinely dismissed theory for its own sake.

Let me say outright and very forcefully that I never 'theorise', if by that we mean engage in the kind of conceptual gobbledygook ... which, through an extraordinary misconstrual of the logic of science, passes for Theory in much of Anglo-American social science ... There is no doubt a theory in my work, or better, a set of thinking tools visible through the results they yield, but it is not built as such ... It is a temporary construct which takes shape for and by empirical work (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 1989, cited in Jenkins, 1992: 67, emphasis by Jenkins).

Although being sporadically critical of Bourdieu, Jenkins (1992) accuses him of "being too modest" (p. 67) in refusing to accept the title of theoriser, adding:

Bourdieu's intellectual project is longstanding, relatively coherent and cumulative. It amounts to nothing less than an attempt to construct a theory of social practice and society ... Where the importance of Bourdieu's project lies is in his attempt to construct a theoretical model of social practice, to do more than simply take what people do in their daily lives for granted, and to do so without losing sight of the wider patterns of social life (pp. 67 - 68, original emphasis).

Bourdieu was critical of the crude economic structuralism of some Marxian-inspired work – Althusser's conception of class for example - though he was undoubtedly influenced by Marx. He recognised the material economic factors contributing to class-based lived realities, but did not rely solely on this as explanatory sufficient. His extended approach to class involves "a broad ranging account of class practices which includes food tastes, clothing, body dispositions, housing styles and forms of social choice in everyday life" (Wilkes, 1990: 109). However, as Wilkes recognises:

This extended exposition of class along a range of parameters does not dissolve class into a Weberian account of 'lifestyle' or reduce its power. Rather, it extends
the force of class analysis, both in the range of its explanatory power, and in the subtlety of its classification (p. 109, original emphasis).

Bourdieu’s central thesis was an attempt to transcend traditional dichotomies within social science. Jenkins (1992) explains:

The central plank in Bourdieu’s sociological platform is his attempt to transcend the ‘compulsory’ and ‘ritual’ choice between subjectivism and objectivism. In rejecting the determinism of mechanistic explanations of social life, however, he does not want to fall into the other trap, as he perceives it, of viewing conscious and deliberate intentions as a sufficient explanation of what people do (p. 66).

Central to Bourdieu’s project then is a need to locate, explain and understand not only the conscious behaviours of agents within structured parameters, but to expound the latent reasons for such action (or lack of action). His general theoretical approach is enriched by the generative formula expressed in Distinction (1984). Here, Bourdieu outlines: ‘[(Habitus) (Capital)] + Field = Practice’ (p: 101). In keeping with his eschewal of Marxian reductionism, this formula helps theorise more subtle elements of class dispositions and practices. Thus, as Wilkes (1990) stresses, Bourdieu analyses class as:

Centred on the fundamental and qualitative distinction between bourgeois, petits-bourgeois and workers. Round these three pegs Bourdieu weaves an elaborate thread of habitus, and it is through ceaseless examples of the habitus, in its many elements – in its artistic components, in eating habits, in the dispositions of the body, in theatre-visiting (or not theatre-visiting), in a concern for music or no concern, in the political attitudes, the cars they drive, the men and women they marry, the sort of living rooms they construct – in all these ways, the lives of classes are drawn (p. 130).

Clearly one could add, as Bourdieu does (1978; 1984; 1988; 1990), that the sporting practices one engages in and consumes (or do not engage in or consume) along with the ways in which they are engaged in or consumed is another element of the habitus. “Habitus represents the link in the dialectic between objective and subjective components of class” (Wilkes, 1990: 116). However, some caution is required as Mahar et al (1990) note in discussing Bourdieu’s generative formula:

While it provides a useful heuristic device for summarising the relation between the major concepts at work, it should by no means be used as some sort of deified solution to analysis. The objectification of theory in this fashion is frequently rejected in Bourdieu’s own writings. Rather, the use of the formula is to provide an explanatory device for exposition, and does not in any way offer a universal solution for social action, which would be antithetical to the general method [employed by Bourdieu] (p. 7).
In order to utilise Bourdieu's model, for the present research, as an "explanatory device" avoiding any "violence of abstraction" (Jarvie and Maguire, 1994: 112), it is useful to elaborate further Bourdieu's conceptualisation of this formula. Crossley (2001) neatly summarises the model, explaining that essentially for Bourdieu:

practice is the result of various habitual schemas and dispositions (habitus), combined with resources (capital), being activated by certain structured social conditions (field) which they, in turn, belong to and variously reproduce and modify (p. 240).

Tomlinson (2004) who relies heavily on MacAlloon's (1988) account, adds that one of the "most succinct" definitions of habitus provided by Bourdieu is "buried in a footnote" (p. 166) in Distinction (1984). Here, Bourdieu explains:

The word disposition seems particularly suited to express what is covered by the concept of habitus (defined as a system of dispositions) ... It expresses first the result of an organising action, with a meaning close to that of words such as structure; it also designates a way of being, a habitual state (especially of the body) and, in particular, a predisposition, tendency, propensity or inclination (p. 562, original emphasis).

Jenkins (1992) cites Bourdieu (1977: 95) and provides a reminder of his central project – eschewing explanatory dichotomies which are overly reliant on individual decision making (agency) on one hand and supra structures (structure) on the other hand – in describing habitus as:

A bridge building exercise across the explanatory gap between these two extremes, another important device for transcending the sterility of the opposition between subjectivism and objectivism ... Literally it is a Latin word which refers to a habitual or typical condition, state or appearance, particularly of the body ... It is 'an acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted' (p. 74).

Habitus then disposes actors to perform certain practices while providing a basis for these practices, which themselves are constrained by the opportunities (and lack of them) in the field (Jenkins, 1992). In other words, habitus is "the site of the internalisation of reality and the externalisation of internality" (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977: 205). The debt owed to Marx is made explicit when Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1989) expands on habitus:

The lines of action suggested by habitus may very well be accompanied by a strategic calculation of costs and benefits which tends to carry out at a conscious level the operations which habitus carries out in its own way ... 'Rational choice' often appears to take over. But, and this is a crucial proviso, it is habitus itself that commands this option. We can always say that individuals make choices, as long as we do not forget that they do not choose the principals of these choices (p. 45)
Bourdieu (1992) makes explicit the way habitus informs our understanding of practices and generative principles, noting its relationship to a ‘field’ operates in two ways. The following account perhaps provides the fullest and most succinct definitional use of habitus for the current research:

On one side, it is a relation of conditioning: the field structures the habitus, which is the product of the embodiment of the immanent necessity of a field ... On the other side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction. Habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world, a world endowed with sense and value, in which it is worth investing one’s energy. Two things follow. First, the relation of knowledge depends on the relation of conditioning that precedes it and fashions the structure of habitus. Second, social science is necessarily a “knowledge of a knowledge” and must make room for a sociologically grounded phenomenology of the primary experience of the field or, to be more precise, of the invariants and variations of the relation between different types of fields and different types of habitus ... As Pascal more or less put it, le monde me comprend mais je le comprends (in short, “the world encompasses me but I understand it”). Social reality exists, so to speak, twice, in things and in minds, in fields and in habitus, outside and inside of agents. And when habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a “fish in water”: it does not feel the weight of the water, and it takes the world about itself for granted (p. 127, original emphasis).

It is worth highlighting that the current research utilises Bourdieu’s ‘habitus’ as an explanatory concept to analyse cognitive dispositions rather than bodily habits (‘hexis’), which Bourdieu also explains inheres in habitus. The applicability of this concept in the current research – analysing groups of sports supporters – is revealed if one considers Codd’s (1990) observations on Bourdieu’s work which reveal the connections between group structures and individual agency:

The practice of each individual is taken to be an embodiment of a collective history of practice. This means that the system of dispositions (habitus) which structures the practice of the individual is no more than a homologous variant of the systems of dispositions which have structured the practice of all the other individuals who have belonged to the same group or class throughout its history. In the process of social learning that is the genesis of practice, schemes of perception, conception and action common to all members of the same group or class are able to pass from practice to practice (i.e. from adult to child) without going through discourse or consciousness (p. 140).

Bourdieu (1978) explains “schemes of perception” further, and in Goffman-esque terms, elaborates on reading (or mis-reading) signs according to one's experiences:

... i.e. to a public very imperfectly equipped with the specific competence needed to decipher it adequately. The ‘connoisseur’ has schemes of perception and appreciation which enable him to see what the layman cannot see, to perceive a necessity where the outsider sees only violence and confusion (p. 829).
As Bourdieu (1984) explains throughout his work, habitus is then both generative and generating in practice. Mahar et al (1990) cite Bourdieu, adding:

Habitus is a mediating construct, not a determining one. It is also 'a virtue of necessity' (1984: 372), particularly in relation to class habitus, where expectations (or lack of them) in relation to forms of capital are closely matched by objective probabilities (p. 12).

Therefore, although representative of a 'collective history' – providing potentially rich theoretical possibilities for analyses of supporter groups - habitus is non-determining in that it can, for individuals, still embody different properties (dispositions) across class fractions.

Because agents apprehend objects through the schemes of perception and appreciation of their habits, it would be naïve to suppose that all practitioners of the same sport (or any other practice) confer the same meaning on their practice or even, strictly speaking, that they are practising the same practice. It can easily be shown that the different classes do not agree on the profits expected from sport, be they specific physical profits, such as effects on the external body, like slimness, elegance or visible muscles, and on the internal body, like health or relaxation; or extrinsic profits, such as the social relationships a sport may facilitate, or possible economic and social advantages ... one is practically never entitled to assume that the different classes expect the same thing from the same practice (Bourdieu, 1984: 209-211).

Groups or class fractions then, on the one hand, act as a “homologous variant of the systems of dispositions”, a collective representation grounded in historical antecedents. Yet on the other hand, different class fractions (perhaps intra-fractions at a more subtle level too) potentially have different “schemes of perception” which informs their experiences at the objective and subjective level of consciousness. Bourdieu (1984) adds that “most products only derive their social value from the social use that is made of them” (p. 21). It is to these social values and uses that we now turn in order to comprehend further Bourdieu’s relevance to the current research.

In Distinction, Bourdieu (1984) refers to “gains in distinction” (p. 20). In order to understand the class distribution of practice, one has to take account of the “specific schemes of perception and appreciation, the different classes have of the costs (economic, cultural and ‘physical’) and benefits attached” (p. 20) to these practices – the “gains in distinction” (p. 20). For, it is these schemes of perception and appreciation that imbue practice with self-gratifying properties. As Jarvie and
Maguire (1994), stress, while echoing Elias and Scotson’s (1994) established and outsider relations:

While their own tastes are naturalised, those tastes of others are regarded with suspicion and hostility. The differential formation of habitus for different groups and classes results in a ‘natural’ disposition to produce certain practices and to classify and judge the practices of others (p. 203).

This suggests that understanding the social values inherent within the field (sport, club, town / city, etc.) is required if we are to move beyond naïve assumptions. Gains in distinction accrued (or not accrued) occur within a field and, as Mahar et al (1990) explain, “a field may be conceived as a field of forces and struggles for position and legitimate authority, and the logic which orders such struggles is the logic of capital” (p. 13). Capital can involve economic, cultural, social, educational and symbolic elements existing within a field, and its value is directly related to the cultural and social characteristics of habitus (Bourdieu, 1984). Moreover, capital can be the basis for domination even though it is often unrecognised as such by participants. It is the accumulation of capital within a particular field then that facilitates gains in distinction.

Tomlinson claims that although widely used by Bourdieu in Distinction, capital is never systematically defined, adding it represents the capacity for individuals or groups to impact upon, change or control situations. Mahar et al (1990) cite Bourdieu, adding:

The definition of capital is very wide for Bourdieu and includes material things (which can have symbolic value), as well as ‘untouchable’ but culturally significant attributes such as prestige, status and authority (referred to as symbolic capital), along with cultural capital (defined as culturally-valued taste and consumption patterns) (Bourdieu, 1986). Cultural capital can include a broad range of goods such as art, education and forms of language. For Bourdieu, capital acts as a social relation within a system of exchange, and the term is extended ‘to all the goods, material and symbolic, without distinction, that present themselves as rare and worthy of being sought after in a particular social formation’ (1977: 178) (p. 13, original emphasis).

Capital can only be fully understood in relation to the field in which it is exists. Bourdieu (in Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992) notes, “a field may be defined as a network, or configuration, of objective relations between positions” (p. 97). The specific relationship that the field has with capital is clarified by Bourdieu:
The forces that are active in the field – and thus selected by the analyst as pertinent because they produce the most relevant differences – are those which define the specific capital. A capital does not exist and function except in relation to a field. It confers a power over the field, over the materialised or embodied instruments of production or reproduction whose distribution constitutes the very structure of the field, and over the regularities and the rules which define the ordinary functioning of the field, and thereby over the profits engendered in it (p. 101, original emphasis).

The contested nature of fields is expressed when Bourdieu adds, “social fields are fields of forces but also fields of struggles to transform or preserve these fields of forces” (p. 101). The field, then, is structured by the power relations within its borders and these power relations are governed by agents’ access (or lack of) to resources (capital) within the field (Jenkins, 1992). The specific relationships these forms of capital have to individuals and class fractions within the field is made explicit by Jenkins (1992) and Bourdieu (in Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). First, Jenkins notes:

The existence of a field presupposes and, in its functioning, creates a belief on the part of participants in the legitimacy and value of the capital which is at stake in the field. This legitimate interest in the field is produced by the same historical processes which produce the field itself (p. 85, original emphasis).

Appearing similar to Gramsci’s (1971) concept of ‘hegemony’, this helps to explain the success of dominant fractions within a field throughout its history. Reinforcing the similarities further, Jenkins (1992) explains:

Bourdieu is arguing that the objective world in which groups exist, and the objective environment – other people and things – as experienced from the point of view of individual members of the group, is the product of past practices of this generation and previous generations ... History is an ongoing set of likely outcomes (probabilities). These are, however, the product of what people do (practices). In turn, practices are the product of habitus, as well as serving to reproduce it or confirm it as ‘true’... We return to the question of how the habitus produces practices. The closest Bourdieu gets to explaining this – other than an implicit appeal to unconscious, and therefore ultimately unknowable, mental processes – is the idea of ‘the subjective expectation of objective probabilities’ (p. 80).

Jenkins then cites Bourdieu (1990: 59):

‘The most improbable practices are therefore excluded, as unthinkable, by a kind of immediate submission to order that inclines agents to make a virtue of necessity, to refuse what is anyway denied and to will the inevitable’. As a consequence, history tends to repeat itself and the status quo is perpetuated (p. 81, original emphasis).
Second, Bourdieu reminds us of the central importance of the 'field' in explicating individual/group practice:

The notion of field reminds us that the true object of social science is not the individual... It is the field which is primary and must be the focus of research operations. This does not imply that individuals are mere "illusions," that they do not exist as agents—and not as biological individuals, actors, or subjects—which are socially constituted as active and acting, in the field under consideration by the fact that they possess the necessary properties to be effective, to produce effects, in this field. And it is knowledge of the field itself in which they evolve that allows us best to grasp the roots of their singularity, their point of view or position (in a field) from which their particular vision of the world (and of the field itself) is constructed (p. 107, original emphasis).

In the current research three aspects relating to the field are considered in relation to the individual interviewees' expressed views. First, the political aspects—'power relations' (Kay and Laberge, 2002) or 'field of power' (Jenkins, 1992)—within a field are illuminated and interpreted. Second, the historical antecedents—'social history' (Kay and Laberge, 2002) or 'social typology' (Jenkins, 1992)—and the competing components vying for resources (capital) are located. Third, the habitus(es) of agents and class fractions are outlined, with a specific focus on the relationship between the habitus and the structural constraints and opportunities determined by the structure of the field (Jenkins, 1992).

Application to sport and current research

In applying Bourdieu's concepts to sport, we are aided by Bourdieu himself who reveals that sport occupies its own field/s. First, Bourdieu (1978) makes reference to sport's "universe of practices" (p. 834) and ten years later (Bourdieu, 1988), he describes, "the idea of the space of sports" as being synonymous with "a field of power" (p. 156, my emphasis). Explaining this "space of sports" further, Bourdieu (1988) adds:

In order to be able to constitute a sociology of sport, one must first realise that a particular sport cannot be analysed independently of the totality of sporting practices; one must conceptualise the space of sporting practices as a system within which each element receives its distinctive value. In other words, to understand a sport, whatever it may be, one must locate its position in the space of sports (p. 153).

Bourdieu adds, "this space of sports must then be related to the social space of which it is an expression" (p.154), and he highlights the "preferential relationships" (p. 154) existing between certain sports and class fractions in France. He adds, "it is
quite possible that such relationships may not be observed in other national spaces of sport” (p. 154). To expand on this point, Bourdieu (1988) continues:

The program of bodily practices designated by the word “rugby” is not the same in the 1930s, in 1950, and in 1980 (even though in its formal, technical definition, it has remained identical, give or take a few rule changes). It is marked, in objectivity and in representations, by the appropriations of which it was the object and by the specifications (for instance, the “violence”) it received in the concrete “realisation” performed by agents endowed with socially constituted dispositions of a particular form ... At every moment this effect of social appropriation causes each of the “realities” offered under a name of sport to be objectively marked by a set of properties that are not part of the purely technical definition, which can even be officially excluded from it, and which guides practices and choices (p. 157).

An aim of the current research is to locate rugby union’s and football’s ‘space of sport’ in Scotland and to contrast and compare them, revealing the types of “social appropriation” guiding practices and choices across the clubs analysed. Moreover, it is to reveal potentially differing ‘spaces of sport’ existing across and within each sport, contrasting with other ‘spaces of sport’ in other clubs and/or locations.

It is at this point that one should be reminded of the subjective and objective possibilities – the enabling and constraining effects - of the habitus in relation to a field. As Jenkins (1992) stresses, Bourdieu (1990):

argues that the habitus only operates in relation to a social field. The same habitus can produce very different practices depending upon what is going on in the field ... the habitus can be transformed by changed circumstances, and expectations or aspirations will change with it (p. 82).

Alternatively, as Bourdieu (1984) notes:

The fact remains that the relationship between the different groups and the different practices cannot be fully understood unless one takes account of the objective potentialities of the different institutionalised practices, that is, the social uses which these practices encourage, discourage or exclude both by their extrinsic logic and by their positional and distributional value (p. 217).

Locating and understanding the habitus / field relationship and its objective (constraining) and subjective (enabling) limitations and possibilities is, therefore, required. As Jarvie and Maguire (1994) note, “habitus then is an embodied internalised schema that structures but does not determine actions, thoughts and feelings” (p. 191).
In addition to analysing the accumulation of capital in the social spaces of sports, Bourdieu (1978) reminds us that we should enquire “not only about the relationship between the practices and variables, but also about the meaning which the practices take on in those relationships” (p. 819). Indeed, White and Wilson (1999) who utilise Bourdieu’s ideas, refer to this challenge when discussing the limitations of statistically-grounded work in relation to sport spectatorship:

We were reminded for example, of the relative lack of knowledge within the sociology of sport about the subtle dynamics through which cultural aspects of socio-economic status enable and constrain primary and secondary sport experience ... many sociological questions remain unanswered, especially those related to the meanings that social groups place on sport spectatorship in general or on different sports in particular (p. 259, original emphasis).

These practices and the meanings associated with them differ according to habitus and the unequally perceived social profits different class fractions accrue from distinctive practice (Bourdieu, 1978). Bourdieu uses the term “distributional significance” as “the meaning which practices derive from their distribution among agents in social classes” (p. 836). Different spaces of sport, therefore, will potentially have different ‘distributional significance’ for different actors within the same sport and compared to other sports. In Kay and Laberge’s (2002) study of adventure racing (‘AR’) in North America, they observe:

Struggles take place not only over particular forms of capital effective in the field, but also over the very definition of which capital is most valued (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 84). Therefore, one of the main objectives of our investigation is to identify the existence of symbolic capitals specific to AR (p. 27).

Likewise, the current research seeks to identify the existence of symbolic capital specific to the fields of rugby union and football in the spaces of sport under consideration. It is important to note that the structure of a field is never static and, as Bourdieu (1978) stresses, sometimes “sporting activity is a mere pretext for select encounters or, to put it another way, a technique of sociability” (p. 839). The potential for ‘techniques of sociability’ to be applied, particularly in rugby union, is evident in the empirical data collected in this research. The dynamic nature of the field’s structure is also linked to class fractions’ “trajectory” in relation to the field. Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992) explains social agents as:

bearers of capitals and, depending on their trajectory and on the position they occupy in the field by virtue of their endowment (volume and structure) in capital, they have a propensity to orient themselves actively either toward the preservation
of the distribution of capital or toward the subversion of this distribution (pp. 108 - 109).

In other words, agents will orient themselves differently towards capital in the same field – enjoying potentially different ‘distributional significance’ - according to the differing orientations, the trajectory and habitus, each fraction has in relation to the capital in question. It follows from this that, first, the dominant meanings attached to a sport can change in time (diachronically) and, second, at any one time (synchronically), the same sport (practice) can have more than one significant meaning attached to it. Bourdieu (1988) makes these two related points explicit:

The dominant meaning, that is, the social meaning attached to a sporting practice by its dominant social users (numerically or socially), can change. In fact, a sport frequently receives two very different meanings at the same time ... At any given moment, a sport is a bit like a piece of music: a score (a rule of play, etc.) but subject to competing interpretations (and a whole array of sedimented past interpretations). That is what each new performer [or supporter] confronts, more unconsciously than consciously, when he or she proposes “his” or “her” interpretation (p. 158).

In utilising Bourdieu’s generative model of practice, we are then reminded of the centrality of social relationships within and between the two sports analysed and the relational nature they exhibit. As Kay and Laberge (2002) explain in their study of adventure racing:

The notion of field is relational in that, rather than referring to a delimited population of producers, it points to the relationships (e.g., opposition or alliances, domination or resistance) between various social agents occupying different positions in a structured network (p. 26, original emphasis).

Furthermore, Bourdieu (1984) explains the ways that class fractions and individuals relate to ‘realities’ and ‘fictions’ are:

bound up with the system of dispositions (habitus) characteristic of the different classes and class fractions. Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier. Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make, between the beautiful and the ugly, the distinguished and the vulgar, in which their position in the objective classifications is expressed or betrayed (p. 6).

It is at this interactional level of analysis that the work of Erving Goffman can help us explain the effects of the habitus, proving to complement the Bourdieu-ian analysis. Indeed, this is not merely coincidental, given that Goffman clearly influences Bourdieu’s work. Bourdieu’s conception of field has been compared with
Goffman's 'frame' and 'rules of irrelevance' and Bourdieu has even been described as the "French Goffman" (Mahar et al, 1990: 8).

4 Summary

This chapter has sought to outline the major theoretical influences being utilised in the present study. The importance of moving beyond naive assumptions, of not simply "mapping" change, whilst remaining sensitive to historical developments, has been reinforced. The work of Elias and Goffman has been outlined, demonstrating their significance to the present study on a secondary level of analysis. Various schools of thought deriving from Marx's writings have been charted, enabling the usefulness of a Marxian-inspired eclectic approach to be demonstrated. Finally, the major theoretical influence utilised, Pierre Bourdieu's *Distinction*, has been outlined, highlighting a number of its major concepts and their relevance to the present study. These include Bourdieu's related concepts, "habitus", "space of sport", "gains in distinction" and "distributional significance". Given that one of the major aims of the present study is to identify the various "capitals" specific to the "fields" of rugby union and association football in a variety of settings ("spaces of sport"), Bourdieu is shown to be highly valuable in analysing the data.
This chapter is divided into three main sections. First, the introductory section attempts to define the qualitative approach, tracing its historical development from the Enlightenment to the birth of sociology, discussing some of the philosophical debates that have characterised the qualitative paradigm. Ontological and epistemological positions are shown before outlining the general methodological approach associated with the cultural studies theoretical perspective as the study is most closely grounded in this approach. This first section finishes by focusing upon the evaluation of qualitative research, with specific reference to Scottish sporting identities.

The second section focuses specifically on interviewing as a method. First, the historical grounding of interviews as a method is shown before discussing the aims and objectives associated with interviewing. The socially constructed nature of the interview is considered and then the typologies of both interview and interview questions are shown. The section ends by discussing the interpretation and analysis of the interview together with generalisations one may make from interviews.

The final section of the chapter focuses more specifically on the current study's research design, beginning with the rationale for using the sports clubs selected for analysis. Then, the approach taken in gaining access to both the research setting and potential subjects are highlighted before outlining in more detail the interviewee selection process. The section ends with an outline of the field strategy adopted.

1. Introduction to Methodological Approaches

1.1 Historical development of qualitative research

The antecedents of the qualitative research strategy emerged during the Enlightenment with empiricist thinkers like Locke, Bacon and Hume practising science according to the principle of basing evidence on observable experience (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). Clearly influenced by the scientific advances of the time
labour saving machinery, medical breakthroughs, production of raw materials for consumable goods — which suggested the advancement of humanity through science, the intellectuals of the Enlightenment saw science as the epitome of enlightened reason (Hamilton, 1992). This represented a move away from religion-centred explanations of the world to a scientific and positivistic model referred to with terms such as ‘the natural science model’ (Bryman, 2001). Hamilton (1992) notes that “it is arguable that the sociological ideas developed by the Enlightenment were preoccupied with the advancement of freedom and humanity” (p. 45). Hamilton (1992) summarises:

> Although a properly professionalised sociology was not to appear until the latter half of the nineteenth century, it is in the carry-over of ideas and concepts from the Enlightenment into the ‘classical sociology’ formulated in the first decades of the nineteenth century that we can discern its roots. In the writings of Saint-Simon and Comte, a theory was elaborated about the emergent ‘industrial society’ forming itself in post-revolutionary Europe, and this constituted an agenda of interests for the new science of sociology which was still being debated by Emile Durkheim and Max Weber in the 1890s (pp. 51 - 52).

This new science of sociology, a term first used by Comte (Hamilton, 1992), involved debate as to the best or most scientific way to study the social world with some adherents suggesting that it was possible to apply similar principles as those of the natural sciences — the scientific model — whilst others argued against this (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Bryman, 2001). These fundamental philosophical debates about the nature of reality were followed by the development of two major and largely opposing paradigms within the scientific tradition, positivism and interpretivism. The philosophical underpinnings of the two traditions are characterised in the approach and relationship they have with ontology, epistemology and method of data collection. The positivist paradigm is closely linked to the methodological approach of the natural science tradition with a heavy reliance on deductive predicting or describing laws through observation, with the assumption that scientific testing can be replicated, while the interpretive paradigm is commonly assumed to consist of inductive and constructivist explanations. Within the qualitative research approach, the interpretive tradition can trace its roots to Weber’s notion of Verstehen (understanding by seeing through the eyes of others) and Schutz’s (1962) “thought-objects” (commonsense thinking) (Bryman, 2001). Schutz (1962) states:
By a series of common-sense constructs they [social actors] have pre-selected and pre-interpreted this world which they experience as the reality of their daily lives. It is these thought objects of theirs which determine their behaviour by motivating it. The thought objects constructed by the social scientist, in order to grasp this social reality, have to be founded upon the thought objects constructed by the common-sense thinking of men (and women) living their daily life within the social world (p. 59 cited in Bryman, 2001: 14).

Bryman (2001) acknowledges the close links between the theoretical traditions of symbolic interactionism and phenomenology and Verstehen, categorising them as "interpretivism":

The similarity in the writings of the hermeneutic-phenomenological tradition and of the Verstehen approach, with their emphasis upon social action as being meaningful to actors and therefore needing to be interpreted from their point of view, coupled with the rejection of positivism, contributed to a stream of thought referred to as interpretivism (p. 14).

The Chicago School, principally founded upon the work of George Herbert Mead, was a major exponent of this 'humanistic' vision of social science which eschewed the 'scientific model' of cause and effect logic through direct observation (Layder, 1993). Layder (1993) highlights the work of the Chicago School's Herbert Blumer and states:

As Blumer (1966: 542) has pointed out, the researcher must attempt to describe how actors themselves act towards the world on the basis of how they see it, and not on the basis of how that world appears to the outside observer. This humanist strand of symbolic interactionism favours research methods and strategies such as participant observation, in-depth or semi-structured interviews, and documentary evidence, which seek to tap the subjective understandings of the people who are the subjects of the research (p. 38).

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) suggest that the Chicago School and the ethnographic approach is the 'traditional' moment, the first of seven 'moments' in the development of qualitative research. The seven moments chart the development of the qualitative approach right up to the present and future. The 'traditional period' covers the early twentieth century until World War II, focusing on the foreign or strange within one's own society. The 'modernist phase', characterised by mass publication of formalised research literature, lasts until the 1970s, preceding the 'blurred genes' period which lasted until the mid-1980s. This period was marked by combining various theories and methods. The 'crisis of representation' marked the next period from the mid-1980s onwards and positions the researcher and her / his interpretations within the methodological discussions. The 'fifth moment' period,
the most recent, replaces theories with narratives, avoiding grand narratives. The ‘sixth moment’, the present one, links qualitative research to questions of democracy, while the ‘seventh moment’ represents the future of qualitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).

1.2 Qualitative research – definition

An outline of the methods and interpretations associated with qualitative research will be presented in order to contextualise the empirical grounding of the present study. Qualitative research should not be seen as merely the opposite of quantitative research (Mason, 1996). As Bryman (2001) states:

‘qualitative research’ is sometimes taken to imply an approach to social research in which quantitative data are not collected or generated... the distinctiveness of qualitative research does not reside solely in the absence of numbers (p. 265).

Providing a succinct working definition of qualitative research is problematic. Bryman (2001) observes, “although there has been a proliferation of writings on qualitative research since the 1970s, stipulating what it is and is not as a direct research strategy is by no means straightforward” (pp. 264 - 265). The qualitative approach advocates studying people in their natural setting (Layder, 1993; Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). The social world is “discovered” and “this can only be achieved by first-hand observations and participation in ‘natural' settings, guided by an explanatory orientation” (Hammersley, 1990: 598). Flick (2002) adds that “qualitative research is oriented towards analysing concrete cases in their temporal and local particularity, and starting from people’s expressions and activities in their local contexts” (p. 13). The qualitative approach can be utilised across many disciplines and between various theoretical perspectives. As Flick (2002) states:

The essential features of qualitative research are the correct choice of appropriate methods and theories; the recognition and analysis of different perspectives; the researchers’ reflections on their research as part of the process of knowledge production; and the variety of approaches and methods (p. 4).

When discussing qualitative (or quantitative) approaches to research, it is wise to consider more than simply the ‘methods’ used within the respective approaches and
to recognise that they are more than techniques for data collection – more than mere tools. Mason (1996) makes this point:

As a researcher you do not simply work out where to find data which already exist in a collectable state. Instead you work out how best you can generate data from your chosen data sources. For this reason, the term method in qualitative research generally is meant to imply more than a practical technique for gaining data. It implies also a data generation process involving activities which are intellectual, analytical and interpretive (p. 36).

Bryman (2001) claims that some writers, for example (Silverman, 1993), are reluctant to “specify the nature of qualitative research as a general approach” (p. 265) but notes the need for a common understanding of the concept. He adds, “unless we can talk to a certain degree about the nature of qualitative research, it is difficult to see how it is possible to refer to qualitative research as a distinctive strategy” (p. 265).

Mason (1996) discusses two intersecting categories of qualitative research. Firstly, she asks “what is the ‘intellectual puzzle’?” (p. 7). Different types of puzzle are associated with different theoretical and intellectual traditions, and therefore different types of social explanation. She discusses ‘developmental’, ‘mechanical’ and ‘causal’ puzzles. The intellectual puzzle leads to the second category (“social explanations”) which consists of a four types – ‘comparing’, ‘developing and tracing’, ‘describing’ and ‘predicting’ explanations. These types are not mutually exclusive with some involving a combination of two or more. For example, a predictive logic may be based on a combination of comparative and developmental explanatory logic. For Mason, the crucial point the researcher must grasp in the qualitative approach is to understand what job a particular ‘explanation’ will do.

Gubrium and Holstein (1997) outline four main traditions of qualitative research – naturalism, ethnomethodology, emotionalism and postmodernism. Concurring with Flick (2002) and Mason (1996), the methods used to collect data and the outcome of interpreting this data will be largely determined by the theoretical tradition adopted.

Methods of social research are closely tied to different visions of how social reality should be studied. Methods are not simply neutral: they are linked with the ways in which social scientists envision the connection between different viewpoints about the nature of social reality and how it should be examined (Bryman 2001: 4).
A ‘multi-methods’ approach is useful in many qualitative research strategies (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Bryman, 2001; Flick, 2002) with data collection methods often incorporating more than one of the following - qualitative interviewing, focus group interviews, discourse analysis, and textual and document analysis. Flick (2002) suggests that the central criteria in qualitative research are:

whether findings are grounded in empirical material and whether the methods have been appropriately selected and applied to the object under study. The relevance of findings and the reflexivity of proceedings are further criteria (p. 5).

To summarise, a research strategy involves linking methods with a particular theoretical perspective in a coherent and complementary way. An efficient methodological approach must address the issue of which tools to use in collecting data and how to interpret the collected data. However, there remains some lack of clarity regarding providing definitive definitions of the qualitative research approach, with some adherents preferring to provide general guidelines only.

1.3 Ontological and epistemological approaches outlined

Flick (2002) outlines three broad theoretical positions within the qualitative approach, symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology and structuralist, providing an overview of their respective similarities and differences in their approach to research. Suggesting that each theoretical position shares Verstehen as a commonality, he stresses that each approach will be constructed according to the theoretical position adopted. Bryman (2001) states that by and large “research data achieve significance in sociology when viewed in relation to theoretical concerns” (p. 5). Theoretical concerns are underpinned by philosophical assumptions based upon ontological and epistemological positions with regard to social reality, and should be addressed early on in the design of a research project (Mason, 1996). “What you see as a potential data source, or what you see as a method of generating data, will both depend upon and express your ontological and epistemological positions” (Mason, 1996: 19). The importance of ontology and epistemology to a research project is further advanced by Mason (1996) who stresses that:

in formulating your own intellectual puzzle, you must ensure that you have thought through what these are, and be confident that they are consistent – that is, that your
Ontology is concerned with what is perceived as the very nature and essence of reality in the social world (Mason, 1996). Bryman (2001) suggests that it involves: whether social entities can and should be considered objective entities that have an external reality to social actors, or whether they can and should be considered social constructions built up from the perceptions and actions of social actors (p. 16).

It is commonly accepted that two broad ontological positions exist within qualitative research, often called objectivist and constructivist (Bryman, 2001) although there are alternative titles given to these positions by others such as Blaikie (1993) who labels them realist and constructivist. An objectivist (realist) ontological position views social reality as made up of observable facts existing independently of the observer. They are external to and independent from social actors. Alternatively, the constructivist position challenges the suggestion that social reality exists independently of the social actors it confronts. It views reality as the product of social actors with interpretations, cultural and social meanings, and subjectivities having a bearing on the construction of reality. There may be multiple realities and the researcher presents a specific version of that reality. The current study adopts a constructivist ontological approach.

In addition to adopting an ontological position, the researcher should be explicit about the epistemological position adopted. Marsh (1999) emphasises the importance of one’s epistemological position in the research project:

An epistemological position is not optional, it is inevitable; it is not like a pullover, more like a skin. Indeed, although most authors do not acknowledge their epistemological position, they operate with an implicit one ... it is essential that authors render explicit their implicit epistemological positions (p. 11).

Mason (1996) describes epistemology as “literally your theory of knowledge” adding that it should concern “the principles and rules by which you decide whether and how social phenomena can be known, and how knowledge can be demonstrated” (p. 13). It is concerned with what counts as evidence or knowledge. Marsh and Smith (2001) argue “there are a number of ways of classifying epistemological positions and there is no agreement as to the best way” (p. 529). There are two general positions, however, with positivism and interpretivism often
being used (Bryman, 2001; Marsh and Smith, 2001). In common with ontological definitions, there are some variations in the names of the main terms with Marsh (1999) labelling interpretivism as relativism. A positivist epistemological approach asserts that the world exists independently of our knowledge of it, with direct observation being able to test theories. The world is not socially constructed. Only phenomena confirmed by the senses can be warranted as knowledge (Bryman, 2001). An interpretive (relativist) epistemological stance “requires the social scientist to grasp the subjective meaning of social action” (Bryman, 2001: 13) and views social phenomena as dependent upon the interpretations of social actors (Marsh, 1999). This epistemological division is grounded in explanations and understanding of the social world. As Bryman (2001) suggests that:

this clash reflects a division between an emphasis on the explanation of human behaviour that is the chief ingredient of the positivist approach to the social sciences and the understanding of human behaviour (p. 13, original emphasis).

Marsh and Smith (2001) highlight this distinction too, explaining that positivists are interested in causes while interpretivists look for meanings. Marsh (1999) and Marsh and Smith (2001) describe a third possible epistemological position, realism or realist. This position appears to bridge the two others by adhering to principles such as seeing the world as existing independently of our knowledge of it, but believing there to be deep structures which cannot be observed. Marsh (1999) makes the realist position explicit by noting:

Its [relativism] weakness is its failure to recognise that there are limits to the possibility of discursive construction, or rather, more accurately, that while any discursive construction is possible, some are unlikely to have resonance because they run counter to material realities ... there is a real, material world out there which is independent of our knowledge of it. However, that real world is mediated by our discursive construction of it and those discursive constructions, or what we choose to call the ideational level, have material effect (p. 13).

Realists do not see themselves as independent of the social world but see their theories containing normative assumptions. Marsh and Smith (2001) state that the realist aim is to “develop analytical frameworks that help us to interpret the complex world” (p. 531) and in terms of studying cultures, add:

So a realist might argue from a different epistemological position that these preferences and the decision making schemes are, in part a reflection of deep structural inequalities, for example based on gender, class or race, that we cannot directly observe (p. 534).
The current study adopts a realist epistemological position.

In summary, a research project should have a clear and stated ontological and epistemological position as these positions will determine what is accepted by the researcher as reality and what are the best methods for investigating this reality. It is important to recognise that different theoretical traditions will have different ontological and epistemological outlooks.

1.4 Cultural Studies and its methodological approach

As stated previously, this thesis aims to utilise a methodological and theoretical approach which is broadly situated within the field of cultural studies, adopting a constructivist and realist ontological and epistemological approach. A set of clearly formulated methodological guidelines within the cultural studies tradition is difficult to find with the concept of codifying methods actually running counter to some aspects of cultural studies (Johnson, 1996). This suggests that in conducting research from within a cultural studies perspective, to reduce the risk of ambiguity, one should be open and clear about the ontological and epistemological positions adopted, the methods being utilised, and the type of explanation being generated, inductive or deductive.

Morgan (1994) claims that “a social theory that purports to give a reputable and binding account of social reality must address the methodological question of how it gains access to that reality in a sufficiently critical way” (p. 10). Ethnography has emerged as a popular method of data collection within the cultural studies tradition (Johnson, 1996) and includes a variety of approaches including interviewing, observing and document analysis (Denzin, 1989; Sugden and Tomlinson, 2002). Sugden and Tomlinson (2002) advocate gaining “empathetic access to a particular social milieu” and developing an “authentic gaze” (p. 12). If not conducted and presented in an open and critical way ethnographic work may produce unscientific results. In criticising the unscientific nature of some ethnographic work,
Hargreaves and Tomlinson (1992) invite ethnographers to provide clear answers to the following:

How was the research organised? How were the data collected? What was the social character of the population observed (social class, ethnicity, age, etc)? What questions were asked? Who refused to respond? How long was spent, when, where, and so on (p. 214)?

They add that “it is the kind of information expected and, readily available in varying degrees, as a matter of course in ethnographic work” (p. 214). They highlight the possibility of ‘hidden cultures’ and warn of the mistaken belief that ‘just being there’ gives one the opportunity to understand and analyse cultures, institutions and structures. Klein (1993) has also warned of these dangers by claiming that “the picture presented to the ethnographer is often contrived to reflect only the most flattering features of the person or group” (p. 284). Being receptive to possible ‘hidden cultures’ is desirable and should discourage ethnographers from becoming complacent. However, spending time in the research environment and gaining some sense of understanding ‘through their eyes’ can still be a valuable data collection technique.

Taylor (1993) advocates gaining an understanding of meanings attached to social actions by the actors themselves, while Sugden and Tomlinson (2002) stress:

- gaining a sense of space, place, character and culture – which can only be achieved through spending some time in the living research environment – sharpens a researcher’s critical gaze, helps the formulation of questions and enhances interpretations and theorisation (p. 12).

Bryman (2001) states that “the empathetic stance of seeking to see through the eyes of one’s research participants is very much in tune with interpretivism and demonstrates well the epistemological links with phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, and Verstehen” (p. 278). Sugden and Tomlinson (2002) claim that some of their work has been described as “the Brighton Method” (p. 10) and this method incorporates six overlapping elements within its methodology which has been fully explained elsewhere (see Sugden and Tomlinson, 2002). The basic methodological principles upon which the self-proclaimed Brighton Method rests distinguish between absolute and sociological truth. Arguing that “there are multiple vantage points, there are multiple truths”, Sugden and Tomlinson argue that:
It is possible to construct an overall interpretation that may not be true to any single vantage point, but which, by taking account of them all, including that of the researcher, is the most honest representation of a given milieu’s shared truth about itself at a given point in history (p. 18).

Describing themselves as ‘social impressionists’, Sugden and Tomlinson compare their methodological approach to that of an artist capturing a version of reality over time as opposed to a photographer who captures the instant passing conditions of reality. They make their position explicit:

The camera can lie. The impressionist painting, on the other hand, is constructed over time and incorporates the various dimensions of the artist’s gaze and what is known about the places and people that are painted. Thus, what is produced in not reality per se, but an informed impression of that reality. The artist then offers the painting for public appraisal, acclaim or ridicule, implicitly challenging other artists to depict the chosen scene differently. In this way we regard ourselves as rigorous social scientists and as social impressionists (p. 18, original emphasis).

Sugden and Tomlinson’s social impressionist approach appears similar to Klein’s (1993) partial interpreter approach with Klein (1993) stating:

The ethnographer is increasingly acknowledged as a partial interpreter, specifically situated in any given culture, not omnipresent, as previously treated. There is, in addition, a quality to ethnography that is ‘fictional’, compiled as an earnest and individually experienced activity (p. 285).

This approach is not without difficulty as Lofland and Lofland (1995) demonstrate by warning of the possible “descriptive excess” (p. 164) inhibiting or overwhelming the analysis of data. Ethnographic work, as defined by Klein’s partial interpreter and Sugden and Tomlinson’s social impressionist approach also risks what has been described as ‘going native’ (Bryman, 2001; Flick, 2002), becoming too involved in, and losing sight of, the problem being studied. As Sugden and Tomlinson (2002) admit, their interpretations partly rely on “the capacity to get close to the centre of the action without ever being totally incorporated within it” (p. 14). Even if it is possible that one can manage to get up close without becoming incorporated into the study, there is the added potential problem of studying illegal or dangerous activities or only seeing through the eyes of some people and not others (Bryman, 2001). Another potential problem for ethnographers relates to researcher bias. Klein (1993) asks to what extent “can we, or should we, promote the notion of ‘value-free’ science or postmodern relativism?” (p. 284) Simmel (1971) discusses the “stranger” “whose membership within the group involves both being outside it and confronting it” (p. 14), and reminds us that:
the objectivity of a theoretical observation clearly does not mean that the mind is a passive tabula rasa on which things inscribe their qualities, but rather signifies the full activity of a mind working according to its own laws, under conditions that exclude accidental distortions and emphases whose individual and subjective differences would produce quite different pictures of the same object (pp. 145 - 146).

Simmel suggests that the “stranger” maintains her / his credibility because she / he “examines conditions with less prejudice [and] assesses them against standards that are more general and more objective; and his (sis) actions are not confined by custom, piety, or precedent” (p.146). Bryman (2001) discusses the notion of researcher values and bias, and advises researchers to:

recognise and acknowledge that research cannot be value free but to ensure that there is no untrammelled incursion of values in the research process and to be self-reflective and so exhibit reflexivity about the part played by such factors (p. 23).

Bryman draws upon Turnbull’s (1973) work and comments:

the reader is entitled to know something of the aims, expectations, hopes and attitudes that the writer brought to the field with him, for these will surely influence not only how he sees things but even what he sees (p. 13 cited in Bryman, 2001: 23).

Keopping (1987) suggests that the researcher “has to fuse the two functions in himself, that of commitment and that of distance” (p. 28). This problem for the researcher has been described as involving two opposing positions in relation to the subject matter under analysis. The ‘standpoint position’ (Gouldner, 1973) and the notion of the ‘professional stranger’ (Agar, 1980) have been used to describe these contrasting positions. Wertsch (1990) describes them as ‘contextualised’ and ‘de-contextualised’ voices, while Bryman (2001) labels the standpoint (contextualised) position as ‘value-laden’. Sugden and Tomlinson (2002) argue that it is possible to conduct rigorous research from the standpoint position:

It is not so much the standpoint of the researcher that is important, but what she or he says about this in relation to the observations and interpretations made and theories constructed … it is possible to research and theorise about power relations in ways that are honest about the perspective that frames the gaze of the researcher, while, at the same time, through self-reflection and dialogue with existing theory and research, contribute to the accumulation of ‘associational’ sociological knowledge (p. 17).

Marcus and Fischer (1986) encourage the researcher to be self reflexive by utilising the concept of ‘defamiliarising’ which appears similar to Klein’s proposed reflexive strategy. Klein (1993) states that:
'new ethnographers' are generating a self-reflexive style of cultural interpretation to make the foreign familiar, those of us who are working 'at home' in familiar cultures face the converse: that is, making the familiar foreign (p. 285).

These methodological challenges are apparent in the work of both the major theoretical contributors drawn upon in the thesis, Bourdieu and Goffman. Bourdieu's studies of the Bearn district, where he grew up, contributed to his reflexive standpoint as Jenkins (1992) acknowledges:

These encounters with his own backyard inspired him to reflect upon the research process and the relative status of 'insider knowledge' and 'outsider knowledge' in sociological accounts and theorising. His subsequent arguments are an interesting inversion of the conventional anthropological wisdom which insists that immersion in the alien or the exotic is a necessary professional rite de passage and the basis for the discipline's epistemological authority. Bourdieu's point is that authority and epistemological integrity can best be produced by a reflexive encounter with the 'known', with the apparently familiar (p. 46).

What has been claimed to give Bourdieu legitimacy in being described as 'original' and academically 'heavyweight' (Jenkins, 1992: 47) is that he sought to distance both the researcher and the subject from the object of study by recourse to his "objectification of the act of objectification", a two step, 'double distancing' de-familiarising process. First, the subject has to be de-familiarised. Jenkins quotes Bourdieu and Wacquant (1989: 33) to explain:

The 'methodological' intent of this research ... was to overturn the natural relation of the observer to his universe of study, to make the mundane exotic and the exotic mundane, in order to render explicit what, in both cases, is taken for granted and to offer a very concrete, very pragmatic, vindication of the possibility of a full sociological objectivation of the object and of the subject's relation to the object – what I call participant objectivation (cited in Jenkins, p. 47, original emphasis).

Next, the analytical process itself is subject to de-familiarisation as Jenkins summarises in explaining Bourdieu's epistemological position further:

It was an attempt to observe a given social situation from an analytical or sociological point of view and also to scrutinise both the 'scientific' stance vis-à-vis that situation and the effect of adopting such a stance upon the resultant sociological knowledge of that situation. Thus, the first step back is from the situation in question –this is one of the usual senses in which we talk about 'objectivity' – while the second step back is from the act of observation itself. This, in Bourdieu's words, results in the 'objectification of the act of objectification'; this is necessary because, without so doing, it is impossible to appreciate the nature of most sociological and anthropological accounts of social life (p. 47, original emphasis).
Thus, for Bourdieu, "the act of observation, pursued unreflexively, produces a static, reified and unreal view of social life" (Jenkins, 1992: 51).

Bourdieu acknowledges the politics of social science as well as his own political stance as an individual and attempts to write them into his work. More to the point, he also argues that it is necessary to be aware of the distortions of social reality which are likely to result from the adoption of the stance of the 'objective' observer. Only by the reflexive recognition of the refractive effects of doing research – of objectification – is it possible to allow or control them (Jenkins, 1992: 177).

Goffman’s symbolic interactionist approach (1959) unavoidably acknowledges the position of the researcher and researched also, noting the necessity of prior knowledge - existing reference points - for both parties. “When an individual appears before others, he knowingly and unwittingly projects a definition of the situation, of which a conception of himself is an important part” (pp. 234 - 235). Furthermore, such is the potency of subjective knowledge within the social milieu being researched, Goffman concedes that other cultural environments may require a different set of concepts:

I did not mean to imply that the framework presented here is culture-free or applicable in the same areas of social life in non-Western societies as in our own ... Given our general dramaturgical rules and inclinations for conducting [social] action, we must not overlook areas of life in other societies in which other rules are apparently followed (pp. 236 - 237).

A degree of insider knowledge then appears to be a vital aspect of Goffman’s methodological approach. Moreover, where aspects of this knowledge may be missing, Goffman accepts that pre-existing knowledge, ultimately, an existing set of reference points, of a given context contributes to discovering new facts.

When one individual enters the presence of others, he will want to discover the facts of the situation. Were he to possess this information, he could know, and make allowances for, what will come to happen and he could give the others present as much of their due as is consistent with his enlightened self-interest. To uncover fully the factual nature of the situation, it would be necessary for the individual to know all the relevant social data about the others. It would also be necessary for the individual to know the actual outcome or end product of the activity of the others during the interaction, as well as their innermost feelings concerning him. Full information of this order is rarely available; in its absence, the individual tends to employ substitutes – cues, tests, hints, expressive gestures, status symbols, etc. – as predictive devices. In short since the reality that the individual is concerned with is unperceivable at the moment, appearances must be relied upon in its stead (p. 241).

Goffman, however, notes that, “paradoxically, the more the individual [researcher] is concerned with the reality that is not available to perception, the more must he
concentrate his attention on appearances (pp. 241 - 242). Consequently he cautions for a degree of researcher reflexivity:

It is always possible to manipulate the impression the observer uses as a substitute for reality because a sign for the presence of a thing, not being that thing, can be employed in the absence of it. The observer's need to rely on representations of things itself creates the possibility of misrepresentation (p. 243).

To summarise, the cultural studies perspective does not have a clearly defined set of methodological principles. Barker (2000) states that “cultural studies has not devoted itself to questions of research methods and methodology” (p. 26), adding that “the technicalities of method” are less important than the “philosophical approaches” underpinning them. Cultural studies work has centred on three kinds of methodological approach (Barker, 2000). First, ‘textual’ approaches are often drawn from semiotics and poststructuralism. The ‘reception studies’ approach argues that “whatever analysis of textual meanings a critic may undertake, it is far from certain which of the identified meanings, if any, will be activated by actual readers / audiences / consumers” (Barker, 2000: 32). Finally, the ‘ethnographic’ approach encourages special care be taken in order to ensure that hidden cultures can be discovered, being careful not to assume that by simply witnessing particular situations, the researcher has understood every situational aspect. The researcher must ensure that a degree of involvement and detachment, commitment and distance is maintained throughout the data collection period. The standpoint position and that of the professional stranger represent two opposing positions towards the area being analysed. Depending upon one’s position in relation to the subject area, it will be necessary to make the familiar foreign or to make the foreign familiar and to maintain a sufficient degree of reflexivity in order to produce accurate reflections of the truth.

1.5 Evaluating qualitative research

There has been some debate as to the best way to evaluate qualitative research.

Some writers have sought to apply the concepts of reliability and validity to the practice of qualitative research (e.g. LeCompte and Goetz 1982; Kirk and Miller 1986; Perakyla 1997), but others argue that the grounding of these ideas in quantitative research renders them inapplicable to or inappropriate for qualitative research (Bryman, 2001: 31 - 32).
Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Guba and Lincoln (1994) are critical of applying quantitative criteria to qualitative work, largely because of their rejection of the existence of absolute quantifiable truths, and have, therefore, proposed an alternative framework for evaluating such research. They propose alternative terms such as trustworthiness and authenticity. Each aspect of their conception of trustworthiness has a parallel in quantitative research. Credibility parallels internal validity, transferability parallels external validity, dependability parallels reliability, and confirmability parallels objectivity. Bryman (2001) has discussed these criteria in detail.

Credibility (Internal Validity):
Entails both ensuring that research is carried out according to the canons of good practice and submitting research findings to the members of the social world who were studied for confirmation that the investigator has correctly understood that social world (Bryman, 2001: 272).

This form of triangulation incorporates a method sometimes called ‘respondent validation’ (Mason, 1996) and ‘member validation’ (Flick, 2002). In addition, internal validity should ensure that “there is a good match between researchers’ observations and the theoretical ideas they develop” (Bryman, 2001: 271). Ethnographic work, which includes qualitative interviews, is usually strong in terms of credibility with “a high level of congruence between the concepts and observations” (Bryman, 2001: 272).

Transferability (External Validity)
The degree to which findings can be generalised across social settings is problematic for ethnographers due to the small samples and case studies often used. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that whether findings ‘hold’ or not in other contexts at other times is an empirical issue (p. 316). Bryman (2001) writes that “it is the quality of the theoretical inferences that are made out of qualitative data that is crucial to the assessment of generalisation” (p. 283). Mitchell (1983) calls this “the cogency of the theoretical reasoning” (p. 207). Bryman, therefore, suggests that qualitative researchers should be encouraged “to produce what Geertz (1973) calls thick description” (p. 272). Thick description could then, according to Lincoln and
Guba (1985), be used as a database from which judgements could be made regarding the transferability of findings to other settings.

Dependability (Reliability)
Dependability incorporates aspects of external reliability – “the degree to which a study can be replicated” (Bryman, 2001: 271) – and internal reliability – “whether there is more than one observer who agree about what they see and hear” (p. 271). Although “it is impossible to ‘freeze’ a social setting and the circumstances ...to make it replicable” it is possible to “adopt a similar social role to that adopted by the original researcher” (Bryman, 2001: 271). Dependability requires having an ‘audit’ approach whereby phases of research can be recorded in order for peers to judge the procedures and assess the theoretical inferences made from them (Bryman, 2001).

Confirmability (Objectivity)
Did the researcher act in good faith or did he or she overtly allow personal values “or theoretical inclinations manifestly to sway the conduct of the research and findings deriving from it” (Bryman, 2001: 274)? Confirmability recognises that complete objectivity is impossible and seeks to demonstrate that the researcher has fully justified her / his theoretical position and findings.

There are two further points requiring discussion. Both of them relate to sampling within ethnography. First, there is the possibility that covert observation is “ethically contestable” (Flick, 2002: 136), second, one would need to consider the extent to which a sample group can be truly representative. Bryman (2001) highlights two main sampling procedures - ‘convenience’ and ‘snowball’ sampling. The former relies on getting information from whomever will give it and wherever it can be accessed while the latter involves being passed on to other potential sources of data by existing sources. Bryman cautions that “ethnographers have to ensure that they gain access to as wide a range of individuals relevant to the research question as possible, so that many different perspectives and ranges of activity are the focus of attention” (p. 302). It should also be noted that people are not the only potential objects of sampling. Places, times, events and contexts can be sampled in order to provide object triangulation, thus potentially increasing validity.
and reliability. Whilst one can take some of the action mentioned in conducting ethnographic work, it should be noted that generalising about qualitative research evaluation is problematic and it is difficult to provide definitive recommendations, as “every field situation is different” (Sarsby, 1984: 96).

1.6 Evaluating Scottish sporting identities: specific challenges

Paterson at al (2001) note the difficulty in defining national identity, and in discussing Scottish national identity state:

While national identity in Scotland does seem part of the taken-for-granted world, it is not an easy concept to measure. We cannot be sure, for example, that two people who say they are Scottish mean the same thing." (p. 102).

Bond and Rosie (2002) question the relative importance of national identity in relation to other identity markers:

We have little sense of the weight such identity is given relative to other sources of identification. Perhaps people's Scottishness is of comparatively little importance when compared to other factors such as gender, social class or age group" (p. 39)?

Therefore, questions of conceptual meaning and the relative importance of such meanings are far from straightforward. The Moreno Scale, named after Luis Moreno has been used in the past to measure how people relate to being Scottish and British (Paterson et al, 2001) (See appendix 1). However, describing how one sees oneself does not answer the question of the meanings people give to these categories (Paterson et al, 2001). This problem could potentially be overcome by conducting qualitative interviews with respondents in order to elicit the subjective meanings people give to these categories. A related potential problem exists with the Moreno scale (and others like it); the way one sees oneself may not correspond with the way one would like to see oneself. For example, a respondent might see herself as Scottish and British as a result of civic identity – she is Scottish and British – but she may not like or value one of these two possible identity markers. Paterson et al (2001) offer a possible way around this by offering the following question in their study:

If you had to choose, which one best describes the way you think of yourself? British; European; Irish; Northern Irish; Scottish; Welsh; None of these...
point of this simpler measure is that it forces people to chose, not because that's the way life is, but for methodological purposes (p. 104).

It also asks them how they think of themselves, possibly allowing for preferred, not simply factual, identity markers to be expressed.


We may find this far-fetched and overly cynical until we remember the instance closer to home of the authenticity of tartan and 'the Scottish experience'. It seems that the desire to believe too easily overcomes the counter-evidence that much of this 'tradition' is of recent origin. It is even possible to acknowledge pastiche while believing in it (p. 9).

Having suggested that the actors within this 'staged authenticity' end up relating to one another by stereotypical images of themselves, they ask "how much of a meaningful identity do people have beyond that which is required by the touristic framework" (p. 9)? The equivalent question could be asked of the fans of Scottish rugby union and football – is there a meaningful sports identity beyond that which is required by the stereotype? Drawing upon Foucault's concept of the 'medical gaze' – which suggests that what medical practitioners see is not simply observed but highly structured by power dynamics like the institutionalising of medicine (Foucault, 1973) – McCrone et al conceive of the modern tourist as being trained or predisposed to see certain sights and scenes (and by implication) to ignore or overlook other sights or scenes. "Modern tourists are to be treated as semioticians, reading the landscape for certain pre-established notions or signs... By the late twentieth century, a new breed has been formed, the 'post-tourist'" (p. 35). As McCrone et al highlight, Urry (1990) has developed research in the field of 'post-tourists'. Perhaps one should develop Redhead's (1997) themes and ask if 'post-fans' exist reading the landscape for certain predisposed sights or scenes?
MaCannell (1974) utilises Goffman (1959 / 1973) to argue that tourists try to enter the back regions in their quest for the authentic by “getting in with the natives” (p. 602). ‘Truer’ knowledge may also be produced if the researcher can also ‘get in with the natives’. McCrone et al (1995) warn that “‘festivals’ or ‘traditions’ are specifically designed as the bearer (sic) of traditional values even although they are the means of their destruction” (p. 44). They add:

> The definition of the ethnic for the tourist purposes operates a double-bind for the group subject to the tourist gaze. Typically, the group ‘museumises’ itself by presenting a stereotype which fits in with the tourist expectations. Instead of adapting its values and practices in line with broader social processes, by conforming to required stereotypes group members come to relate to each other predominantly in these ways (p. 44).

Perhaps this alleged failure to adapt practices and values to the existing world could help explain the ‘ninety minute patriot’ accusation directed towards the Scottish electorate by Jim Sillars? Do the fans of Scotland’s two high profile national teams relate to their own members in this kitsch, ‘museumised’ way, demonstrating a ‘banal nationalism’ separated and distinct from broader social processes and political action?

Maguire (1999) provides a reminder of the contingent nature of national identity:

> National cultures contain competing discourses that are bound up with the actions of specific groups. Through these actions and discourses, people construct meanings which influence and organize both their own and others’ actions and conceptions of themselves (p. 177).

Identity construction is neither fixed nor is it forced upon unwilling victims from a dominant authority. There are often competing versions of identity ‘up for grabs’ and sport offers fertile ground for such commerce. Yet it must be remembered that this is never simply a zero-sum conception of power – neither exclusively reinforcing or challenging popular or dominant ideologies – and that sport and sporting identities can both enable and constrain, can both challenge and reinforce dominant and subordinate versions of ideology.

> In relatively stable liberal capitalist democracies power is reproduced effectively through a variety of means; sport clearly is one of these means, in many of its forms and manifestations. But it can also be a means whereby alternative values are protected, or developed and nurtured, and at times mobilized against a dominant culture (Hargreaves and Tomlinson, 1992: 215).
1.7 Summary

This section has attempted to provide an outline of the qualitative research paradigm, discussing competing definitions and the development of the qualitative approach, while outlining the contrasting ontological and epistemological positions possible, and adopted in the present thesis. The cultural studies approach has been highlighted as this constitutes the theoretical position adopted in the present thesis and the evaluation of the qualitative paradigm has been discussed, with particular attention paid to Scottish national identity studies. The following section moves on to discuss the primary method of data collection, the interview.

2 Interviews

The present research project wishes to investigate how an interest in Scottish sport, defined by being a regular attendee at selected rugby union and football clubs, is connected with respondents’ sense of national identity – whether, for example, they express and experience their national identity more intensely because of their involvement in Scottish sport, or if there are different examples of Scottish national identity exhibited. Comparisons are made between the clubs in each sport and across the different sports in order to discover meaningful patterns. By analysing the internal cultures within selected groups of rugby union and football fans in Scotland, it is intended to shed light on whether the fans are bearers of Scottish nationalism in either a political or symbolic sense or whether they actually reinforce and further legitimise the status quo. Perhaps neither of these apply and there are clearer signifying lines at other intersecting points such as those of class, geographical location or ethnicity?

The ontological approach taken in the present study values people’s knowledge, views, interpretations and experiences as meaningful properties of social reality (constructivist), and the questions designed in order to investigate this reality should correspond with the epistemological position taken, which is broadly realist. A legitimate way to generate data from this standpoint is by interacting with the
relevant subjects and this can be carried out by ethnography – primarily qualitative interviews with participant observation representing the secondary method of data collection.

"Interviews are one of the most commonly recognised forms of qualitative research method" (Mason, 1996: 39) and offer good possibilities for gaining information that cannot be simply observed (Bryman, 2001). Interviewing also allows the interviewee to reconstruct events over and over, and reduces ethical concerns about gaining information without consent – as may occur in observation situations. Kvale (1996) has discussed interviewing as a method in detail and provides a typology of questions and a list of criteria for preparing to interview. Bryman (2001) lists some of the advantages and disadvantages of the method and warns of interviewees suffering from a "reactive affect" (p. 332), modifying their behaviour because of the interviewer's presence. Watson (2003) highlights a four stage model for interpreting interviews. He advocates distinguishing between first hand and secondary knowledge, seeking internal consistencies within individual testimonies, verifying content against other sources and looking for recurrent themes.

2.1 Rationale for using interviews

The qualitative interview being utilised in the present study is descended from the anthropological ethnographic tradition which Marcus and Fischer (1986, 1999) note emerged from the work of Bronislaw Malinowski's 'Argonauts of the Western Pacific' (1922). This work saw the emergence of anthropology as an academic practice in the United Kingdom and the United States. Marcus and Fischer (1999) claim that anthropology "laid the groundwork for the critique of the idea that there could be a value-free social science, an idea which was popular in the 1950s, but was increasingly challenged during the 1960s" (p. 20). The rejection of value-free interviewing is reinforced by Kvale (1996) who argues that "interviewing is a craft: It does not follow content- and context-free rules of method, but rests on the judgements of a qualified researcher" (p. 105). He further notes the importance of openness and flexibility required of the interviewer and suggests that interviewing is more of an art than a standardised social science method. Hammersley and Atkinson
(1995) and Walsh (1998) define ethnographic research as participation in people's daily life for an extended period of time. The present study, therefore, will not be ethnographic in the pure sense but it will have underlying ethnographic principles and will use some of the tools of ethnography. In discussing the ethnographic interview, Spradley (1979) describes the analysis of ethnographic interview data in such a way as to reinforce the legitimacy of the present study's linkages to the ethnographic tradition:

Most important for the ethnographer is the fact that informants have already learned a set of categories into which their culture is divided. An informant's cultural knowledge is more than random bits of information; this knowledge is organised into categories, all of which are systematically related to the entire culture. Our goal is to employ methods of analysis that lead to discovering this organisation of cultural knowledge. We especially want to avoid imposing categories from the outside that create order and pattern rather than discover it. Ethnographic analysis is the search for the parts of a culture and their relationships as conceptualised by informants (pp. 92 - 93, original emphasis).

When qualitative research practitioners select appropriate methods for a research design, they should carefully consider the aims and objectives of the research and whether they are compatible with the overriding epistemological and ontological positions being adopted. In discussing Scottish national identity in relation to Scottish sporting clubs' supporters, it is imperative that the present study is informed by an understanding of the self-perceptions and opinions of these respective supporters from the selected clubs, and attempts to use the cases to illustrate more general phenomena in relation to existing theoretical claims. Kvale (1996) notes that interviews are often applied in such case studies.

Flick (2002) suggests that "if the source of a single case and the context of experiences is the central aim of the research, narratives of the development of experiences should be considered" (p. 93). In Flick's interview typologies, it appears that the "expert interview" and the "ethnographic interview" are best suited to providing "narratives of the development of experiences". McCracken (1988) concurs, adding that the qualitative interview allows respondents to tell their own story in their own terms. Kvale (1996) reiterates the value of the interview in such studies, stating that "interviews are particularly suited for studying people's understanding of the meanings in their lived world, describing their experiences and self-understanding, and clarifying and elaborating their own perspectives on their
lived world" (p. 105). Robson (2002) suggests that qualitative interviews are good
where individual perceptions of processes within a social unit are to be studied. The
social unit and processes in the present study are represented by the respective clubs
and their fans' individual cultures and practices.

Robson (2002) summarises by asserting:

distinctions are commonly made among seeking to find out what people know,
what they do, and what they think or feel. This leads, respectively, to questions
concerned with facts, with behaviour, and with beliefs or attitude (p. 272).

As the present study wishes to focus on behaviour, beliefs and attitudes - what
respondents do, think or feel - the interview process attempts to ensure that this
occurs without too much danger of researcher-led interpretations or inquiry. Shiner
and Newburn (1997) highlight that using semi-structured interviews:

minimises the extent to which respondents had to express themselves in terms
defined by the interviewers and encouraged them to raise issues that were important
to them. It was thus particularly well suited to attempt to discover respondents' own
meanings and interpretations (p. 520).

Seale neatly summarises:

I have argued that an important contrast exists between approaches that treat
interview data as a resource to discover things about events outside the interview
situation, and other approaches which treat the interview as a topic, where the
accomplishments of participants are investigated through a detailed examination of
the language people deploy ... these stances towards the analytic status of interview
data are not mutually exclusive ... In my view, it is perfectly acceptable to adopt a
policy whereby interviews are treated as potentially both topic and resource" (p.
215, original emphasis).

Although the present methodological approach situates interview data as belonging
more to the category Seale (1998) describes as 'interview as topic' than to
'interview as data', the philosophical approach to the method will be flexible
enough to allow either approach a position within the data-analysis if merited. In
designing a research study which seeks to analyse people's behaviour, beliefs and
attitudes, and in considering the range of methods appropriate, it is wise to bear in
mind Seale's reminder that interview data can be both a resource and a topic.
2.2 Interview as a social construction

Increasing criticism of the Classical Approach (see Seale, 1998) to interviewing has led to the discursive turn highlighting the performative function of language. Fontana and Frey (2000) write, "increasingly, qualitative researchers are realising that interviews are not neutral tools of data gathering but active interactions between two (or more) people leading to negotiated, contextually based results" (p. 646). Rapley (2001) echoes Fontana and Frey's claims and describes the interview as "never merely a neutral means of communication. In interviews, language is not a neutral carrier of information. Rather interview-talk itself is a form of social action and should be studied as such" (p. 307, original emphasis). Drawing upon Goffman (1959), Rapley provides a reminder that speech is used to present the self in a nice light, "as certain types-of-people in relation to the topic of the interview and reflexively the interview itself (p. 303). This may manifest itself in at least two possible ways. First, as Walsh (1998) demonstrates while discussing gatekeepers, "they will be concerned with the picture of their community, subculture, group or organisation and may want it and themselves painted in a favourable light" (p. 225). This could lead, therefore, to them acting and behaving in a manner in which they think they should in order to gain positive affirmation of their status. Second, they may become like "the expected people" (Marcus and Fischer, 1986, 1999) that previous researchers have described. That is, the subjects seek the researchers' accounts of what 'they are like' and use these as reference points to describe their behaviour and/or attitudes. In addition, there may be other potential reservoirs of information detailing what 'they are like', ranging from club biographies, media reports, and personal experiences. These may combine to present a sense of self-knowledge of each club's supporter culture.

Rapley (2001), meanwhile, reminds us of the contextual nature of talk, warning of the dangers involved in theorising from talk by citing Firth and Kitzinger (1998):

Talk is always occasioned and produced in a context, in interaction with others – and that participants are orientating towards the questions, concerns, assumptions, interpretations and judgements of others in producing their talk. When social scientists make the methodological leap from what people 'say' to what they 'believe' or how they 'behave' they obscure the social function of talk and obscure its role as talk-in-interaction (Firth and Kitzinger, 1998: 317).
This careful sensitivity to the interactional capacity of the interview process was pioneered by Clifford Geertz and David Schneider, both graduate students of Talcott Parsons' Department of Social Relations at Harvard (Marcus and Fischer, 1986, 1999). Marcus and Fischer describe this interpretive anthropology as "operating on two levels simultaneously: it provides accounts of other worlds from the inside, and reflects about the epistemological groundings of such accounts" (p. 26). Geertz's 'Thick Description' provided reflexive interpretations of truth rather than objective accounts of it and in terms of the relativism spectrum, is close to Foucault's 'Regimes of Truth' (Walsh, 1998). This interplay of texts, as Marcus and Fischer (1986, 1999) stress:

served to mark vividly the difference between the behavioural scientist and the cultural interpreter. According to this view, social activities can be 'read' for their meanings by the observer just as written and spoken materials more conventionally are. What's more, not only the ethnographer reads symbols in action, but so do the observed – the actors in relation to one another (p. 26).

Although being nearer the 'Regimes of Truth' and 'Thick Description' end of the relativism spectrum, recognising the interactional nature of talk, the present methodology rejects viewing reality as only texts with no objective reality. Rather, it seeks to reflect Walsh's (1998) position. He notes that "the social and cultural world must be the ground and reference for ethnographic writing, and reflexive ethnography should involve a keen awareness of the interpenetration of reality and representation" (p. 220).

Displaying a keen awareness of the interpenetration of reality and representation while grounding such work in the social and cultural world requires a sensitivity to the place of symbols in creating cultural meaning. Spradley (1979) claims that "all cultural meaning is created by symbols" (p. 95) and he highlights the three elements to the symbol: demonstrating a clear similarity to Barthes's (1957) work on signs and signifying systems, Spradley describes "symbol", "referent" and the "relationship between the two" as the elements of the symbols of culture. Barthes's "signifier" (referent) and "signified" (symbol) appear to represent and mirror "sign" (relationship between the two). Spradley expands on his symbol and referent relationship:

It is an arbitrary relationship in which the referent becomes encoded in the symbol. Once this encoding takes place we cease to think of the symbol itself and focus our
attention on what it refers to. Once learned, we take our symbolic codes for granted, often treating them as if equivalent to what they referred to ... We call this referential meaning (p. 96).

As Spradley concedes, however, this does not provide us with deeper, culturally significant information. To overcome this obstacle, he suggests:

For the purposes of ethnographic research, I think it is more useful to look at cultural meaning systems from the perspective of a relational theory of meaning. This will shift our attention away from what a particular symbol denotes and connotes to the system of symbols that constitute a culture (p. 97, original emphasis).

As he further notes, all symbols are parts of the system of others. "A relational theory of meaning is based on the following premise: the meaning of any symbol is its relationship to other symbols" (p. 97, original emphasis). The present study will seek to move beyond 'referential meaning', to discover the meaning of these types of symbols within each case study club and to contextualise the relationships they have with other symbols within that particular culture. This legitimises the selection of the present study's case study clubs, with three from association football and three from rugby union. It is hoped that within and across each of the sports, a relational theory of meaning to other symbols will be discovered, leading to analysis and theorisation. "Decoding cultural symbols involves far more than finding their referents; it requires that we discover the relationships that occur among these symbols" (Spradley, 1979: 97).

In carrying out interviews in an ethnographic setting, Walsh (1998) provides a summary of good practice to adhere to:

The production of truth rests on three things: the plausibility of the claim given our existing knowledge; the credibility of the claim given the nature of the phenomena; and the circumstances of the research and the characteristics of the researcher (p. 232, original emphasis).

2.3 Typologies of interview

Many research methods practitioners discuss interviewing as a method by highlighting their preferred typology and providing a set of prescribed guidelines for their practical use. The following section outlines the type of interviews most
closely associated with the present study, demonstrating the overlapping and sometimes confusing nature of the labelling of interviews in the literature.

Fontana and Frey (2000) outline six major types of interview — structured; group; unstructured; creative; oral and postmodern. The incompatibility of some of these types to the present study is demonstrated as Fontana and Frey describe their respective categories. For example, in structured interviews, they note that the interviewer asks all respondents the same series of pre-established questions and they add “this kind of interview often elicits rational responses, but it overlooks or inadequately assesses the emotional dimension” (p. 651). This makes structured interviewing unsuitable for the present research.

The difficulty of labelling a qualitative interview as a specific typology is made evident when Fontana and Frey (2000) describe the unstructured interview. They refer to unstructured interviews as being the same as open-ended ethnographic interviews; and in turn, they describe ethnographic interviews as in-depth interviews also. The close methodological links between qualitative interviewing and participant observation is then made explicit: Many qualitative researchers differentiate between in-depth (or ethnographic) interviewing and participant observation. Yet, as Lofland (1971) points out, the two go hand in hand, and many of the data gathered in participant observation come from informal interviewing in the field (Fontana and Frey, 2000: 652).

Fontana and Frey (2000) discuss group interviews, and reiterating the view of Kvale (1996) and Robson (2002), note that this type of interview is often categorised under focus group interview. They add that this technique can straddle the line between formal and informal and can be used to gather opinions or reactions to issues and policies. Robson (2002) claims that “the more common versions have a substantial degree of flexibility and are effectively some form of hybrid with characteristics of a discussion as well as of an interview” (p. 283).

Robson (2000) highlights that “interviews can be used as the primary or only approach in a study, as in a survey or many grounded theory studies” (p. 270). He distinguishes between the categories of fully structured, semi-structured and unstructured interviews, adding that the latter two are widely used in flexible
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qualitative research designs. Semi-structured interviews often have pre-determined questions but crucially, for the present study, the wording and order can be changed and explanations given; questions which seem inappropriate with a particular interviewee can be omitted, or additional ones added. This seems particularly pertinent to the present study which sought to interview a variety of differing types of club supporter with contrasting life experiences, and in different social and cultural settings resulting in highly specific themes and questions arising in relation to each group or subject. Robson stresses that semi-structured interviewers “have their shopping list of topics ... and have considerable freedom in the sequencing of questions, in their exact wording, and in the amount of time and attention given to different topics” (p. 278). Robson draws upon King (1994) who describes semi-structured and unstructured interviews as qualitative research interviews which should be used where a study wishes to focus on the meaning of particular phenomena to the participants and where individual perceptions of processes within a social unit – such as a work group, department, club – are to be studied. Robson (2000) demonstrates to the potential researcher the common confusion surrounding the typologies of interviews by noting that Powney and Watts (1987) prefer a different typology still. They use respondent interviews to describe those where the interviewer is in control and informant interviews, sometimes called non-directive, which often appear unstructured and leave the interviewee in control. Robson (2000) highlights a particular type of unstructured interview – the informal interview – which is important to the present study.

This is where one takes an opportunity that arises to have a (usually short) chat with someone in the research setting about anything which seems relevant. In an ethnographic-style study, this might arise after a period of observation to try to seek clarification about the meaning or significance of something that took place (p. 282).

Robson’s informal interview appears similar to Flick’s (2002) ethnographic interview in which:

the local and temporal framework is less clearly delimited than in other interview situations. There, time and place are arranged exclusively for the interview. Here, opportunities for an interview often arise spontaneously and surprisingly from regular field contacts (p. 90).

These reflect the view of Spradley (1979) who writes “it is best to think of ethnographic interviews as a series of friendly conversations into which the
researcher slowly introduces new elements to assist informants to respond as informants” (pp. 58 - 59).

Seale (1998) provides two possible categories of interview and three types of qualitative interview. His categories are ‘interview as topic’ and ‘interview as resource’. Interview as resource treats data as objective facts which can be utilised as data, while interview as topic treats the interview as a social event in its own right which can itself be analysed as a topic. He adds, “another way of analysing the interview as topic is to understand the talk as generating various versions of preferred self-identity, containing moral elements” (p. 214). Seale describes qualitative interviews as either depth, unstructured or life history respectively.

Flick (2002) is a little more specific, providing several possible sub-categories of the semi-structured interview which he says is used when the subject is more likely to express self in a more open forum than in the standardised interview or questionnaire. The sub-categories are “focused”, “problem-centred”, “semi-standardised”, “expert” and “ethnographic”. The latter three appear to be relevant to the present study, with semi-standardised appearing similar to what other writers label “semi-structured”. “Ethnographic” is relevant due to the aforementioned opportunities for an interview to often arise spontaneously from the field. The expert interview, discussed in more detail by Meuser and Nagel (1991), seems to apply to the present study’s groups of supporter-experts in their respective clubs. Flick (2002) notes:

the interviewee is of less interest as a (whole) person than in his or her capacity of being an expert for a certain field of activity. He or she is integrated into the study not as a single case but as representing a group (of specific experts) (p. 89).

To summarise, there are a variety of terms used to describe and label the numerous types of interviews used in research methods. There are slight differences between some research practitioners’ terms, and many of these typologies of interview share characteristics with those of other practitioners’ typologies. For example, Flick, (2002) describes the ‘semi-standardised’ interview, which can be further sub-categorised as ‘expert’ or ‘ethnographic’. These appear to share most characteristics with King’s (1994) and Robson’s (2000) ‘semi-structured’ interviews. In turn, these also appear similar to Fontana and Frey’s (2000) ‘ethnographic’ interview which is
similar to the 'in-depth' interview also mentioned by Fontana and Frey. Kvale (1996), Fontana and Frey (2000) and Robson (2002) all highlight 'group' interviews and show their close relationship to 'focus group' interviews. The present study utilises the semi-structured interview, the ethnographic and expert interview at various times and under certain circumstances throughout the data collection process.

2.4 Types of question

In common with interviews, a variety of overlapping terms and typologies exist to describe types of questions used within qualitative interviews. The types of questions suitable for use with these typologies of interview will be highlighted and discussed in relation to the present study, before explaining the rationale behind the questions asked during the interview process.

Spradley (1979, 1980) explains that there are thirty types of questions associated with the ethnographic interview. He then discusses and outlines four specific question categories. These are 'grand tour', 'mini tour', 'restating', and 'ethnographic explanation'. Describing grand tour questions, he explains that they are a "special kind of descriptive question" and are "asked, not in a simple statement, but with repeated phrases, expanding on the basic question" (Spradley, 1979: 62). 'Mini tour' questions are usually offered in response to 'grand tour' questions and deal with smaller units of activity. 'Restating' is used as a tool in order to allow the informant to expand upon an account. An example would include — 'So you have told me that you do x and y. Could you tell me what that involves?' Spradley (1979) adds "this serves to jog the memory of the informant, it helps return to the original question, and it helps her expand on the description" (p. 64). The fourth specific category of question offered by Spradley is the 'ethnographic explanation'. This is linked to 'native language' questions (Spradley, 1979, 1980). "This descriptive question asks for an expression related to what the informant is talking about — but in her native language" (Spradley, 1979: 65).
As previously stated, Spradley's 'ethnographic interview' is very similar to that of McCracken's (1988) 'qualitative interview', Flick's (2002) 'semi-standardised interview' and Robson's (2002) 'semi-structured interview,' which all fit into the interview typology being adopted in the present study. McCracken's (1988) qualitative interview has two fundamental question types: 'grand tour' and 'planned prompt' questions. The grand tour strategy is a developed sensitivity of the researcher for noticing key terms, and, as they emerge, for prompting the subject to talk about them. This usually happens through 'floating prompts' which are a facilitative and unobtrusive way of conducting interviews (McCracken, 1988)

Flick's (2002) semi-standardised interview has three major question types: 'open', 'theory driven' and 'confrontational'. The open question allows such questions as 'what do you think of x?' The theory driven question tests hypotheses – for example, 'do you support Scotland because it is commonly seen as patriotic to do so?' The confrontational question allows the interviewer to respond to what has been said by the interviewee in order to critically examine it. Flick summarises:

During the interviews, the contents of the subjective theory are reconstructed. The interview guide mentions several topical areas. Each of these is introduced by an open question and ended by a confrontational question (p. 81).

Flick recommends a second stage to the semi-standardised interview which he terms the 'structure laying technique' (p. 84). This is similar to the common method of 'respondent validation' (Mason, 1996) which involves a second meeting with the interviewee after initial transcribing and content analysis has occurred to affirm or revise aspects of the essential statements.

Robson's (2002) semi-structured interview has three main types of question. These are 'closed', 'open' and 'scale'. Closed questions force the interviewee to choose from two or more fixed alternatives, whereas open questions have no restrictions on content or manner of reply, and scale questions provide a degree of agreement or disagreement to be registered.

While placing legitimate and essential value on the typologies of interview and question, the researcher would be wise to heed the advice of Fontana and Frey (2000), who, while discussing interviews as a method, state:
Clearly, as we move forward with sociology, we cannot, to paraphrase what Herbert Blumer said so many years ago, let the methods dictate our images of human beings. As Punch (1986) suggest, as field-workers we need to exercise common sense and responsibility, and, we would like to add, to our subjects first, to the study next, and to ourselves last (p. 663).

This common sense and responsibility to our subjects became necessary during many of the interviews. By using the “naiveté” approach (Gluckman and Devons, 1964), adopting the position of the “decentred” (Billig, 1998) and discussing issues in a ‘decontextualised’ voice (Finn, 2000), the researcher was faced with a couple of evolving methodological challenges. First, at times the researcher appeared to be asking silly or obvious questions, which risked partially alienating subjects who may have questioned the researcher’s credentials or research quality, possibly resulting in reduced respect or trust of the researcher from the interviewee. Second, by being so openly naïve, decontextualised and decentred, the researcher partially invited the subject to digress, often in the mistaken belief that she / he is ‘educating’ the interviewer in the ‘necessary basics’ and context. Furthermore, there is the ever-present danger of the subject going down a ‘blind alley’ and discussing unrelated or partially related issues within the context of the actual interview question. In order to manage these risks effectively, the researcher increasingly adopted McCracken’s (1988) ‘grand tour ‘and ‘planned prompt’ strategy outlined previously. This involves the researcher noticing key terms as they emerge and then prompting the subject to talk about them in more detail.

Two central conceptual themes remained during individual interview questions across both sports and all clubs. These can be categorised as ‘general’ and ‘comparative’. The general thematic questions related to the feelings, memories and desires of the respective interviewee and his / her perceptions of their wider club support, while the comparative thematic questions were designed to illuminate inter-sport and city, and intra-sport and city comparisons. In order to do this effectively, each interview schedule was divided into sub-themes about which the subject was invited to speak. The ‘warm up’ sub-section allowed the subject to familiarise her / his self with the interview environment by introducing her / him self and describing their relationship to their sports club in basic terms. This was followed by the ‘club identity’ sub-section, which sought to investigate and
enunciate the nature of the individual and group attachments to each sports club (and often each supporters’ club in the football groups). Issues such as the importance of local players and club origins were discussed in this section. The following sub-section focused specifically on the self-identity perception of each interviewee. The preferred national identity perception was investigated by utilising the Moreno Scale (appendix 1) and preferred political identity was approached in terms of Scotland being autonomous, devolved or ruled from Westminster. Then, in relation to their club, the notion of ‘The Other’ was investigated by asking who they are and why. After these sections were completed, the interview proceeded to discuss support for Scotland’s national teams, with the interviewee’s own code discussed first before enquiring about their views on the opposite football code’s national team. Within this section, questions relating to local, regional, national and supranational sporting identities were asked in addition to questions relating to place of residence and its linkages with national identity. For example, the extent to which one can have a national identity while living in another location or having been raised elsewhere was examined. This section was followed by a set of questions relating to the national sporting ‘Other’, enquiring about the reasons and manifestations of these relationships. In designing the interview schedule, however, Jones (1985) provides a cautionary reminder that:

there cannot be definitive rules about the use of open-ended questions, leading questions and loaded questions, disagreements with respondents and so on ... What is crucial is that researchers choose their actions with a self-conscious awareness of why they are making them (pp. 48 - 49).

2.5 Analysing and interpreting interviews

After the interview has been carried out, the data must be organised in an appropriate manner which facilitates the analysis and interpretation stages to occur. This is usually carried out by transcribing interview data. McCracken (1988) provides a detailed five-stage account of the process of transcribing. He promotes the use of a professional typist to transcribe data in order to prevent potential researcher frustration and “familiarity with the data that does not serve the later process of analysis” (pp. 41 - 42). This is in direct contrast to Seale (1998) who suggests:
Though laborious, the experience of transcribing can bring a much closer appreciation of the meanings in the data, and this is often the time at which ideas for coding arise, as well as ideas for topics to pursue in subsequent interviews, perhaps as a part of a theoretical sampling strategy" (p. 207, original emphasis).

There is a degree of relativity in terms of the reported time it takes to conduct the transcribing process, with Robson (2002) suggesting that one hour of material takes around ten hours to transcribe. This is more than the five to six hours suggested by Bryman (2001). Perhaps this difference is largely dependent upon the degree of detail one applies to the transcribing process. As Rapley (2001) points out, transcribing often does not include interviewer 'non-action' such as pausing and nodding of the head. Rapley describes these types of 'non-action' occurrences as 'an action' because they affect the interviewer's response. He provides an in-depth example of a possible transcription process, which includes every pause and possible action with corresponding codes built in to the language of transcription. However, he concedes:

I am not advocating that researchers from all areas adopt such 'detailed' transcription practices. However, an attempt should be made to include some degree of the interactional detail and at the very least interviewers' talk should always be included (p. 306, original emphasis).

Robson (2002) and Spradley (1980) both warn against collecting too much data before conducting initial data analysis. Spradley's justification is more related to the philosophical grounding of conducting ethnographic research. He states, "In ethnographic inquiry, analysis is a process of question-discovery. Instead of coming into the field with specific questions, the ethnographer analyses the field data compiled from participant observation, to discover questions" (p. 33). As previously mentioned, this question-discovery process situates the present study within the ethnographic tradition even if the question-discovery process is not limited exclusively to observation, but includes the initial ethnographic interviews and the semi-structured interviews with selected subjects. These two types of interview used in the present study allowed the researcher to engage in a two-tier question-discovery process whereby the early investigative ethnographic interviews facilitated discovery around potential future interviewees and possible analytical categories of investigation. The second question-discovery process occurred during the pre-planned semi-structured interview sessions with sports club supporters. These sessions led to new themes and questions arising, both within the subjects'
own club and across other clubs, leading to cultural and theoretical connections being made. The thematic coding process adopted in analysing the data is outlined in appendix 4.

When transcribing, coding and analysing the interviews, there are some dangers which the researcher must take care to avoid. Fontana and Frey (2000) and Rapley (2001) echo Holstein and Gubrium's (1995) sentiments when they advise that interviews should not be seen as a "reality report" or as accepting that the data speak for themselves. Fontana and Frey (2000) suggest that to fail to do this would be to mistakenly assume the researcher is unbiased and neutral. The ontological and epistemological grounding of the present study accepts a priori that the researcher, like the subject, will have undoubted biases. C.W. Mills (1959) discussed this very issue stressing:

I am hopeful of course that all my own biases will show, for I think judgements should be explicit ... My biases are of course no more or no less biases than those I am going to examine. Let those who do not care for mine use their rejections of them to make their own as explicit and as acknowledged as I am going to make mine! Then the moral problems of social study - the problem of social science as a public issue - will be recognised, and discussion will become possible. Then there will be greater self-awareness all around - which is of course (sic) a pre-condition for objectivity in the enterprise of social science as a whole (p. 21).

The key, however, is to acknowledge these only where and when appropriate, and to demonstrate that reflexivity has taken place throughout the data collection and analysis process. Fontana and Frey (2000) state:

These concerns have led to new directions in qualitative interviewing focusing on increased attention to the voices of the respondents (Marcus and Fischer, 1986), the interviewer-respondent relationship (Crapanzano, 1980), the importance of the researcher's gender in interviewing (Gluck and Patai, 1991), and the roles of other elements, such as race, social status, and age (Seidman, 1991) (p. 649).

Clearly, a number of factors could potentially impact upon the interview process and care must be taken to avoid data contamination or researcher bias.

As has been argued, the present study is grounded in a constructionist ethnographic tradition even though its primary method of data collection is the semi-structured qualitative interview rather than direct observation on a daily basis over an extended period of time. The ethnographic links are made more explicit by considering Marcus and Fischer's (1986, 1999) position regarding interpretive ethnography.
"The essence of holistic representation in modern ethnography has not been to produce a catalog (sic) or an encyclopaedia ... but to contextualise elements of culture and to make systematic connections among them" (p. 23). Interviews can be 'explorative' and 'hypothesis testing' (Kvale, 1996). The present interview design is intended to facilitate the cultural contextualising of supporters' behaviour and attitudes and to make connections between them.

The main purpose of an interview can be either empirical or theoretical ... Or an investigation might also be designed to test the implications of a theory or, as in the grounded theory approach developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967), to develop an empirically grounded theory through observations and interviews (Kvale, 1996: 98).

The interviews conducted with the supporters groups used in the present research belong more to the grounded theory approach to research, seeking to explicate knowledge about a small number of supporters from each respective club and to uncover their "buried epistemologies" (Willems – Braun, 1997).

The problem of numbers arises in designing a study such as this. How many does one interview? Kvale provides a solution. "Interview as many subjects as necessary to find out what you need to know" (p. 101). He adds:

A common critique of interview studies is that the findings are not generalisable because there are too few subjects. A paradoxical answer, from the history of psychology, is that if the aim of a study is to obtain general knowledge, then focus on a few intensive case studies (p. 102).

Kvale encourages the generalising to larger groups from small case study research:

Two reasons for obtaining significant knowledge from a few subjects, which has later been found generalisable to larger groups, may be suggested. Quantitatively, each case contained an immense number of observations of single individuals. Qualitatively, the focus on single cases made it possible to investigate in detail the relationship of a specific behaviour to its context (Kvale, 1996: 103).

Kvale adds that if the purpose of research is to understand how one person experiences the world, then this one person is sufficient for interviewing. Interviews are commonly used to study small groups to develop knowledge about that particular group or to illustrate more general phenomena (Kvale, 1996).
3. Research Design

3.1 Rationale for using sports clubs in study

The original intention was to research the supporters of the Scotland national rugby union and football teams. However, due to the nature of the respective supporter networks of the two sports, it became apparent that this approach was too problematic. For example, historically, the national football supporters have a well established tartan army supporters’ group which facilitates travel and ticketing arrangements; while, additional supporters – those unconnected to the official supporters’ organisation - largely gain tickets independently of the individual member clubs. Meanwhile, the rugby supporters, despite the 2007 launch of the Scotland Rugby Supporter Club, have tended to attend international matches through acquiring tickets from the respective rugby clubs, and their committees. Furthermore, the numbers of supporters attending club matches regularly differs markedly across both codes, with, for example, the average home attendances for Hearts and Hawick in the year before data collection being 12,272 and 600 respectively (www.Heartsfc; personal communication with Hawick committee member). This has historically meant that in rugby a larger number of Scotland supporters are unconnected to a club team (officially or through supporter loyalty) compared to their football counterparts. Therefore, supporters of three Scottish rugby union and football clubs have been chosen and contacted. The rugby union clubs are Hawick, Glasgow Hawks and Edinburgh Academical (Accies). The football clubs selected are Partick Thistle, Heart of Midlothian (Hearts) and Hibernian (Hibs). Official contact was made with representatives of each club. The process of interviewee selection is discussed further in the next sub-sections.

Rugby union in Edinburgh and Glasgow has historical linkages to the public schools and has traditionally been associated more with the middle-classes (Mangan, 1998). As previously stated, Kowalski (2004) acknowledges this, stating that rugby union in Scotland “with the exception of the textile and farming communities of the borders, for long was the domain of the more Anglicised middle-classes of Edinburgh and Glasgow” (p.73). This is perhaps particularly so in Edinburgh, but with this in mind, it was felt that both the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh should
be represented. Edinburgh Accies is perhaps the most established club in the country, while Glasgow Hawks is a recent addition to the Scottish game being founded to lead the development of top class players from an amalgamation of established Glasgow clubs. Following on from Kowalski’s claim, the inclusion of a Borders club was also important when one considers that despite the alleged conservative nature of Scottish rugby as a whole, the Borders is the only area of the country where it is claimed to be truly a game for all classes (Bogle and Smith, 1998; Speirs, 2000; Massie, 2000).

In selecting three football clubs, a number of key issues were considered. In order to situate the empirical data within the overall research context, it was considered important to attempt to maintain a geographical comparison between Glasgow and Edinburgh to remain consistent with the choice of rugby union clubs from the same cities. In addition, it was considered academically important to analyse the two clubs which arguably represent the biggest rivalry outwith Celtic and Rangers. A conscious decision was made to avoid another Old Firm analysis due to the substantial amount of work already carried out on these two clubs. Therefore the Edinburgh clubs Hearts and Hibs were chosen. Furthermore, these two clubs have been likened to the ‘Old Firm’ rivalry and it is important to question this comparison whilst situating their actual rivalry within an empirically driven account. In the absence of an established professional football club in the Borders, it was felt that the Glasgow club, Partick Thistle should be analysed. This decision was partly due to the club’s Glasgow location, thus maintaining the Edinburgh and Glasgow comparison. However, perhaps it was equally important to select Partick Thistle due to its commonly perceived status as the quintessential non-sectarian Glasgow football symbol having no obvious associations to religious or political identity markers.

The selection of these clubs allows for a potentially multi-layered analysis incorporating a number of lines of enquiry. A Glasgow – Edinburgh comparison is made possible within both sports, while maintaining the intra-city comparisons between Glasgow Hawks and Partick Thistle (Glasgow) and Hearts, Hibs and Edinburgh Accies (Edinburgh). The three Edinburgh clubs are also among the most well established clubs in the history of their respective sports in Scotland, with
Raeburn Place, home of Edinburgh Accies being referred to by some as 'the home of Scottish rugby union'. Glasgow Hawks, one of Scotland's newest and most prominent rugby union clubs, are located in the football-centred city of Glasgow allowing potentially fruitful cross-data to be generated. With the Borders traditionally being most closely associated with rugby union in Scotland, Hawick, one of the most successful and passionately supported rugby union clubs in the country, was selected. It is hoped that these choices will allow for an original and rich analysis in an under-developed area.

3.2 Research setting and access

After the selection of clubs was made, it was deemed necessary to contact a potential gatekeeper from each club with a view to establishing a working rapport. All three rugby clubs were contacted by a letter (appendix 2) addressed to their respective club secretaries. This was followed up by an introductory phone call to each club secretary in order to enquire as to whether they received the letter and to explain further the aims and objectives of the project and the proposed club involvement in it. Once this initial contact had been made, and verbal agreement to their involvement had been reached, face to face meetings with individual club secretaries were arranged. The meetings with Hawick and Glasgow Hawks were planned purposely to coincide with a home fixture. (The researcher also attended a gala 'sevens' day at Hawick)\textsuperscript{xiv}. This enabled the researcher to observe the club – officials, supporters, sponsors, media – in an authentic light, observing supporter demographics and behaviour, and vitally, facilitating the process of selecting interview subjects. Time was spent before, during and after the match speaking to a range of supporters in a variety of settings including the clubhouse, committee room, the stand, the terracing, the corporate area and the public bar. Fortuitously perhaps, during this time both club secretaries demonstrated sensitivity to the wider research project and they introduced the researcher to a number of potential interview subjects, taking time and effort to ensure that different types of club supporter were identified; Bryman (2001) refers to this as "convenience" sampling. From these match day meetings, the researcher, with some further help from the club secretaries, was able to devise a prospective list of interview subjects. The
potential subjects' contact details were forwarded to the researcher and communication between the researcher and potential subject began. Throughout this process, the researcher and club secretaries kept in regular contact, updating one another on any pertinent developments. A 'snowballing' effect occurred at times throughout this process, with some interviewees and the club secretaries suggesting 'other' possible subjects. It was not possible to attend an Edinburgh Academical match. However, after a lengthy period of communication including the initial introductory letter, a meeting was arranged between the researcher and club secretary. This facilitated the snowballing effect witnessed with the other two rugby clubs. Demonstrating an excellent appreciation of the project's aims and objectives, the secretary of Edinburgh Accies suggested some potential interviewees who were subsequently contacted with a request for a meeting and possible interview.

Towards the end of the designated data collection period the researcher spent a week in Edinburgh in order to meet and introduce the study to a wider variety of possible Accies interviewees who had been suggested by other subjects. This allowed meetings and interviews to occur at short notice and with limited inconvenience to each subject.

Despite the rugby clubs' secretaries being contacted as gatekeepers, this approach was deemed inappropriate for the football clubs. This was due to two main reasons; first, the football clubs' supporters are mainly more independent of the official clubs. Second, the football supporters tend to have a greater number of individual supporter groups and, particularly with the larger clubs, have supporter groups in numerous locations within and outwith the immediate vicinity of the football club.

With each football club, a small selection of supporters clubs were selected and contacted with an explanatory letter (appendix 3) asking for their cooperation. These supporters' clubs were initially contacted as a result of their location, all being situated within the districts associated with their respective sports clubs. For example, in Edinburgh, Gorgie is traditionally associated with Hearts, and Leith with Hibs. In Glasgow, the west end of the city is associated with Partick Thistle. Two supporters' clubs (Hibs' 'Erin Trust' club and Partick Thistle's Jordanhill club) responded positively immediately and the researcher arranged a meeting with each of their committees. The researcher initially met with the main club gatekeeper – the
supporters’ club secretary – and outlined the project proposals paying particular attention to the role and involvement of the respective clubs and their members. After these initial meetings, a snowball effect occurred in similar fashion to the rugby clubs, with club secretaries suggesting a variety of potential interviewees. The researcher then contacted these potential subjects and communicated the nature of the project. It was during this process that the researcher was able to gain a more complete sense of each potential subject’s worth to the project. ‘Worth’ to the project was defined by practical issues of reliability, willingness, flexibility, in addition to the type of supporter she / he was in terms of gender, age, club links and so on. With Hearts, there was no response from the two supporters’ clubs contacted. It was then decided to contact another club (Portobello) through a third party. This approach led to a successful meeting with the Portobello club’s secretary and a similar snowballing process as occurred at the other clubs. Two supporters’ clubs’ (from Hibs and Hearts) Player of the Year evenings were attended by the researcher in order to observe each club more closely and to ensure a varied range of possible interviewees were selected within the confines of each respective supporters’ club. During these evenings, the researcher took special care to engage in a number of ‘unstructured interviews’ (Robson, 2000), each occurring spontaneously throughout the evening in order to familiarise himself with the supporters and their supporter club culture, and to facilitate future communication with potential interview subjects he met that evening. Although it was not possible to attend an official Jordanhill Partick Thistle supporters’ club function, the researcher spent a number of hours on several occasions, socialising, chatting and observing members of the club in their meeting location, ‘Pablos’, a west end (of Glasgow) public house.

On agreeing to be interviewed for the study, each respondent was promised confidentiality and consequently, with their prior agreement, names used in the transcripts and analysis are pseudonyms.
3.3 Selecting interviewees

How does one select and legitimise one's choice of interviewee? McCraken (1988) places the selecting of subjects for interview in the third stage of his Four-Step Method of Inquiry relating to qualitative interviewing. He argues that because the interviewees are not a sample, their selection should not be governed by sampling rules.

There are two major principles guiding the selection of interview subjects for the present study. First, the study requires individuals who are willing and able to be interviewed and who can communicate their thoughts effectively. Additionally, they must be able to demonstrate the ability to be (partially) reflexive in their analyses. As Spradley (1979) asserts, "an informant is someone who can tell about patterns of behaviour in a particular scene, not merely his or her own actions" (p. 91). This is precisely why the present study has sought the help of individual supporters' groups in football, and the rugby supporters closely aligned to the rugby clubs' respective committees; these supporters' proven ability and commitment to work voluntarily on behalf of larger supporter numbers arguably justifies the assumption that these particular individuals possess the reflexive capacity to know and describe patterns of behaviour relating to themselves and others. This does not discount the possibility that there may be some debate as to what extent these individuals are likely to be knowledgeable about their respective club culture. However, it seems appropriate in the present study, to ascribe them this status. This is not to say, of course, that the 'knowledge' they possess about their club and supporter culture will be identical to the 'knowledge' expressed by other supporters from within their club and culture. It is implicitly accepted that their knowledge is a form of knowledge about their club supporters which may differ from other supporters' knowledge. In this respect, it should be acknowledged at this point that the interviewees selected are either Scottish by birth or of Scottish parentage. The interviewees of Scottish parentage only were born and raised in a Commonwealth country. There was no ethnic minority representation among the interviewees, although it should be noted that during all the ethnographic work within each "space of sport", no ethnic minority individuals were visible to the researcher and, therefore, made selection for interviewing purposes problematic.
The second major guiding principle in interviewee selection is highlighted by Walsh (1998) who states, "another principle may be that based on theoretical sampling: the selection of informants whose information is more likely to develop and test emerging analytical ideas" (p. 227). This is why the initial communication with each case study club has focused on using gatekeepers to introduce or suggest potentially valuable subjects to the researcher. Each gatekeeper has been informed in writing and in personal contact of the broad analytical focus of the study with a view to selecting appropriate subjects. The first opportunity the researcher had to ethnographically observe and engage in the inner sanctums of each club provided invaluable opportunities to carry out spontaneous ethnographic interviews in the guise of 'talk', and this has provided the study with a richer source of potential interviewees who can test and develop emerging analytical ideas. Indeed, one may say that the first stage of the interview process in the present study involved carrying out participant observation and ethnographic interviews – to varying degrees depending on the club and circumstances – in the pursuit of identifying and selecting potential interview subjects. Spradley (1979) explicitly recognises the potential in this approach:

When we examine the ethnographic interview as a speech event, we see that it shares many features with the friendly conversation. In fact, skilled ethnographers often gather most of their data through participant observation and many casual friendly conversations. They may interview people without their awareness, merely carrying on a friendly conversation while introducing a few ethnographic questions ... At any time during the interview it is possible to shift back to a friendly conversation. A few minutes of easygoing talk interspersed here and there throughout the interview will pay enormous dividends in rapport (pp. 58 - 59).

Spradley (1979) encourages the use of phrasing questions in both personal and wider terms. When asking personally phrased questions, the ethnographer asks questions like 'how would you describe x'. "This tells the informant to present his own point of view or her own particular language usage" (pp. 90 - 91). The wider based questions are designed to elicit information about others' opinions and behaviours. The researcher has sought to find instructive examples of sporting (national / local) identities rather than any statistically representative sample, and in doing so, has encouraged interviewees to express opinions they have individually, as well as opinions which others may have on a collective basis.
3.4 Field Strategy

The researcher is not a neutral tool, but an active participant (Fontana and Frey, 2000). Schwandt (1997) adds:

It has become increasingly common in qualitative studies to view the interview as a form of discourse between two or more speakers or as a linguistic event in which the meanings of questions and responses are contextually grounded and jointly constructed by the interviewer and respondent (p. 79).

Fontana and Frey (2000) provide two contrasting approaches in how to develop the researcher-respondent relationship. First, they highlight the 'postmodern interview' approach in which there is more emphasis on minimising 'status differences' and developing closer relationships. "Interviewers can show their human side and answer questions and express feelings. Methodologically, this new approach provides a greater spectrum of responses and greater insight into the lives of respondents" (pp. 658 - 659). Second, the contrasting approach advocates that the researcher should "avoid getting involved in a 'real' conversation in which he or she answers questions asked by the respondent or provides personal opinions on the matters discussed" (p. 660). They add, "a researcher can avoid 'getting trapped' by shrugging off the relevance of his or her opinions ('it doesn't matter how I feel, it's your opinion that's important')" (p. 660). The position adopted by the present researcher is somewhere in the middle of these polar opposites. The researcher must ensure s/he is friendly enough to gain access and develop rapport, while simultaneously guarding against giving away too much personal opinion or information that may affect rapport or contaminate data. Indeed, this became necessary on a few occasions. The present research takes place within the cultural boundaries of Scottish football and rugby union, and these environments each have their own "space of sport" which impinge on and affect the social intercourse dynamic. This can lead to potentially tricky situations in the field. A working example from the present study occurred during one of the earliest communications between the researcher and a potential gatekeeper. The gatekeeper inquired about the researcher's preferred choice of football club. "Who do you support then?" asked the gatekeeper. This seemingly neutral question left the researcher with a major dilemma very early on in the interview process, as earlier, during the same conversation, the gatekeeper had expressed his disdain for supporters of both Celtic
and Rangers Football Clubs, and in particular, those who “take the bus from other towns and cities to see them”. As the researcher had previously lived in Arbroath and had regularly taken the bus to see Celtic, he was reluctant to be too truthful and open in case this led to resentment and mistrust, or discouraged the gatekeeper from being completely open and honest about his views and behaviour. The researcher subsequently informed the gatekeeper that “I was too busy playing football to really support anyone seriously”. This form of “impression management” was maintained throughout the data collection period by the researcher who became a ‘performer’ in the sense Goffman outlined in his dramaturgical model (1959). As Goffman reminds us:

A performer tends to conceal or underplay those activities, facts, and motives which are incompatible with an idealised version of himself and his products. In addition, a performer often engenders in his audience the belief that he is related to them in a more ideal way than is always the case (p. 56).

Clearly any failure to “perform” efficiently, to maintain a “front” compatible with the idealised version (preferred by the subject) risked harming the embryonic researcher-subject relationship. Of course, this type of impression management has to avoid outright dishonesty. Goffman expands further while discussing such challenges:

In everyday life it is usually possible for the performer to create intentionally almost any kind of false impression without putting himself in the indefensible position of having told a clear-cut lie. Communication techniques such as innuendo, strategic ambiguity, and crucial omissions allow the misinformer to profit from lies without, technically, telling any (p. 69).

These types of events lead to the issue of involvement and detachment; to what extent is it wise or scientifically fruitful for the researcher to become personally involved during dialogue and in the wider relationship? Moreover, to what extent is it possible to distance oneself from one’s own social and cultural embodiment in pursuit of scientific truth? In pursuit of sociological truth, the researcher employed this form of “impression management”, establishing trust and rapport in a professional and approachable manner yet simultaneously managing the relationship effectively in order to remain ethically and sociologically grounded.

Spradley (1980) explains that the researcher will become both an ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ simultaneously (p. 57). McCracken (1988), meanwhile, advocates “manufacturing distance” as a way to manage both being involved and detached. He
uses the terms “familiarisation” and “defamiliarisation” and notes that without familiarisation (involvement) the listening skills needed for data collection are impoverished. He adds that without defamiliarisation (detachment) the researcher is unable to establish distance from her or his embedded cultural assumptions. This position is similar to Marcus and Fischer’s (1986, 1999) “defamiliarising” process of “making the familiar foreign” and “the foreign familiar”. They highlight two types of defamiliarisation critique; “epistemological” and “cross-cultural juxtaposition”. The former involves going out to the periphery of our cultural norms in order to disrupt our settled ways of thinking, while the latter allows for a foreign culture to be understood and “brought back” for cross cultural comparisons. The present study incorporates the former, the defamiliarisation by epistemological critique. Marcus and Fischer explain, “disruption of common sense, doing the unexpected, placing familiar subjects in unfamiliar, or even shocking, contexts are the aims of this strategy to make the reader conscious of difference” (p. 137). The present study aims to situate the researcher in such a position that he is able to view familiar subjects and contexts through an unfamiliarising lense. As Marcus and Fischer have shown, this type of defamiliarising is grounded partly in the work of Max Gluckman and Eli Devons’s (1964) ‘Systems and Open Minds’. They validated the use of the ‘naivete’ to allow the researcher to enter the field with an open mind, free of preexisting assumptions or prejudices. This ‘naivete’ approach has been adopted in the present study, particularly during semi-structured interviews at moments when issues which were familiar to the researcher were discussed. By playing the naivete card, the researcher was more able to allow the interviewee to lead the discussion and to construct his or her own arguments and conclusions with little or no researcher-led contamination.

Walsh (1998) also expresses a desire to make the foreign familiar and the familiar foreign. Referring to Schutz’s (1964) essay “The Stranger” to explain the process, Walsh (1998) notes:

The stranger can become a member of the group through participation ... At the same time, being a stranger creates an attitude of objectivity because the stranger must carefully examine what seems self-explanatory to the members of the group ... The ethnographer tries to treat the familiar world of ‘members’ as anthropologically strange, to expose its social and cultural construction (p. 218, original emphasis).
Familiarisation, defamiliarization and involvement and detachment are discussed by others in the social sciences too. Two theorists, each with their own disciplinary specialism in national identity studies, have discussed such concepts within their respective academic paradigms. Educational sociologist Finn (2000) adapts Wertsch’s (1990) framework which utilises the concepts of the ‘voice of decontextualised rationality’ (detached) and the ‘contextualised voice’ (involved). Discussing the position of power within such analyses, Finn suggests that the power of the decontextualised voice “relies upon a system of representation that is taken to be abstract and neutral” (p. 60). Finn adds:

normally this voice is contrasted with experientially based voices that are cast as ‘contextualised forms of representation’. Their accounts are judged to be particularistic, leading to unsubstantiated generalisations, and influenced by emotions rather than detachment (p. 60).

Finn demonstrates the ease with which the dominant voice usually appears to be that of decontextualised rationality. Meanwhile, social psychologist Billig (1998) utilises the concepts of ‘ethnocentrists’ and ‘decentred’ individuals. He explains:

Whereas ethnocentrists view the world from the narrow perspective of their own group, decentred individuals are said to exercise a crucial act of imagination: they can view themselves, and their own national groups, as outsiders might see them. By such imagination, they can free themselves from the limited prejudice of ethnocentric thinking (p. 36).

The present researcher adopts the position of Billig’s ‘decentred’ individual who attempts to free himself from the limited prejudice of ethnocentric thinking. However, a note of caution is required with this approach. Clearly, it should be highlighted that the extent to which the researcher can ‘play’ the naïveté must be judged by the quality of discussion and results of the data analysis; and these results will involve a two-tiered naïveté approach. The first tier relates to the data collection (interviews), while the second relates to the analysis and interpretation of the data material. The researcher should bear in mind that the defamiliarising process of adopting the naïveté approach includes the process of analysing and interpreting the data in addition to collecting such data. The true extent to which any researcher can become the complete naïveté is questionable and the researcher (and reader) should bear this in mind throughout the study.
3.5 Recording data

Each semi-structured interview was planned in advance with the researcher travelling to a variety of places and settings to carry them out. These places ranged from areas of the town or city where each interviewee lived or worked or where their club was based. The settings varied according to the wishes of the interviewee and included the sports club clubhouse, local café, the home of the interviewee, and the interviewee's place of work. Each place and setting was pre-arranged to reduce potential inconvenience to the interview subject, and consequently, different settings were used according to the wishes of each individual across the sports clubs within the study. Each interview was recorded with the permission of the interviewee.

The primary data collection tool was an Olympus DM-10 digital voice recorder. The recorder allows digital files to be transferred to a computer in order to be transcribed. During each interview, notes were taken in addition to the voice recording. This allowed non-verbal communication to be recorded. A limited selection of club documents have been collected for analysis, including match programmes, player of the year dance programmes, monthly newsletters and club biographies. These written documents are used as a secondary source and are intended to illuminate and clarify aspects of each club identity thus deepening the conceptual understanding of interview data generated.

3.6 Summary

This section has provided a brief explanation of why gatekeepers were selected, together with an explanation of the interviewee selection process. The rationale for types of question asked has been outlined and the initial stages of analysis and interpretation has been highlighted together with the philosophical approach taken for the analysis of interview data. The data do not represent a "reality report" which speaks for itself. Some of the inherent dangers of the ethnographic data collection process have been specified, and the importance of maintaining a safe distance from
the researched environment has been reinforced in terms of involvement and detachment.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the general methodological framework of the thesis, focusing firstly on its philosophical position. The ontological and epistemological positions adopted are constructivist and realist, allowing for the values and opinions of subjects to be considered. The main data collection method, interviewing, has been analysed demonstrating its effectiveness as the primary data collection method utilised. A working set of typologies of interviews and interview questions have been discussed. The performative function of the interview has been highlighted and it has been acknowledged that the interpretation of interviews within the thesis forms negotiated and contextually based results. Additionally, the possible limitation of subjects hiding negative aspects of behaviour / opinion and of subjects over-conforming to become “expected people” (Marcus and Fischer, 1986, 1999) have been shown. The thesis attempts to move beyond “referential meaning” (Spradley, 1979: 97) and, in doing so, utilises three sub-categories of interview as expressed by Flick (2002); the “semi-standardised” (semi-structured), the “ethnographic” (spontaneous “interview as talk”) and the “expert” interviews are utilised.

In the end, once the preparation has taken place and the interview begins, much of the success or otherwise hinges upon the dynamic of the situation at that particular moment in time. As Flick (2002) stresses:

> there is no unambiguous definition of the ‘right’ behaviour for the interviewer in the focused (or any other semi-structured) interview. The successful carrying out of such interviews depends essentially on the interviewer’s situational competence (pp. 78 - 79).
5. SPORTS CLUBS IN STUDY

The following chapter builds upon the aforementioned rationale for selecting the respective sports clubs for empirical analysis. It provides a club by club account of pertinent sociological considerations impacting upon the present study. The demographic differences between Hawick and the cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh should be acknowledged as a potential contributing factor in the construction of identity among respondents from the respective areas. It seems fair to consider that respondents from Glasgow (the most populated city) and Edinburgh (the capital city), thirty three and twenty six times more populated than Hawick\textsuperscript{iv} may have different types of relationships with their respective cities than perhaps the Hawick-based respondents have with Hawick. In the cities, more localized identities were expected to be exhibited, such as specific area of city or, in the case of the rugby clubs, “school” attachments. Indeed, this is reflected in the following sub-sections detailing each club, with Hawick, the location, appearing more central to the sporting identity of Hawick RFC than either of the cities to their respective clubs.

1. Hawick Rugby Football Club

Hawick Rugby Football Club is of great interest for the sociological study of Scottish identity/ies, combining a rich tapestry of biographical and historical threads. These threads, which at various sites and times, intertwine with the rugby club include a strong sense of (local) self-identity, an historic and contemporary relationship to the industrial woollen mills and the annual Common Riding festival.

Hawick is the Borders’ largest town, and though there are other potential Borders clubs that could have been selected the rich traditions of Hawick Rugby Football Club combined with its widely recognised close-knit supporters’ network make it a suitable choice. The dual importance of the rugby club and its supporters is recognised by Bogle and Smith (1998) who write:

This support, indeed the very culture of the town, was, of course, a major factor in the success the club enjoyed in the Seventies – a conclusion shared by Stephen Jones of the Sunday Times, who sought to know ‘why Hawick, a small outwardly
unremarkable town in the Scottish Border country, should consistently have, in
context, the most successful rugby club in Europe’. He discovered a remarkable
rugby club which inspires such devotion from the community that, ‘when the
surrounding countryside explodes in russet and gold and bronze in autumn, Hawick
people still see only green’ (pp. 62 - 63).

Indeed, Hawick’s links to the rugby game are firmly grounded in the history of the
sport in Scotland. The original game of “Hawick Ba’”, played annually on Shrove
Tuesday until around 1890, before being moved to weekends to suit the mill
owners, has a long tradition pre-dating 1825 and is thought to have survived until
the 1930s (Bogle and Smith, 1998). Bogle and Smith also note that the most famous
Ba’ game in the Borders was in Carterhaugh, near Selkirk in 1815 where the
shepherds of Yarrow took on the men of Selkirk. The driving force behind the
match is said to have been Walter Scott.

A large contingent of players marched over from Hawick ... The names of the
Hawick contingent are actually known, and they are, in a sense, the first identifiable
Hawick football players in history ... Another Hawick man known to have taken
part was James Hogg, a local stocking-maker and author of the Hawick Common
Riding song Teribus (Bogle and Smith, 1998: 2).

This description of the earliest recorded Hawick team provides an insight into just
how important and interlinked the rugby, the industrial mills and Common Riding
were. Indeed, these remain important and interlinked to varying degrees today.

The original official club, Hawick and Wilton Football Club, was formed in 1873,
playing its first game, and the first ever Borders league match, that same year
against neighbouring Langholm. In 1885 they became Hawick Football Club (Bogle
and Smith, 1998). In the post-war years Hawick became an even more established
Scottish club, having won the unofficial championship eight times by 1972, the
Borders title fifteen times by 1973 and having established itself as sevens
specialists. They won the first official Scottish championship in 1973 and the first
Scottish Cup in 1996 before winning the treble of Scottish Cup, Scottish league and

Hawick Rugby Club continues to constitute a focal point in the wider community of
Hawick. Bogle and Smith (1998) note how through the years the clubhouse at
Mansfield Park has hosted weddings, discos and local meetings of various sorts.
Hawick Rugby Club has attempted to maintain these local links wherever possible,
not least by its insistence to the SRU in 1974 on giving priority to local businesses for track-side advertising. Perhaps a measure of how Hawick Rugby Football Club perceives its own local identity was evidenced in 1997 when it was turned down for lottery funding to help build a running track along the front of the rugby ground. The club was astounded to learn of the reason given, namely that ‘the community would not gain significantly from it’. As Bogle and Smith argue, this is “despite rugby being at the heart of that community” (p. 90). Irrespective of the accuracy of this claim, it is sociologically significant that the rugby club officials believe the club to be at the kernel of the community and, therefore, reacted with such disbelief.

The annual Hawick Common Riding event, which is held in June, commemorates the raid by the young men of Hawick, traditionally known as Callants, who fought off raiding English parties, and in doing so, captured from them their English flag. This occurred in 1514, the year after the Battle of Flodden at which most of the men of Hawick were killed. Each year, three unmarried male Teris are selected from within the town and given the title of Comet. These traditions, circumscribed by a national identity, represent the strong bonds the town has with the past, while reinforcing the ascribed roles existing within the townsfolk for Teris and outsiders. The present day links between the common riding and rugby are maintained by the Hawick rugby supporters who, whilst travelling to away matches, traditionally sing Common Riding songs (fieldwork). Bogle and Smith (998) suggest this practice dates back as far as 1914.

A recurring theme within both the town of Hawick and the rugby club is the importance of being born and bred in Hawick. There is a primordial belief in the unique and ‘inherited’ character of the Border people from the days of the Reivers (Spiers, 2000) and this is particularly evident in Hawick. The Reivers originally referred to the various peoples (tribal leaders, peasants, outlaws) who lived in the areas now known as Northumberland, Cumbria, the Borders and Dumfries and Galloway between 1250 and 1600 (MacDonald Fraser, 1989). Hawick has always had a strong tradition of fielding local players, with this reaching its peak in the famous ‘Fifteen Hawick Men’ of Cup Final Day in 1996 (Bogle and Smith). This game has been immortalised in the song ‘They were a’ Hawick men, every yin o
thum Hawick men’ which Bogle and Smith describe as “destined to wing its way a’ owre the world ti where absent Teries are callants still by mony a tie” (p. 191).

This rugby song revealingly touches upon some of the major interlinking themes of Hawick people’s self-identity – the belief that Hawick identity accompanies you wherever you reside in the world (‘still by mony a tie’), and the centrality of the common riding events which celebrate the ancient battles with English warriors, demonstrated in song with reference to the young Scottish fighters ‘callants’ (‘all callants’). The use of the term ‘Teri’ is revealing too in that according to local tradition, a Teri is someone born and bred in Hawick. However, during fieldwork, it was revealed that a Teri used to be someone born on one particular side of the river Teviot which runs through Hawick. This definition was later revised to include those born on either side of the river. In 1988 the Hawick hospital closed, meaning that hospital births could no longer take place in Hawick. This led to another revision to the Teri definition to include all those whose birth is registered in Hawick. Although the rugby fans are traditionally known as ‘Robbie Dyes’, the more culturally determined term, ‘Teri’, is used by Bogle and Smith to describe the success of the 1996 Scottish Cup victory. They use the sub-heading ‘A great day to be a Teri’ and, in discussing the build up to the day, add “there was desperation to find tickets which would place the holder in the Teri section of the crowd” (p. 72). The complexity of being a Teri and / or a Hawick rugby player is demonstrated by Bogle and Smith’s account of Hawick born and Gateshead raised Alan Tomes participating in Hawick trials and being met with the request for regulars to “get stuck intae that big English bastard” (p. 143). Revealingly, this demonstrates an ability and willingness to see that birthplace is not what makes one a Hawick person, yet it still remains true that to be regarded as a Teri, one must be born or registered and raised in Hawick. In 1991, the Hawick committee stated its acceptance to outside players coming into the team “as long as this was kept within bounds” (p.88). However, as Speirs (2000) highlights, cross border player movement has a long history dating back to the late nineteenth century. He provides three accounts of Hawick players who were born elsewhere yet represented the club. Again, however, the very perception of being a local club with local players and local fans is sociologically significant for the present study.
The third major element within the town of Hawick is the industrial textile mills. The mills have a long and important link to the town, stretching back four hundred years. Bogle and Smith (1998) note that “the Hawick rugby team had a particularly enthusiastic following in the local knitwear factories, where people worked closely together and where rugby football formed a common language” (p. 45). They also explained that during the 1950s boom in the textile industry, most Hawick youngsters left school and entered one of the local knitwear factories where they often remained until they retired, or if female, until they got married. Although the textile industry boom is a fading memory, these links remain to the present day, with Pringle, one of the most famous textile companies in the town, sponsoring the rugby club and employing a number of club officials.

Together, the industrial mills, the Common Riding and the rugby club combine to provide the town of Hawick with a set of traditions, and it is these traditions that the present study views sociologically in relation to wider themes of Scottish sporting identity. There is one further primary feature of Hawick’s rugby tradition which is of sociological significance for the present study. The dualistic and sometimes paradoxical nature of major rivalries in the Borders and in Scotland. Hawick’s main rivalry is with fellow Borders club Gala, their first match having taken place in 1876 (Bogle and Smith, 1998). Indeed, such is the perceived importance of this fixture to both clubs that Bogle and Smith suggest “that to sum up the Borders League and all it has stood for over a hundred years, you need only call upon any of the scores of Gala-Hawick games” (p. 27). However, as Scottish rugby stalwart Bill McLaren comments, “there is of course intense rivalry between the Borders clubs, but there is a strong kinship too” (quoted in Bogle and Smith, 1998: 175). This kinship is not only reliant on beating one another, a goal so crucial to Hawick fans and players, that they would rather Gala avoid relegation to another league (Bogle and Smith, 1998), but involves a joint union in opposition to the city clubs. Speirs (2000) highlights that Borders clubs join forces under certain circumstances to combat the city clubs and the SRU largely because of a feeling of city bias against them. Speirs shows that this Borders perception is not a recent phenomenon, having antecedents as far back as 1891. Demonstrating the importance of the regional Borders identity in opposition to the city identity, and the affection and
identification with the old South of Scotland select team, Robin Charters, of Hawick, ex-president of the SRU, criticises the SRU's restructuring programme:

They have discarded a district like the South, which has had a very detrimental effect on the whole of the Borders. I think the link between the Borders clubs and the South will come back in time. The people in the Borders would support the Border Reivers, but not the Edinburgh Reivers (cited in Speirs, 2000: 95).

This regional attachment to the Borders was most recently apparent in the reactions to the newly announced disbanding of the Borders Reivers by the SRU due to funding issues\textsuperscript{xvi}. The Borders Reivers Action Group and the Scottish Borders Council urged supporters in the region to protest at Murrayfield (Rinaldi, 2007). There appears to remain a strong determination to have some Borders representation at this level despite the demise of the South of Scotland and the Borders Reivers. It is clear, therefore, that the choice of Hawick Rugby Football Club is a sociologically grounded one, promising to reveal much about the identity perceptions of its fans as Hawick people, Borders people and Scottish people.

2. Edinburgh Academical Football Club

Edinburgh Academical Football Club (Accies)\textsuperscript{xvii} was the first senior club formed in Scotland and is the third oldest rugby union club still in existence in the world (Douglas, 1997). The club's first recorded match took place on 23\textsuperscript{rd} January 1858, though their associated school, Edinburgh Academy, had been playing various forms of rugby for a number of years previously. In 1855 Alexander and Francis Crombie, pupils from Edinburgh Academy, introduced the modern game to Scotland (Edinburgh Academical Football Club, 1958; Douglas, 1997) and Alexander who became the first captain of the Academicals is popularly described as "the father of the game in Scotland" (Edinburgh Academy Football Club, 1958). The "Schools'" connection to the development of British and world rugby union is important. The central role of "the schools" was part of the wider games ethic and Muscular Christianity process developing in British education during the latter parts of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century (Mangan, 1998). Mangan refers to this as "Lorettonianism", after the Edinburgh public school, Loretto from which much of the games ethic spread with the help of influential rector Hely
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Hutchinson Almond. Mangan enunciates the central role played by the public schools and their products who proceeded to work in prominent positions throughout the British Empire. Although developed in the public schools and with strong links to Edinburgh Academy, “Lorettonianism’s” influences spread wider than the elites and middle-classes:

However, even more critical to the adoption of the Games Ethic in Scottish education was the influence of Almond on Edinburgh Academy through the Old Lorettonian R.J. Mackenzie, Rector from 1889 to 1902. Edinburgh Academy’s Almondian innovations became in time part and parcel of the curriculum of the famous Scottish middle class day schools, and then eventually the state secondary schools (Mangan, 1998: 195).

Some of Mangan’s claims reflect those of Douglas (1997) who writes “the leading, Scottish schools ... played a hugely significant role in the development of the game not just in Scotland but, through their Oxbridge connections, in England as well” (p. 11). Douglas adds that “Edinburgh Academy can, with the Royal High School, genuinely be said to have been in the vanguard of the movement which established rugby union football north of the border” (p. 30). Douglas highlights the role played by ex-Academicals schoolboy, The Lord Justice Clerk, Lord Kingsburgh, who played at Raeburn Place as a schoolboy, collected gate money at the first international and played a pivotal role in the machinations which led to the formation of the International Board. It is worth noting that during their first forty years of existence, the Academical Football Club was a branch of the Academical Cricket Club. In turn, these were distinct from the Academical Club which concerned itself more with the business of the School (Edinburgh Academical Football Club, 1958).

The Academicals’ home ground situated at Raeburn Place in the heart of the new town of Edinburgh, hosted the world’s first international rugby match between Scotland and England on 27th March 1871. The School acquired the land at Raeburn Place in 1854 – ironically for cricket playing purposes - as part of the School’s desire to adhere to and encourage the principles of Muscular Christianity (Douglas, 1997). The importance of these events in Scottish sporting history are emphasised by Douglas (1997) who comments, “this plot of land ... can rightly be termed the cradle of rugby union football in Scotland” (p. 11). He adds that “it is a great pity indeed that more is not made of its historic links with the birth of the Scottish game”
The club also boasts the most capped players for Scotland. In a capital city with a population of 448,624 and with two high profile football clubs located in other parts of the city, Edinburgh Accies, provides an alternative type of club to analyse from Hawick, whilst allowing an inter-city Edinburgh / Glasgow comparison and an intra-city Accies / Hearts / Hibs comparison to occur.

3. Glasgow Hawks Rugby Football Club

Glasgow Hawks are a relatively recent addition to the club game in Scotland, having been formed in 1997 from Glasgow Accies and Glasgow High Kelvinside (GHK) in the west end of the city. Glasgow Accies were formed in 1866 and GHK in 1982, with the latter being an amalgamation of Glasgow High School Former Pupils, formed in 1884 and Kelvinside Academicals who were founded in 1888. These founder clubs played a major role in the development of rugby union in Scotland. In 1867 Glasgow Academical Football Club played West of Scotland in a fixture that is now one of the oldest surviving football matches in the world (Hawks RFC, 2004)

In 1870 Glasgow Accies become the first Scottish football club (of either code) to tour England, playing matches against Manchester and Liverpool. J.W. Arthur of Glasgow Accies was a signatory to a letter challenging the clubs of England at the rugby code. This letter, signed by many others from the Scottish game, led to the first Scotland and England rugby international which was played at Raeburn Place Edinburgh in 1871.

In 1871, Glasgow Accies joined the (English) Rugby Football Union, which was formed in 1871 as no Scottish body existed at this particular time. That same year, they played host to the world’s oldest district match against Edinburgh. The Scottish Football Union formed in 1873 with Glasgow Accies being one of its founder members. Glasgow Acies became the first Scottish club to play in London beating Blackheath in 1878. This was followed in 1882 by a tour of England with Edinburgh Accies. In 1883 they moved to the ground now known as Old
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Anniesland. In 1922 ten thousand spectators watched Glasgow Accies play Heriots at New Anniesland. This remained a record for a Scottish club game for 74 years. The Hawks now play their fixtures at Old Anniesland, sharing their ground and facilities with the High School of Glasgow in the west end of the city.

Between Hawks' founding clubs nineteen Scottish championships have been won (Accies fourteen, Glasgow High F.P. five) and the Hawks have won the league once and Scottish Cup twice. The Hawks appear intent on developing Scottish talent and in January 2004 they criticised the SRU for alleged favouritism towards other Scottish clubs. (The Herald, 6 /1/ 04.). Criticising the number of overseas players involved in the domestic game. David Williams, the Hawks first XV manager, complained:

We are totally fed up with the machinations and double dealing emanating from Murrayfield, so we have decided to go public on the matter... Is it any wonder that we despair of the state of rugby in Scotland and are opposed to its current structures and administration when we keep being penalised for our success, and finding ourselves up against sides full of immigrant mercenaries?... We at Hawks are very concerned at the composition of any of the teams we play against, because our principal objective is to help young Scottish talent to develop, and our team is full of Scottish age-group internationalists.... But the SRU doesn't seem remotely keen to help us, and time and time again this year, we are finding ourselves confronting not only opponents full of South African, New Zealand and Australian accents, but also professional players released to our opponents by the three district subsidiaries (The Herald, 6 /1/ 04).

As with Edinburgh Accies, the Hawks share their city with a number of other significant rugby union clubs and some high profile football clubs. This contributes to Hawks, based in Scotland's largest city (population 577,869), providing a rich alternative to both of the other rugby clubs selected as well as allowing for a Glasgow comparison with Partick Thistle. In relation to their most well-known Glasgow neighbours, the Hawks have been known to demonstrate a keen 'Glasgow sense of humour'. Following a UK-wide transmission of a Panorama documentary focusing upon the alleged 'sectarian' nature of Glasgow's Old Firm (shown on 20 / 2 / 05), they circulated a match day pamphlet during their Glasgow derby against Glasgow High Academicals advertising, "A Glasgow Derby – And no signs of a Panorama Documentary."
xix Whilst on one level, this may be simply showing a sense of humour, on another level, certain national and regional tensions may be apparent in opposition to the types of Scottishness exhibited among the supporters of neighbouring sports clubs. Additionally, although the Glasgow Hawks are an
amalgamation of other clubs, these clubs retain a sense of their identity, competing in competitions under their own name. The extent to which the various other clubs retain a sense of identity within the Hawks set-up requires investigation as does the club’s relationship with their fellow Glasgow sports clubs and their Scottish counterparts from both codes.

4. Heart of Midlothian Football Club

*Kaiser Bill he came marching o’er Belgium and France
To challenge the Empire with warlike advance.
But the bravest of Hearts volunteered for the fray
And threw in their lot with old Geordie McCrae!
Come pack up your footballs and scarves of maroon.
Leave all your sweethearts in Auld Reekie toon.
Fall in wi’ the lads for they’re off and away
To take on the bold Hun with old Geordie McCrae!*


Heart of Midlothian (Hearts) are perhaps the third most prominent football club in Scotland, having won the Scottish Championship four times, the Scottish Cup seven times and the League Cup four times and regularly averaging the third highest home attendance figures in the country. There is slight ambiguity surrounding the precise details of the formation of Hearts. Alexander (2003) writes that Hearts were formed in the autumn of 1873 at Washing Green Court in the South Back of Canongate area of Edinburgh. He adds they used to meet in Mrs Cormack’s Refreshment Rooms situated next door to the public steam house. The official club website, however, records 1874 as the date of formation. Club historian, Mackie (1959) suggests that the club’s first captain Tom Purdie may have been correct in his assertion that their formation, albeit in crude form at this time, occurred in the autumn of 1873 with their first game being against a Queens Park select on December 27th 1873. This was recorded at the time as “a missionary game in Edinburgh to popularize the sport there” (Mackie, 1959: 24). The contemporary nature of the game is demonstrated by Mackie who notes that irrespective of how accurate claims about Hearts’ formation may be, “it does give a colourful picture of Edinburgh football as played in the Meadows on those ‘missionary’ days. Rules were imperfectly understood, and there were many disputes regarding their interpretations” (Mackie, 1959: 25).
There is further contradiction between the club and historians when one considers the origins of the choice of name for the club, with the official website claiming it took its name from the Royal Mile dance hall frequented by its founders, and Alexander (2003) claiming that Tom Purdie suggested Heart of Midlothian in honour of Walter Scott’s 1818 novel of the same name. Irrespective of which is more accurate, the distinction is negligible as both would presumably have been named after the Tolbooth. Mackie (1959) unsurprisingly settles on a combination of both explanations. Hearts joined the Scottish league in 1875 and quickly established itself as a major club, winning its first trophy in 1878 against Hibernian in the final of the Edinburgh FA Cup. Hearts’ colours would soon change from their original white with maroon heart on chest, to red, white and blue hoops before finally changing again to their famous maroon jersey. Alexander provides a romantic explanation for the maroon shirt being accidentally born as a result of the red, white and blue shirt being boil washed. However, Mackie (1959) provides a more pragmatic explanation. He cites the explanation given in 1939 by John Cochrane, a Hearts player during their first three seasons, who claimed that the original Hearts merged with the Meadows team St. Andrews Boys Club after a defeat at their hands, and subsequently, made the conscious decision to dye the new jerseys maroon. The club ended up at their present Tynecastle home on Gorgie Road in 1886 after a couple of previous moves, most recently from across Gorgie Road. They adopted the name Tynecastle in honour of the district in which they found themselves. (Mackie, 1959; Alexander, 2003).

In addition to having strong identity links with their home city, Scotland’s capital, Edinburgh as well as Gorgie, Hearts retain a strong sense of their historical links to the famous 16th Royal Scots British Army battalion, which became better known as ‘McCrae’s Battalion’ in honour of their commanding officer Sir George McCrae (Alexander, 2003). As previously acknowledged, McCrae’s were formed out of the remnants of the 3rd Edinburgh Rifle Volunteers (3rd ERV) whose football team, formed in 1874, became the first Edinburgh club. Led by John Hope the vehement Protestant who campaigned in favour of temperance and anti-Catholicism, the instantly successful 3rd ERV club’s membership was confined to members of the corps (Finn, 1994).
On 25th November, 1914, during the initial stages of the First World War at a time when joining up for active service was still voluntary eleven Hearts players enlisted in McCrae's Battalion after a certain amount of pleading from the Hearts board of directors to "remove the slur on the professional game" (Alexander, 2003: 74). This plea occurred against a backdrop of widespread castigation against the ever-increasing professional football for its alleged malevolent influence on the nation's youth and for "usurping every high ideal, corrupting the very foundation of the Empire – 'Service for Service's sake'" (Alexander, 2003: 18). Although the official club pleas for their players to enlist is significant in itself, Alexander highlights that the players had already been unofficially approached prior to the Hearts directors making their appeal, and he concludes that the players had probably already made up their own minds. A measure of the feeling at the time is evident when one considers that not a single player even asked any questions upon signing up for the war effort (Alexander, 2003). Indeed, the newspapers of the time carried the following appeal which perhaps allows one to imagine the hegemonic influences of the day:

I say to the young men in this ancient capital and free country: You are Strong; Be Willing! ... If only you will come forward in sufficient numbers you can stop the war. All cannot go, but if your home ties permit, and you shirk your obvious duty, you may escape a hero's death, but you will go through your life feeling mean (cited in Alexander, 2003: 76, original emphasis).

In the days immediately following the Hearts players enlisting, the term "McCrae's Battalion" was being used to describe the unit which was rapidly becoming famous. "By late afternoon news of the 'Edinburgh Sensation' had reached Westminster" (Alexander, 2003: 77). Following the success of the plea for players to enlist, the club extended their official request to their supporters:

The Board of Directors of Heart of Midlothian Football Club hereby make a strong appeal to their supporters to join Sir George McCrae's Battalion. It is the earnest desire of the directors that an entire 'Hearts Company' be formed of players, ticket-holders and general followers. The players have shown the way and it is now up to the other sections named to complete the requisite number ... Heart of Midlothian applicants are requested to state when enlisting that they wish to be included in the Hearts Company. Now then, young men, as you have followed the old club through adverse and pleasant times, through sunshine and rain, roll up in your hundreds for King and Country, for right and freedom (cited in Alexander, 2003: 81 - 82).

This official Hearts' call to arms for "King and Country", for "right and freedom" was an immediate success, with McCrae's soon finding itself attracting the likes of
Donald Gunn, a Scottish born journalist from New York who joined up “because he was a Hearts supporter” (Alexander, 2003: 92). Of course, it should be explicitly acknowledged that sportsmen from other football clubs with no obvious Protestant or unionist pedigree, in addition to non-footballing sportsmen, joined the battalion too (Alexander, 2003). Finlay McCrae, an Inverness man and goalkeeper for the Scottish hockey team, was one such enlistee who wished to join up with the “Sportsman’s Battalion” (Alexander, 2003: 179).

In 1919 Hearts issued complementary season tickets to around one hundred survivors of McCrae’s Battalion, and inside the front cover was the inscription, “these men went to fight for King and Country ... they are welcomed back to Tynecastle” (cited in Alexander, 2003: 268). The sometimes curious nature of this defence of Britain is apparent in the sentiments of twenty year old First World War soldier Jim Steuart who wrote, “I don’t expect I will feel much leaving England, as I would if I left Scotland, for really this is a foreign country to us, not in the nasty sense, but customs are quite different” (cited in Alexander, 2003: 115). Hearts’ proud and close links to McCrae’s Battalion may be expressive of wider (Scottish) unionist connotative linkages which are expressed by sections of its supporters. They were also the first sports club in Britain to collect funds from their supporters for the Prince of Wales’s Relief Fund, the chairman of which happened to be a major shareholder in Hearts (Alexander, 2003).

Hearts made a conscious effort to maintain the historical connection between their club and McCrae’s. Indeed it was left to the club, through supporters’ contributions, to erect a war memorial to the “Heart of Midlothian fallen”, which was unveiled at Haymarket opposite the railway station. Additionally the club organised the annual Armistice Day ceremony up until the 1960s when they began leaving it to the Salvation Army (Alexander, 2003). These links to McCrae’s Battalion and the events of the First World War have recently been rekindled by the release of the compact disc single “Hearts of Glory” which was officially advertised and endorsed by Hearts FC in the spring of 2004. Proceeds from the sales went towards the memorial fund.
As previously stated, there is some perception of Hearts and their Edinburgh rivals Hibernian being an east-coast, ‘Edinburgh Old Firm’, reflecting their own and ‘other’s’ identity within these parameters (Kowalski, 2004). In recent times, sections of Hearts supporters have demonstrated their associations to certain aspects of unionism by wearing scarves decorated with Ulster Loyalism images to matches, displaying the Union Flag, and aligning themselves with the British National Party (Jardine, 2002). There has also been an increase in fan incidents in recent years when Hibernian and Celtic, both clubs with Irish-Catholic associations, play Hearts. In contemporary times, the ‘sectarian’ nature of the Hearts support has manifested itself in various ways. In April 2005, at Hampden Park, the national stadium, a minute silence for the death of the leader of the Roman Catholic Church, Pope John Paul II, was disrupted by Hearts supporters to such an extent that it was cut short by more than half (Stow, 2005). This was followed by a mixed reaction among Hearts supporters’ spokespeople, with some refusing to condemn the actions of the Hearts support (Stow, 2005). These incidents led to media attention from around the world into Scotland’s sectarian problems (Innes, 2005). In 2002 a Hearts supporter was banned from Tynecastle by the club after wearing a Rangers top against Celtic (Jardine, 2002). The Hearts supporters are also known for singing ‘the Gorgie Boys’ with the lyrics ‘we’re up to our knees in Fenian blood’. Although without adequate investigation, it is unwise to ascribe definite motives for these acts, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that they are linked to sectarianism, particularly issues surrounding unionist, loyalist, Protestant, British and Scottish identity markers. Additionally, the sectarianism within the Hearts’ support may represent “fostered impressions” designed to present a “front” in opposition to a perceived ‘other’.

In conducting research into Hearts supporters’ perceptions, it is hoped that some of these themes will be illuminated in a clearer fashion. Hognestad (1997) argues that Hearts identity is “continuously carved out in relation to a series of relevant Others” (p.194). The notion of the ‘Other’ for Hearts supporters becomes intriguing with Rangers, Celtic and city rivals Hibernian, all apparently ascribed this status in particular contexts by certain supporters. Perhaps surprisingly, considering the unionist and Protestant links ascribed to Hearts (Hognestad, 1997; Kowalski, 2004; Kelly, 2007), there are examples of Hearts supporters actively celebrating a Rangers
defeat in Europe. In carrying out anthropological work while on a trip abroad with a Hearts supporters group, Hognestad notes, “the greatest cheer of the trip occurred” when they heard of the news of Rangers defeat, and he adds, “in a malicious fashion Jambos on the bus revelled in jubilant chants of ‘no Huns in Europe’” (p. 208). The sociological significance of this act is compounded considering that on this occasion, both Hearts and Rangers were representing Scotland against European opposition, yet, despite being keen to promote themselves as Scottish first (Hognestad, 1997) – supplanting their local identity for a national identity - the Hearts supporters happily rejoiced in the victory of a Bulgarian team over their Scottish / British counterparts. Clearly for some Hearts supporters, negotiating a Scottish identity whilst simultaneously maintaining an underlying localised, Gorgie / Edinburgh identity in opposition to a series of significant ‘others’ remains complex. This perceived rivalry Hearts fans have with Rangers and Celtic, which Hognestad attributes mainly to Hearts supporters’ antipathy towards supporters of successful clubs, has long antecedents. Indeed, at the end of the 1914 season when Celtic pipped Hearts for the League championship, the Edinburgh newspaper, the Evening News remarked:

Hearts have laboured these past few weeks under a dreadful handicap, the like of which our friends in the west cannot imagine. Between them the two leading Glasgow clubs have sent not a single prominent player to the Army. There is only one football champion in Scotland, and its colours are maroon and khaki (cited in Alexander, 2003: 99).

The successful Glasgow clubs appear to be major rivals to Hearts in the perceptions of Hearts supporters, and in conducting fan research with Hearts supporters, the nuances and contradictions surrounding facets of this rivalry are explored. For example, how does the ‘Edinburgh Old Firm’ tag manifest itself against each member of the Old Firm, and are there specific differences in these manifestations between Celtic and Rangers? What is the nature of the city rivalry with Hibernian? Is it still “keen but friendly” (Alexander, 2003: 56) like it was in the early days? How are the Scottish and British aspects of Hearts’ identity manifested, particularly in relation to local rivals Hibernian and Glasgow rivals Rangers and Celtic, and are there meaningful differences from those expressed by fellow Edinburgh residents from the rugby code, Accies?
5. Hibernian Football Club

Hibernian Football Club (Hibs), like their Edinburgh rivals Hearts, can legitimately claim to be among the most prominent football clubs in Scotland, having won the Scottish League four times, the Scottish Cup twice and the League Cup three times, whilst regularly attracting some of the highest home attendances outside of the Old Firm.

The birth of Hibs is inextricably linked to the mass immigration of Irish Catholics to Edinburgh during the nineteenth century. Although at the time of Hibs’ formation the Catholic Irish represented less than 10% of Edinburgh’s population, they were a significant minority who had developed their own sub-culture, becoming, as Lugton (1999) suggests, “Hibernicis ipsis Hiberniores, more Irish than the Irish.” (p.18). Upon arriving into Edinburgh, the Irish Catholics settled mainly in the slums of the Cowgate area of the Old Town, and gradually developed their own ‘Little Ireland’ (ibid). Little Ireland and the Edinburgh Port of Leith rapidly became associated with the Irish migrants and by 1821 had 12,000 and 800 Irish residents respectively. Shortly after the opening of Little Ireland’s first Catholic church in 1835, 16,000 of Edinburgh’s 133,000 population were Irish and by 1848 Leith’s population included almost 2000 Irish (ibid). By the mid-nineteenth century 30% of the Old Town population were Irish-born, with 25,000 in Little Ireland.

Hibernian Football Club was founded in 1875 by members of the St Mary’s Street branch of the Catholic Young Men’s Society (CYMS) under the chairmanship of Irish-born Canon Hannan (Finn, 1994; Lugton, 1999). On August 6th 1875, during the evening celebrations in St Mary’s Hall Edinburgh of the centenary of the birth of Daniel O’Connell, the champion of Catholic Emancipation in Ireland, Canon Hannan officially launched Hibernian Football Club (Lugton, 1999). It was the first prominent ‘Irish club’ in Scotland, and initially, its players had to be practising Catholics (Lugton, 1999; Burdsey and Chappell, 2001). Hearts historian Mackie (1959) notes that Hearts’ biggest rivals were formed by ‘Irish Catholics’. Their first secretary Mal Byrne drew up the rules of the new club on a document carrying the Harp and motto ‘Erin-go-bragh’, (Irish Gaelic for Ireland forever) (Mackay, 1986). Lugton (1999) records that it was first captain and co-founder
Michael Whelehan who first suggested Hibernian as the club name, in honour of the 'Ancient Order of the Hibernians' which had been absorbed into the CYMS. Hibernian quickly established itself as a major Edinburgh club with rapid success ensuing (Mackay, 1986).

This rapid success probably contributed to the club's problematic relationship with other Scottish clubs and associations in its formative years. However, the early problems the club faced in simply gaining acceptance as a member club, and the permission to play matches that accompanies such membership, is inextricably linked to the club's Irish heritage and original 'Catholic only' player policy. Both the local Edinburgh FA and the newly formed Scottish FA refused to allow Hibs entry to their associations (Mackay, 1986; Finn, 1994; Lugton, 1999). Furthermore, the Edinburgh FA issued instructions to its existing members to refrain from playing any matches against Hibs (Lugton, 1999). Demonstrating an early example of comradeship to their Edinburgh rivals, Hearts agreed to play Hibs on Christmas Day, 1875 (Lugton, 1999). Throughout the 1880s there was widespread debate regarding whether Hibs' Scottish born players should represent Scotland or Ireland. Mackay (1986) quotes a contemporary account taken from the Scottish Football Annual. Referring to the SFA, it states "that body, thus early displaying a spirit which has all along marked their dealings with the Hibernians, refused them admission. 'The Association was formed for Scotchmen' said they in effect" (p. 4, Original emphasis). Finn (1994) suggests that part of the reason for Hibs' early league membership refusals can be attributed to opposition from the Edinburgh FA, probably as a direct result of the influence of the powerful (and original) Edinburgh football club, the 3rd Edinburgh Rifle Volunteers (3rd ERV). Finn, who illustrates the anti-Catholic culture associated with the 3rd ERV, describes this opposition as revealing "the extent to which religion, nationalism, militarism, politics and anti-Catholicism had a potent influence on Scottish football before the entry of the first Catholic Irish-Scots club into the game" (pp. 91 - 92). Mackay (1986) records how in 1876, it was only after a petition was signed on their behalf by all the prominent players in Edinburgh, that "Hibs were reluctantly admitted into the SFA" (p. 4).

Curiously, until July 2005 when the club began serialising Lugton's three-book collection, the official Hibernian Football Club website account of the club's
formation stated “our club was founded by Irish born football enthusiasts [but] Hibernian immediately became fully integrated into the Edinburgh community” (www.hibs.org.uk/Club_History.htm). Not only was there no reference to Catholicism – exclusively Catholic players in the early days, or Cannon Hannan’s and the CYMS’s involvement – but the early difficulties encountered by the club in attempting to join the Edinburgh and Scottish football associations had been historically revised. The result was that both Catholic associations and the local and national opposition to their football association membership were overlooked by the modern day (official) club historians. It is reasonable for the club to record that the Edinburgh players of the day welcomed the integration of the club, with Mackay (1986) stressing that Hibernian “found more sympathy among the footballers of Edinburgh” (p.4). However, the wider ‘Edinburgh community’ was not quite as welcoming as the present-day official club account suggests. In addition to the anti-Catholic 3rd ERV influence within the Edinburgh FA, Hearts, emerging as local rivals, lodged protests with the football authorities in the hope of preventing Hibs from competing in the prestigious Edinburgh Cup (Mackay, 1986). The first protest was made in 1880 - 81 when they sought to secure a motion:

that the Edinburgh FA request Hibernian Football Club to withdraw from the said (Edinburgh) Association in consequence of the unfair and brutal play exhibited by them on the field and the rough usage that the players are subjected to after the game (cited in Mackay, 1986: 21).

The second Hearts protest occurred after they were defeated by Hibs in the Edinburgh Cup and Hearts protested that Hibs had a player who was “not local” (Mackay, 1986: 22). In 1891 Hibs was found guilty by the SFA of doctoring its books and, facing the possibility of being suspended, it was recorded at the time that the club “had gone defunct of their own accord” (Mackay, 1986: 48). In August that year, after failing to pay subscriptions, Hibs were deleted from the SFA and EFA rolls (Mackay, 1986; Alexander, 2003). For a limited period that year, a new Hibernian club was formed and they named themselves Leith Hibernian. The Hibernian re-emerged, playing their next match in February 1893 (Mackay, 1986). Alexander (2003) attributes these developments largely to failing to recover from losing six first team players to the newly formed Celtic from Glasgow. Celtic was formed in November 1887 after recognising the achievements of Hibs in Edinburgh and immediately became successful after gaining the services of various Hibs.
players (Mackay, 1986). The rapid demise of Hibs occurred, leading to their supporters blaming Celtic. Mackay writes:

They (Hibs supporters) were in no doubt who was responsible for their side's demise, and so when Celtic appeared at Easter Road on October 20th, they were received by a large and threatening assembly (p. 43).

Indeed, early signs of a united Edinburgh camaraderie appeared in 1889 when Mr Sneddon, the president of the former Edinburgh FA – now renamed East of Scotland FA – addressed the annual Hearts concert and defended the club's Edinburgh rivals:

For various circumstances which all deplored and were familiar with, Hibernians have been weakened this season, and from the quarter least expected. Better things might have been looked for from the club from which Hibernians received their blow, and if it was a ray of consolation, it was the universal sympathy expressed for them. All hoped Hibernians would regain the club's loss of prestige and place it as formerly among the front rank of Scottish football clubs (cited in Mackay 1986: 44).

This suggests that the religious and political divisions that may have affected Edinburgh football were superseded by the common goal of uniting in the face of adversity against the Glasgow club, Celtic, and, even more revealingly, it is perhaps demonstrative of an Edinburgh-Glasgow rivalry.

The extent to which Hibs represents Catholic Irish-Scots in modern Scotland is unclear. While it is true that the club has officially sought to negate much of its Catholic or Irish heritage – a practice that gained momentum during the chairmanship of freemason Harry Swan who considered changing the club name and colours and successfully removed the Irish Harp logo from the Easter Road entrance (Mackay, 1986xxiii) – there has been claims by some that Hibs (and Hearts) fans still use sectarian songs and symbols in order to construct imagined identities. (See Kowalski, 2004; Hognestad, 1997).

An additional aspect of Hibs' identity relates to their traditional working-class roots. Demonstrating the complexity and interconnected nature of identity formation, Lugton (1999), the Hibernian historian, compares and likens the 1991 'Hands Off Hibs' campaigners, who fought against a merger with Hearts, to the origins of the club's founders, stating:

Their (campaigners) presence was a response to the founders of Hibernian Football Club, whose humble working-class roots we should never forget, for those roots,
written in the very stones of St. Patrick’s Church, St. Mary’s Street Halls and the tenements of Little Ireland, are the soul and ethos of Hibernian (p. 2).

In researching the supporters of Hibernian football club, the extent to which their Irish heritage remains and is eschewed or reinforced alongside notions of Scottishness will be partially revealed. Additionally, their rivalry and perhaps their comradeship with Edinburgh rivals Hearts will be illuminated, allowing comparisons to occur between the two clubs.

6. Partick Thistle Football Club

In 1996 the very existence of Partick Thistle football club was in doubt due to mounting debts, culminating in the November 1997 rumours that they had played their last ever match (Reid et al., 2002). These events led to the formation of the ‘Save the Jags’ Partick Thistle supporters’ group who raised over £100,000 to help ensure the club’s survival. The supporters’ group went on to form The Jags Trust which subsequently became the first group of Scottish club supporters to have a representative on the board of their club. Partick Thistle has managed to remain a permanent fixture in Scottish football for the foreseeable future and their supporters are safe in the knowledge that their ‘well loved Glasgow institution’ has survived the challenges and rigours of twenty first century corporate sport (thus far).

Partick Thistle was formed following the demise of Partick FC and played its first recorded match on 19th February 1876 against a local team curiously named Valencia, and its first committee was formed in 1877 (Reid et al., 2002). The club’s current home in Maryhill (north west Glasgow) was secured after a series of ground moves. In 1880-81, Thistle secured a new ground at Jordanvale Park in Whiteinch allowing them to cease relying on public parks, Kelvingrove Park and Overnewton Park in the north west of Glasgow. In 1883 they moved to Muir Park on Dumbarton Road and the following year they occupied their defunct rivals Partick’s ground in Inchview, Whiteinch, which was close to their original home. In 1897 they moved again to Meadowside close to the River Clyde on the eastern edge of the burgh of Partick, but in 1908, as a result of Meadowside becoming Henderson’s Shipyards,
the club were left homeless and were forced to leave Partick behind (Reid et al., 2002). As the club historians Reid et al. (2002) record, “the Union Jack was hauled down for the last time and many a tear was shed by the good folk of Partick” (p. 39). After a brief spell sharing Ibrox Park with Rangers FC, Partick Thistle finally ended up in their present ground at Firhill Park in Maryhill. The move is described by Reid et al. (2002):

In an ideal world, the Partick Thistle Board would have preferred to secure a new ground within the Burgh of Partick. After all, the Club’s roots were firmly implanted in that area ... A little stretch of the imagination is required to say that Maryhill is adjacent to Partick, but it’s certainly not a million miles away... How would the people of Maryhill and the north-west of the city respond (p. 40)?

As the historians conclude, the local people happily took Thistle to their hearts, so much so that there were rumours that the Board considered changing the club name to Maryhill Thistle. Although they remained Partick Thistle, Glasgow (and Maryhill) had a club that was claimed by media commentators and supporters alike to be unique. This is aptly demonstrated in the opening page of the official club history which states, “the club was a focus of local identity and pride ... This is the story of a quite unique football club [that] reflects a philosophy of life which only Partick Thistle followers can portray to the outside world (Reid et al., 2002: 4). This belief in uniqueness manifests itself in two main areas, the fans’ traits and behaviours, and the team’s (from all eras it seems) ‘unique’ traits. It is claimed that “Partick Thistle are unique, they are different from any other football club. Their supporters are a different breed” (Reid et al., 2002: 62). Reid et al. continue to extol the “unique” Partick Thistle virtues:

They (Partick Thistle supporters) have to be extremely patient, and a sense of humour and a thick skin are basic requirements. They have to be able to cope with being patronised. Young Jags have to be resilient to enable them to withstand the rigours of peer group pressure on them to change their allegiance (p. 129).

Such are the qualities claimed to be associated with being a Partick Thistle supporter, the historians list essential traits one should aspire to attain in order to fulfil the role of Partick Thistle supporter while implying the unique (and ultimately challenging) way the team and club perform.

It has never been part of Thistle’s make-up to do things the easy way... Patience has always been high up the list of requirements to be a Thistle supporter – along with, among others, strong character, resilience, a thick skin, stickability (if there is such a word) and perhaps as important as any other feature, a sense of humour.
Anyone lacking any of these qualities should really not aspire to being a Thistle fan (Reid et al., 2002: 48).

Despite a degree of self-perpetuated mocking, in national terms, the club has been relatively successful having won the Scottish Cup and the League Cup once before, most notably defeating Celtic in the League Cup final a mere four years after Celtic’s European Cup triumph. It is further noted by Reid et al. (2002) that two of Partick Thistle’s teams’ many ‘endearing features’ are their inconsistency and unpredictability. These features are perhaps celebrated by reference to the club by some as the Maryhill Magyars – an ironic comparison to the great Hungarian teams of the 1950s – and by the well-known Billy Connolly joke that for many years the name of the club was believed by many to be “Partick Thistle Nil” (see Connolly, 1985).

This (often self-induced) sense of uniqueness and battle against adversity no doubt has strong links to the club’s popularised status as “Glasgow’s club”, the non-sectarian and non-racist club in the football-centred city shared with Rangers and Celtic. Much of this discourse is located within a Scottish national identity framework, with Dimeo and Finn (1998; 2001) showing how these issues came to the surface during the late 1990s when the club were close to bankruptcy. The essentialist ‘Scottishness’ of Partick Thistle was invoked, “because whatever Partick Thistle may be they are intrinsically, definitively, and eccentrically Scottish” (Evening Times, 29 August 1995; cited in Dimeo and Finn, 2001: 33). This belief, popular in Scottish media discourse, and popularised in Scottish music hall parody and television comedies, presents Partick Thistle as not only intrinsically Scottish but also inherently non-sectarian. Reid et al. (2002) also express this, suggesting that Thistle are “Glasgow’s ‘other’ team” and the “Great Glasgow Alternative”, providing “a balancing influence” which represents “the epitome of moderation and tolerance” (p. 128). The club’s badge of course, is the Scottish thistle and has been on the club shirt since the 1880s (Reid et al., 2002). The extent to which these identity discourses are representative of the supporters used in the present study is analysed, as is the ways in which these identity constructions interact with national identity discourse among the supporters interviewed.
7. Concluding Comments

The research problem surrounds the central issue of whether the fans of Scottish rugby union and football clubs reinforce or challenge notions of a united Scottish sporting identity. To what extent are popular representations of Scottish national identity exhibited or eschewed by fans of Scottish rugby union and football and to what extent are there a variety of Scottish sporting identities existing within and across clubs? Is there a diverse or unified socio-cultural representation between the fans of the respective clubs and sports? Are there meaningful patterns in relation to class, ethnicity, and religious factors? Do the fans of the respective clubs support Scotland's national teams? Are there differences between the sports in terms of being seen by the fans to represent a popular form of Scottishness and to what extent do these forms of Scottishness constitute a national identity, a nationalist identity or a patriotic identity? It is hoped that with such a rich selection of clubs analysed, the data findings and analysis proves theoretically fruitful.
6. DATA FINDINGS

1. Hawick Rugby Football Club

This chapter is divided into club specific sub-sections and outlines the main data findings across the six clubs selected. Clearly there are some variations across the clubs regarding topics and focus of discussion. However, an attempt has been made to present the data within a similar framework. In doing so, the following club specific sections are further categorised into sub-sections which broadly correspond with the general thematic structure utilised in the interview schedules. First, the sport club identity is presented, before moving onto Scotland’s sporting and political identity, then finishing with the notion of “the other” for each club. This chapter introduces the major themes to emerge from the data in order to allow a more theoretical analysis to occur in the subsequent chapter.

Hawick Sporting Identity

In discussing issues centred on sporting identity, it became apparent that Hawick identity represents the core within a hierarchy of extended sporting identities. Although all respondents support both Hawick and the regional Borders team, the three Scottish respondents expressed a stronger loyalty to Hawick than to either the Borders or Scotland. Ewan states:

People are proud of being Hawick and people are proud of being from the Borders so in that sense you’ve got eh, it’s a step further up. Ye’ve got the town identity, the regional identity and as a supporter ye’ve got yer club, the professional side the Borders, and the Scotland side (IT: 22).

Meg adds:

I feel more deeply about Hawick winning than ... I mean if the Borders win that’s great and ye are really excited ... But it’s no the depth of feeling that ye have if Hawick happen to lose a game that ye think they should have won. I’ve a closer association I would say with Hawick (IT: 41).

Ewan makes the rugby and town relationship more explicit, adding, “I’m sure people would support their local side first. If they are rugby fans (emphasis) they would support Hawick first” (IT: 26). Ewan adds, “I would say the rugby supporter has an identity firstly with his town then with the Borders. Not to the exclusion of Scotland. It could be the club and Scotland” (IT: 26).
Although the core loyalty remains with Hawick, the nature of the rest of the hierarchy is fluid and depends to a certain extent upon the situation at a given time. The ambiguity about whether Scotland or the Borders team comes next in the hierarchy of loyalty (after Hawick) is reflected in Meg's response to being asked to specify her order of preference in team loyalty. She responds with "Hawick, Scotland, the Borders and the Lions at the moment" (IT: 41). Expanding upon the fluid nature of this order of preference, she concedes that prior to the introduction of the professional Borders team as representatives of the region, she placed the South (the old amateur regional team), in second place ahead of Scotland. Rationalising this position, Meg states:

Well it might depend on the composition of the Borders team ye know. But professionalism has changed that because it used to be that when you went to watch the South, there was players from the Borders clubs who were brought in to play as the South team and you knew those players because they had played against Hawick the previous week or month or whatever. So every player that came to play for the South, ye knew them cause Hawick played against them (IT: 41).

The decreasing level of personal identification with players is not the only reason why Meg preferred to watch the South. Implying the professional Borders side has lost an element of fan identification and empathy, Meg adds:

Talk about real (emphasis) identity. I mean that wis, I would say the Borders clubs supported the South more so than they do the Borders. Well they weren't professional. They were just boys who played for the club and because they played well they got into the South team. They played for the South one week and then they were back playing for the club the next week (IT: 34).

Stephen also demonstrates the inverse relationship between decreasing familiarity with the players and identification with the team, as a result of professionalism:

I used to go and watch the South playing more than I've seen the Borders playing. Cause it was likes of guys you could relate to playing, ken it was the strongest team, amateur club players and I just felt there was always a stronger affinity with that team than there is with the professional team. Professional teams dinnae really do it for me I have to say (IT: 33).

There appear to be two inter-connected processes at work here. First, there is an antipathy towards the professional ethos and second, due to a reduction in the personal knowledge and contact with players, there is more reluctance to actively support the Borders (and Scotland) teams.
Stephen explicitly makes this point in relation to supporting Scotland:

If you know players, ye are more likely to go and watch a team. If ye have got some close tie with that Scotland team, likes if there were two or three Hawick players playing for Scotland I’m more likely to go and watch them … Whereas if there are no Hawick players in the squad I’m no likely to go and watch them (IT: 34).

Reinforcing the importance of a localised identity being represented at the national level, Stephen connects the disappearance of international players from the club sides to a reduction in club and country attendance figures:

Hawick would have their international players playing and the opposition team would have their international players playing. And ye get to know these players and ye’ve seen them and ye related to them when they turn onto the pitch at Murrayfield … professionalism has taken that away. That’s why the clubs aren’t so strong now. That’s why so many people don’t go to the games now because they’re not seeing the top players playing (IT: 15).

There appears to be some friction between instrumental rationality in playing terms – players fulfilling potential by playing at the highest possible level – and supporter identification with players, club, region and country. On the one hand, supporters are disappointed that club sides no longer have international players (as a result of the professional regional teams signing them), sentiments expressed by both Ewan and Stephen. This disappointment can lead to supporter loyalty becoming “stretched” (Ewan: 14), with some club supporters deciding to boycott their region’s team on principle (Meg: 23). Yet on the other hand there is a tacit acceptance that in order for players to achieve their instrumental potential, they must turn professional. Ewan states:

But in the main people accept the inevitable. They’ll (club fans) realise that if their best players are going to progress, to achieve the pinnacle of their potential and they’ll realise there is only one way to go and that’s up (IT: 14).

Furthermore, despite losing the best players to the professional regional side, some Hawick supporters paradoxically use their support of the Borders to reinforce their local Hawick identity. This support for the Borders appears to be based more on re-appropriating the Borders identity to become an expression of a surrogate Hawick identity. Ewan expresses the pride Hawick fans experience when ex-Hawick players represent the Borders or get capped for Scotland, additionally noting, “because of their presence in the Borders side, that encouraged people from Hawick to go and support the Borders side (IT: 14).
Meg expresses similar sentiments, adding:

My attitude was they took five of our best players. If I want to see the five best Hawick players playing I have to go to the Borders [matches]. And I became a member of the Borders as soon as we were formed. Not that I was delighted that they had been formed but if I wanted to see the best ... they were playing for the Borders (IT: 23).

In addition to demonstrating a loyalty to ‘local’ players, this demonstrates a simple desire to see the best Hawick players even if they no longer play for the Hawick club. Additionally, it may also of course be demonstrative of an instrumental desire to see simply “the best” players irrespective of their club history. Indeed, throughout the interviews it became apparent that simply seeing good rugby was a central aspect of the respondents’ rugby identity. Meg reinforces this theme further, discussing the Region team:

I mean ye get the Leinsters and Cardiff and ye know ye do get a lot of good rugby and ye see a lot of internationals playing at Netherdale (home of Borders and Gala). It’s no just your team that you’re going to see. You go to see the opposition as well ... it’s good to see them in the flesh because you are actually a lot closer to the pitch there than you are at Murrayfield and ye get a better view of the game ... I mean ye are seeing internationals close up and eh, sometimes seeing how good they are (IT: 43).

The symbolic capital attached to rugby in the town of Hawick, even for non-rugby fans, was outlined by all four respondents. Stephen and Jake discussed the importance of the annual sevens day in terms of it being representative of a wider expression of Hawick identity, attracting families and groups who do not usually attend on a weekly basis. A degree of emotional and symbolic capital that transcends mere sporting attachment appears to inhere in the rugby club. Jake notes:

The rugby club does have quite a bearing on the town and I think a lot of people who may not even attend games will always be interested in how the team’s done and will always have some comment to offer, if the team’s lost or you know, it’s bad news. And if they’ve won that’s pretty tremendous (IT: 4).

Ewan explains this as a result of the long-term development of rugby traditions in which the people of Hawick “have forged their own identity” and that much of it “has been expressed on the rugby field and the traditions the rugby club have had for over seventy five years” (IT: 3).
Stephen explicitly associates the rugby identity with the wider identity of the whole town, evident here in his comparison between Hawick and city club Edinburgh Accies:

Their fans are different from ours completely because Hawick have, it's a town (emphasis) and it's all geared to that whereas Edinburgh Accies, they could win the cup final, they've no identity, they've no got a town that will come out and support them. The [Glasgow] Hawks are the same. They won the cup a few years ago and they went back to their club rooms and that was it. We won the cup and had an open deck bus along the High Street ken. Because it's all Hawick, it's a town. It's a whole town and community. Everything is geared to Hawick things doing well (IT: 25).

This transcendent nature of rugby within the town was explained further, with Jake highlighting that Jim Telfer who is historically associated with Hawick's close rival Melrose, became Hawick High School rector and, “so of course he was never ever popular when he was the rector here” (IT: 20). Additionally, Ewan and May illustrated the wider cultural and symbolic attachments associated with the rugby traditions within the town. Ewan noted that the local Farmers' Society combines its annual lunch with the Hawick RFC derby match against local rivals Gala, having a corporate lunch in the Hawick clubhouse before and after the match. Meg reinforced the intersecting nature of various Hawick traditions. She noted that the rugby fans adopt Common Riding songs, singing them at matches and whilst travelling to away matches by bus. Explaining that Hawick schoolchildren are taught at least three to four Common Riding songs in school, Meg claims that the songs are such an integral part of Hawick identity that they are sung at Christmas and other family gatherings in the town.

Although the collective identity of Hawick is closely related to the rugby traditions in the town and region, evidence emerged of the changing nature of such traditions. Stephen and Ewan expressed the view that considerably fewer local men are playing the sport than in the previous twenty or so years, with Stephen noting two inter-related aspects to these developments. As a result of “other distractions for them now” (IT: 11), local males are less inclined to participate in rugby as either players or spectators and this has a cumulative effect with potential spectators being lost. “There's fewer guys in town play rugby so fewer families are involved in it” (IT: 11).
Stephen adds:

at one time the rugby was very high up on the list because we were virtually unbeatable in Scotland for years ... but it's not as strong as it used to be, the identity is no there, ye ken, ye get a lot of people now that have never been down to a rugby game (IT: 9).

Drawing linkages to the decline of the mills, Ewan expands on the inter-related nature of the rugby traditions and the economic effects of mass closures of mill factories in the town:

Nowadays of course, that figure of sixty plus [mills] has reduced to around a dozen or so. And it has seriously affected the economy of this area, particularly employment itself. This has meant there has been a considerable amount of people who would leave the town and this has a knock on effect on the rugby (IT: 4).

Additionally, Ewan acknowledges that previous generations have also left the town to pursue a university education:

In the sixties guys who played for Hawick and were at university would travel down here twice a week to train and to play. Now some of them these days with improved communications that we have struggle to do that. Nowadays they'll go to the nearest team that will pay them a fiver a game. Excuse my cynicism (IT: 4).

Despite Stephen and Ewan lamenting the loss of a previous (golden) era, New Zealander Jake believes Hawick have retained aspects of their traditions which have been lost in his native country:

I think there is an identity that hasn't quite been lost here that I've certainly seen lost in New Zealand where in days gone by you used to be quite loyal to your club but now the way things have gone and you have to go away for employment, especially now with the distances you have got to travel, they no longer come back to the town that they lived in because they form new allegiances. Whereas there are still boys who are travelling, coming back to the town to play for the club (IT: 9).

The current situation in Hawick can perhaps serve as an 'empirical paradigm' for the Borders and Scotland in their dynamic and often complex relationship with various globalising tendencies, illuminating the apparent tensions and conflicts which arise when globalisation effects of late modernity clash with tradition. The traditional aspect of a particular Hawick manifestation is evident in what the locals describe as the 'aye been syndrome'. Stephen explains:

It's been my whole life ken, Hawick and its customs and traditions and its rugby, and I just feel as though I wouldn't like to be an outsider trying to get into some of the things. They can be very strange, Hawick people ken. The 'aye been' syndrome has a big, big bearing in the town ... they don't like change ye ken (IT: 3).
Linking this to a Hawick habitus, he adds, “Hawick folk have a mentality of their own. Ye ken, they just do their own thing, they buck against the trends” (IT: 14). Jake agrees, claiming Hawick to be “somewhat insular even within the Borders” (IT: 4), whilst Ewan suggests the ‘aye been’ syndrome makes modern changes anathema to large sections of the town’s community. The effects of the ‘aye been’ syndrome appear to manifest themselves in both rugby and common riding, two of the most traditional pastimes in the town and there are close parallels across the traditions. There are two main strands which are shared; the first consists of female involvement within rugby and the common riding being linked to supporting a male family member or partner. Discussing the rugby club, Jake stresses, “they are there to support their boyfriends or their husbands and that kind of thing” (IT: 8), and Ewan notes, “there is a strong female support. Again, it’s because their family and fathers and brothers and sons and all the rest of it” (IT: 7).

Additionally, central to the female involvement is an apparent division of labour whereby the females prepare and serve refreshments at functions whether it be the teas and sandwiches at the rugby clubhouse or picnics for the common riding rideouts. Furthermore, female involvement at the common riding is viewed as largely decorative. Meg, Ewan and Jake expressed this view with Jake comparing the modern developments in New Zealand gender relations before stressing:

And then I came over here and that was one of the first things I noticed. Whilst they won’t stop the women from riding out and they’ve said they never have, there is still that feeling that the women are there to support, to pretty up the situation (IT: 7).

Ewan concurs, adding:

The cornet’s lass had her entourage but you know they didn’t do that much. The cornet’s lass, all she did was tie on the colours to the flag and that was about it. They were kept pretty much in the background and they looked pretty, they put their best frocks on and all the rest of it and stand around and sort of hand out tea and scones and stuff (IT: 5).

The clash between tradition and modernisation has resulted both in female riders participating in the common riding rideouts – even if Jake is correct in suggesting these female riders are largely from ‘other’ Borders towns – and females becoming rugby committee members and physiotherapists, thereby assuming a more active sport specific role within the rugby club. Additionally, the traditional all male rugby
dinner has been opened up to include females, possibly as a result of the increasing female involvement in the less highly gendered supporting roles. Although it was noted during the interviews that the schools and local children’s clubs have girls’ teams, Hawick RFC does not have a female team.

**Scotland’s Sporting and Political Identity**

Three out of the four respondents were Scottish born UK citizens and one a New Zealander who has lived in Hawick for the last four years. The three Scottish born respondents all described themselves as Scottish, with Meg and Stephen selecting ‘More Scottish than British’ and Ewan selecting ‘Scottish not British’. These selections were reflected in their chosen political preferences, with Meg and Stephen supporting devolution and Ewan preferring independence.

The four respondents all support Scotland’s rugby team, with all but New Zealander, Jake supporting the British and Irish Lions team too. Paradoxically, however, for two respondents this Lions ‘support’ represents an extension of a Scottish sporting identity, reinforcing Scottishness as the principle sporting national identity rather than any obvious Britishness as one might have expected. Ewan and Meg express relief that they did not spend large sums of money to tour with the Lions in the summer of 2005 with Ewan’s comments broadly representative of the views expressed:

> I am totally disgusted with the selection of the Lions. We’ve only got three Scots and that is ridiculous. There was a letter to the Scotsman the other day saying ‘since there’s probably more from Scottish descent playing in the New Zealand side will we support them against the Lions?’ (IT: 24).

Ewan then makes explicit that the primary sporting identity expressed through the Lions for him is a Scottish one, adding, “I thought to myself thank God I haven’t spent a fortune going across to New Zealand in the hope to see Scottish players representing the British Lions” (IT: 24). Meg expresses similar sentiments stressing relief that she did not spend money when so few Scottish players were involved.

The principle identity of the supporters is in sharp contrast to that which is promoted by the playing staff of the Lions, as Meg herself illustrates:

> When they go away they are not English, Scottish, Irish or Welsh, they are Lions. Ye know and they are not to look upon themselves as members of different countries. They’ve come together and to be the Lions (IT: 40).
Stephen, Jake and Ewan expressed the view that the cost of attending Murrayfield had increased to such an extent that it was adversely affecting the potential attendance figures. Two respondents explicitly prefer a Scottish coach than a foreign coach, while one implicitly suggests such a preference. The reasons for this are linked to a more general instrumental rationale evident in other aspects of their views on Scottish rugby as opposed to any obvious national identity expression. Meg believes it more beneficial for coaches and players to develop long term within the national system from club level right up to international level in order to demonstrate sporting competence, while Jake and Ewan extend this view further. Jake notes, “I think there is something about the psyche of the country, of the make up of the people that somebody else is, finds difficult to breach into ... I believe it is harder than if they have a natural born person who understands that psyche” (IT: 24). Ewan concurs, explaining former Scotland coach, Australian Matt Williams’, perceived failings as:

due to the fact that he doesn’t understand what Scottish rugby is all about, the structure of Scottish rugby ... He insisted on having the international squad together at the expense of the professional sides ... Now, someone with a feeling for Scottish rugby I don’t think would have made that mistake (IT: 28).

Underlying this instrumental rationale for preferring Scottish coaches is the belief that within Scotland there is a lack of confidence and over-negativity regarding Scotland’s abilities. Jake and Meg made specific reference, with Jake noting on numerous occasions that Scots lack confidence in their own ability:

There’s something about Scots that I like ... And when you look at what Scots have done over the years in history in terms of what they’ve given and done to the world and this feeling now where there are so many of them pulling themselves down and that kind of thing when they don’t need to ... Too many Scots are putting their country down and I don’t think they need to. I think they should celebrate what they’ve given the world and maybe get off their backsides and show that they can still give things to the world (IT: 30).

Reflecting similar sentiments, Meg adds:

We don’t have enough confidence in our own ability. The folk who are making the appointments of coaches or anybody that they are going to put into a position of responsibility, if they hear a cultured English accent or if they hear a New Zealand or whatever, that’s the person for the job. Oh he comes from New Zealand or he comes from Australia, he must know a lot about rugby, he must know about coaching, and he gets the job over ye know (IT: 27 - 28).

Both Jake and Stephen believe that Scotland’s football fans are more patriotic and passionate than their rugby counterparts with Jake associating this to an alleged
public perception of rugby within Scotland still being middle-class and “for the toffs” (IT: 26). Ewan and Meg, however, believe that rugby has increasingly assumed the role of representing Scotland’s sporting identity, with Ewan expressing an instrumental rationale, comparing football to rugby, noting that, “at least Scottish rugby is still at the top table” (IT: 27). In response to whether or not rugby has increasingly assumed a national identity expression, Meg’s replies:

I think it has to a certain extent ... there are now vast numbers of folk who go to rugby and some of them I think huvnie a clue about what rugby’s about. But because they have got their tickets through some company or other they go (IT: 31).

Expanding on this point, Meg’s rationale appears more linked to a ‘footballisation’ process within rugby in Scotland as she implies:

It used to be that the crowd was very well mannered. You know if there was a player taking a penalty or a conversion then the crowd was quiet but now there’s an element coming in where very, very few players are given silence for their kick and it’s come right through. It’s not just the national and internationals ... I would say there’s been a decline in manners among the crowd (IT: 31).

Meg makes the ‘footballisation’ process within rugby explicit in the following transcript extract:

MS There are a lot more fans wearing kilts now than there ever used to be.

JK Is that right?

MS Aye, ye get a lot of Scotland supporters wearing kilts.

JK And why do you think that is?

MS Since Braveheart haha.

JK But can you hazard a guess, what period would that be?

MS I would say in the last 10 years.

JK Last 10 years, 95 ish. And have you any idea why that would be?

MS It’s a real Scottish thing when ... supporters were going abroad ye got a lot more folk going to away games like, well Italy’s in it as well now, to Rome. It used to be Cardiff you’d get lots of Scottish fans wearing the kilt and a lot more now than there used to be and I would say maybe 10 or slightly more years there have been ehh ... more kilted warriors haha.

JK What about other things to do with the crowd? What about the crowd mentality or some of their wee practises. I mean would a rugby crowd sing songs? Has that changed at all?
Well Flower of Scotland is the rugby song. I mean that wis the rugby song but it's been taken on. I'm sure the football boys sing it now. But it was originally...

(IT: 32 - 33).

Ewan draws comparisons between football and rugby supporters' practices too, adding:

I think there is a coming together of the style of the type if you like, which is kinda typified in the eccentric dress of the kilts, the Caterpillar boots and that type of thing, the rugby shirt and the see you Jimmy hat and all the rest of it and the painted faces so. Now that is a development in the Scottish rugby scene that has changed probably over the last ten years. So there is a coming together (IT: 30).

The Other

The notion of the 'other' resulted in all respondents selecting both Galashiels (Gala) and Melrose as Hawick's major rival depending upon the context and situation. Stephen suspects that some Hawick fans will not travel to support the Borders simply because the matches are played at Gala's ground. The Gala rivalry appears to be a traditionally historic town-centred rivalry as opposed to solely rugby rivalry as Jake implies:

I think the thing with Gala is just the town, you know, 'the toons' rivalry' between one another and all the comments about dirty Gala and palemarks you know ... Gala was the last town in the Borders to get sewage works so they were still sitting on pales when Hawick had flushing toilets and that ... That's been a rivalry that's gone back years (IT: 19 - 20).

As a relative outsider, New Zealander Jake adds:

I think it seems to be more entrenched in Hawick than it does in Gala ...there's quite a different feeling in the town than there is here. And I think Gala, much to Hawick's worry, is fast overtaking them as the biggest town in the Borders, and of course the big complaint is that everything goes to Gala. But there is an air of optimism in Gala that I don't sort of see here (IT: 20).

All respondents agreed that a degree of instrumental rationale contributes to the potency of Hawick's relationship with rival clubs and Gala's relegation to a lower division has resulted in a slight lessening of that rivalry and an increased focus on Melrose.

The traditional rivalry with Gala as opposed to Melrose appeared to be more revered by the respondents with Jake's comments broadly representative of the views expressed. "The rivalries are there and always will be there. Hawick has a sort of
love hate relationship with Gala ... whereas with Melrose it's just a hate relationship” (IT: 14). This “hate hate” relationship with Melrose is so strong that all respondents believe most Hawick fans would support Gala against Melrose. Furthermore, Ewan explained that some of his friends refuse to attend matches in Melrose but will attend Gala. The disdain for Melrose is believed to be shared by other Borders clubs and, within Hawick at least, is linked to three main reasons as outlined by the respondents. Meg explains the first reason while explaining that Melrose are now Hawick’s main ‘other’, noting:

I would say Melrose now. Everybody’s Border rival, everybody wants to beat Melrose ... because they went the money route. They seemed to have money ... they seem to be buying in players and able to buy in players when nobody else was doing that (IT: 16).

The antipathy shown towards Melrose’s professional ethos is reinforced by Stephen:

Melrose have been seen to be the best run club in the Borders through their sevens ... They’ve been able to pay players and entice players to come and play for them and there were foreigners there which Hawick don’t have and Gala don’t have. That team is there for the knocking, ken. And it might be envy as much as anything (IT: 18).

The second main reason for the Melrose rivalry relates to an instrumental rationale of the perceived threat a team poses for Hawick’s league or cup chances. Meg explains that Gala is the original rival because of its traditional challenge to Hawick’s playing superiority through the years and she relates the Melrose rivalry to their increasingly successful teams coupled with Gala’s playing demise. Ewan agrees, rationalising the Melrose rivalry by stating that “we are more likely to be beaten by Melrose” (IT: 20).

The third reason relates to the outsider perception of Melrose and it’s main rugby club as being made up of middle-class, posh and ‘English’ people. Stephen stresses:

they’ve got a big kinda corporate type thing, middle-class. Melrose have always been ‘come on the rose’. It’s a posher area, ken it’s a satellite town and it’s just well-off people that live in Melrose and it’s no just your ordinary Tom, Dick and Harries (IT: 23).

The extent to which Melrose are viewed with disdain by fellow Borders clubs is illuminated by Jake who demonstrates a Borders camaraderie between Gala and Hawick which does not exist with Melrose, as the following transcript shows:

JF Hawick had won the cup as well as the championship and we were driving back through Gala and all the buses were festooned and everything and a group of Gala
people were sitting out and having a ... It was quite a nice night and they were sitting out having a beer on the terrace and they saw the Hawick bus coming through and they knew the result by then, and you know it was just that Borders thing coming together again. They raised their hands you know and everyone on the bus waved and the big comments were ‘och they’re all right those Gala people’ because they were recognising that Hawick had won.

JK But you say ‘the Borders thing’ again. But are Melrose not? They’re a Borders club as well so how is it different?

JF Well one of the comments is ‘well they are all English who live in Melrose’ hahaha

(IT: 21).

Despite having a ‘hate relationship’ with Melrose, to the extent that they are viewed, within the Borders, as partial outsiders, Melrose (and Gala) would be supported by Hawick fans against city clubs. There appears to be a hierarchy of loyalty based upon the extent to which individuals feel part of the ‘we’ group formation. In assessing whether other Borders clubs would be supported against city clubs by neutral Hawick fans, Jake explains, “You see, I probably think the Borders team would probably come through in the end and people would support their own sort” (IT: 22). Ewan and Meg also expressed a preference for a Borders’ team over any city club with Meg rationalising it as, “because the city teams tend to have far more backing money wise. They seem to be able to put their hands on far more money and get bigger backers than the Borders clubs can” (IT: 18 - 19). Ewan emphasises the friendly camaraderie among the Borders towns. He describes how during an after dinner speech at a Hawick v Gala fixture a prominent Gala official received great applause for denigrating Glasgow Hawks for having few supporters. The expression of a ‘we’ habitus in the Borders is strengthened as Ewan demonstrates by explaining the shared traditions of the common riding among rival towns:

All the [common riding] principles from the other Border towns are invited to participate, certainly for the main three days. They’re also on some of the preceding ride outs as well. And similarly all the Hawick principles participate in other common ridings and from the point of view of the man in the street if ye like, if there’s shall we say, ‘oh it’s Jed’s common riding this weekend, let’s go for a night out there’ and it’s ... And at Hawick common riding they all come up here. Yes it is a unique thing mmm (IT: 21).

All respondents agreed that generally England are the main international ‘other’ although the levels of rivalry varied slightly between respondents. Stephen notes, “England’s the team I love to beat. I love to beat England even when they are no’ at
the top and the Welsh were the top rugby playing country, I still love to beat England" (IT: 36). Yet, Stephen adds:

I like England to do well when they're no' playing Scotland, likes eh in the World Cup I wanted England to win the World Cup. Ken I don't have the deep hatred and I'm no' resentful, ken they've got their country and we've got ours (IT: 37).

Although noting that England are the team the Welsh and Scots like to beat, Meg revealingly expressed an instrumental rationale to Scotland's 'other'. In response to being asked who Scotland's 'other' is, Meg responds "Italy at the moment ... well our team has not been performing" (IT: 38).

2. Edinburgh Academical Rugby Football Club

Edinburgh Academical Sporting Identity

All respondents alluded to the 'traditional' nature of Edinburgh Academical (Accies), highlighting the first international match between Scotland and England at Raeburn Place as a central aspect of the club's constructed identity. Lesley explains that due to the Accies' "reputable reputation" (IT: 5), many touring clubs visit Raeburn Place and participate in social events at the clubhouse. Connor's comments represent a summary of the 'traditional' themes alluded to by the others:

I mean the Accies is the oldest rugby club in Britain, second oldest rugby club in the world. We've been playing rugby at Raeburn Place since 1857 and ... where it fits into the local community, it has always been very much a part of the professional part of the city (IT: 3).

Connor expands on his comments, illustrating the central (symbolic and practical) role the fee-paying Edinburgh schools played in shaping aspects of Scottish (city) rugby:

Historically rugby was set up and worked, the [fee-paying] schools themselves set up the clubs and so the clubs themselves were kind of emm, school based or centred ... so there is a direct relationship between the school, a direct relationship (IT: 8).

Aaron emphasises the importance of the fee-paying schools in shaping, fostering and protecting the individual Edinburgh rugby clubs' identities in modern times.
In discussing possible club mergers he stresses:

I mean could I actually live with Accies playing alongside Herioters and so on in order to make a better side? Yes I could if it was the will of us all. But the trouble is we had the opportunity to do that ten years ago and they rejected it and that's because of the old school tie thing. The old school ties, and Accies were totally arrogant saying we don't need this (IT: 11).

With specific regard to Edinburgh Academy's links to the Accies in modern Edinburgh, Connor's comments emphasis the 'professional', 'traditional' and upper middle-class disposition within the school:

The school base has changed somewhat. It has broadened as a day school and decreased as a boarding school so the colonialism, the military, the rural and farming community has reduced ... The middle-class base has increased and I suppose the barriers between your traditional upper-class, middle-class and lower-class, I guess the barriers have blurred quite dramatically ... the people going to the school at the academy has changed and the make up has changed as a result. The player base at the club has changed. Historically it was mostly professional apart from the military colonialist and the farming people. It was mostly professional. Mostly again, lawyers and accountants and even currently there are more Scottish Law Lords who are former pupils of Edinburgh Academy than any other school in the whole of Scotland (IT: 4).

All respondents agree on the centrality of the fee-paying Edinburgh Academy to the identity of the Accies in playing, supporting and administrative terms. Angela and George suggest the "core" identity of the club originates from the school and the influence of its former pupils (IT: 2), while Lesley adds that most major Edinburgh clubs are linked to (fee-paying) schools (IT: 5 - 8). However, the extent to which the school continues to play a central role in the club's present identity in modern Edinburgh was questioned by every respondent with Connor and Lesley's comments perhaps being the most instructive. Connor expands upon his previous remark, highlighting the nouveau riche who have little or no historical links to the school or rugby club:

The type of person coming to the school has changed and the type of parent sending their children to the school has changed quite dramatically. When you get them into a city like Edinburgh which is a big financial centre with the banks and the building societies, assurance companies and all the rest of it, you have got very, very high earners in these industries and they look at a school like the academy and regard it as the sort of school they want to send their children to. Because they don't necessarily have a connection to the club we don't necessarily see them (IT: 4 - 5).

Expressing similar sentiments, Lesley alludes to the possibility that the younger generation may not share the traditional school and rugby club identity:
I think there are more people moving around in Edinburgh. In my generation they grew up in Edinburgh, they, it was a city, ok it was an international city but not to the same extent that it is now. So you have got people coming and going a lot in Edinburgh all the time; going to different schools and moving about. Whereas with my husband, you went where your father went and that’s where he went and his son goes there. But there are a lot of other people in the schools now and it’s not like that anymore. Edinburgh’s a very diverse city now and people move in and out in five years, two years, so I think it’s changed a lot because it’s so much more complex, cosmopolitan, so that might change people’s perceptions of their loyalty to a school or a club (IT: 13).

The fact that there are a lot of other people at the Academy now whose parents send them there because it is the “right sort of school” rather than for family or traditional reasons, may suggest that the school has a reduced significance on the cultivated habitus of the rugby club. There may indeed be weakening ties between the two, as other people move into the area. However, the upper middle-class disposition designated by the ties between the school and rugby club is sometimes reinforced and strengthened by other incomers to the city who may not share the Academy’s history but may possess a cultivated habitus which reflects an upper middle-class disposition. Aaron, a non-Academy former public schoolboy exemplifies such a position:

I didn’t go to the school. I went to another [fee-paying] school in Perthshire which didn’t have another rugby boys’ team affiliation. There weren’t that many good open clubs ... They (Accies) also had a very good reputation for being very sociable. A lot of people from my school had gone there that I knew ... I had ex-school friends there and of course Accies were seen as a good open and sociable club. I guess with like-minded people, with similar backgrounds to myself and all the rest of it (IT: 2).

Therefore, although not schooled at the Academy, being a public school product the (personal and group) significance of his educational capital (albeit gained elsewhere) helps Aaron to accrue further cultural and symbolic capital by being a member of the Academical club. As Bourdieu (1984) shows:

the educational institution succeeds in imposing cultural practices that it does not teach and does not even explicitly demand, but which belong to the attributes attached by status to the position it assigns, the qualifications it awards and the social positions to which the latter give access (p. 26).

This suggests the primacy of class habitus over any Academy specific habitus, illustrating that for some, the upper middle-class disposition is more central in helping shape the Academical identity than any specific familial or historical ties to the Academy.
According to Bourdieu (1984):

But the fact that educational qualifications function as a condition of entry to the universe of legitimate culture cannot be fully explained without taking into account another, still more hidden effect which the educational system, again reinforcing the work of the bourgeois family, exerts through the very conditions within which it inculcates. Through the educational qualification certain conditions of existences are designated – those which constitute the precondition for obtaining the qualification and also the aesthetic disposition, the most rigorously demanded of all the terms of entry which the world of legitimate culture (always tacitly) imposes ... One can posit, in broad terms, that it is because they are linked either to a bourgeois origin or to the quasi-bourgeois mode of existence presupposed by prolonged schooling, or (most often) to both of these combined, that educational qualifications come to be seen as a guarantee of the capacity to adopt the aesthetic disposition (p. 28).

As Bourdieu shows, not only are the `qualifications' seen as a guarantee of the capacity to adopt the aesthetic disposition, but so is the manner in which the qualifications – irrespective of those gained or not – are taught and learned; and this illustrates a primary type of constructed identity being reinforced through the Academical rugby club.

The specific type of aesthetic disposition being inculcated within the confines of the rugby club reveal further the upper middle-class habitus among these core members. A key expression that kept recurring throughout all the interviews was the “sociable” disposition within the club. By closely analysing the contexts and examples of where this ‘sociable’ character is manifested, the subtle upper middle-class tastes are tacitly revealed. In describing the primary identity with which he associates most within the club, Aaron states, “it was very sociable and yes, there were a lot of like-minded individuals and all the rest of it” (IT: 3).

Angie and George express similar sentiments to Aaron, reinforcing the subtle class-based status of the ‘sociable’ disposition within the club as captured in the following transcript:

GP And it’s a good social weekend /
AP It keeps coming back to that
GP It's an aspect of rugby we come back to. It's not just (emphasis) a sport /
AP No, no (she agrees), it's the ambience that goes with it /
Furthermore, these like-minded individuals provided material gains in distinction functioning as an informal networking circuit helping to improve business opportunities within the club environment. In discussing his club membership, Connor admits:

I regarded it as an ideal opportunity to open doors for me from a business point of view and ... I was practising as a chartered surveyor and working for a firm like Riordan's, I found that membership certainly provided me with a reasonable amount of work (IT: 6).

In explaining sporting practices Bourdieu (1978) suggests that the petty-bourgeoisie or bourgeoisie find an opportunity "to accumulate or maintain a political capital of renown and honourability which is always potentially reconvertible into political power" (p. 832). Connor maintains and accumulates economic capital through gaining more clients while reinforcing his cultural and educational capital.

The subtle middle-class dimensions become clearer as Angie and George expand on their perceived differences between rugby and football in Scotland, and referring to what Lesley calls 'joshing', George, who used to watch Hearts in the 1960s, explains that unlike football, rugby is about "the banter and chat" (IT: 16) as opposed to the "hate and aggro" associated (in his mind) with football.

It's (rugby identity) different. You know one (football) breeds we are separate and we hate you whereas we (rugby fans) are, well we are all here for the game and the chat after and while we will happily score points against one another it is not an animosity kind of style. It's a sort of upmanship but with humour (IT: 16).

Anne, who did not allude to attending football in the past or present, adds, "there's a huge difference between football and rugby as there's much more social ambience to the rugby side than to the football ... It is socially related much more than football in my mind" (IT: 8). The subtle references to an upper middle-class disposition becomes clearer if one considers that football could also be justifiably described as at least equally 'socially related'. However, it appears that for these respondents the (largely 'working-class' perceived) 'sociable' aspects associated with football are recognised only for their anti-social content.
The subtle ways that the word ‘sociable’ represents an upper middle-class habitus when used to describe the identity of the Academical club was perhaps most sharply illustrated in the following comments by George and Aaron. George notes:

We possibly have too much of a social ethos and some people say, you know if you speak to the critics of the club, they will say we are far too sociable and we will never make a serious campaign because we are not from the background of the working-class and are desperate to succeed (IT: 4).

Aaron adds, “the social side of it was always at least equally if not more important than the rugby side. It just so happened that because of the background and the schools that most people went to at the club we all knew how to play a good game of rugby” (IT: 3). These comments reveal an almost old fashioned middle-class ‘amateur’ ethos implicit within ‘knowing how to play a good game’ and being ‘far too sociable’. It appears that in this context being ‘sociable’ is simply a sub-text for the middle-class values and traditions associated with an old fashioned ‘amateur’ ethos grounded in the values of Muscular Christianity and so closely tied to the history of Edinburgh Accies and the development of rugby union in Scotland and Britain.

Another of the central themes that emerged in relation to the identity of the Academical club related to the effects of the introduction of professionalism and the format of regional team, Edinburgh Gunners. Underlying much of the negativity expressed towards professionalism was a reluctance to leave behind the ‘amateur’ ethos. Aaron believes the “whole spirit” of Scottish rugby union has been lost due to professionalism, noting, “you can’t identify with it anymore” (IT: 17). Connor highlights that in the immediate aftermath of the Accies paying modest wages, “a lot of our financial support disappeared like snow off a dyke because a lot of people took objection to the professionalisation” (IT: 8).

All respondents agreed that the professional game has been detrimental to the Accies. Aaron, Angie, George and Connor believe that substantial numbers of ‘traditional’ supporters have deserted the club game, with the latter three respondents suggesting some have abandoned the game altogether, having not diverted their loyalty to the regional team. George’s comments are broadly
representative of the others’ views. While discussing the introduction of professionalism, he notes, “while people resented it, the spectators say ‘well it’s not the way it used to be’ and there’s no doubt the numbers of spectators dropped at that point and they didn’t drop to go and watch the pro teams” (IT: 6). Aaron alludes to a “total tension” (IT: 10) existing within the clubs and their supporters regarding supporting the regional teams (in playing and spectating terms). Furthermore, he believes this has increased since the ‘district’ system was replaced by the regional teams.

There is total tension as far as I’m concerned ... The clubs don’t want to give as much support [to regional teams as opposed to old district teams] ... They don’t have this burning desire to feed into the Edinburgh Gunners. I mean Hawick Trades and the feeder clubs used to feed into Hawick and that was their primary role and ... one of their players would move into the top team and there was a pride. That doesn’t happen. And so, that whole integration has sort of been lost. Now you used to go play for the Edinburgh Districts and the Edinburgh Districts very much came from the Edinburgh clubs. Edinburgh District should have become the new Edinburgh club. But it was just actually created as a sterile entity on its own and with no involvement with the clubs whatsoever (IT: 10).

Aaron adds that this has led to a “polarisation” (IT: 11) among the Accies’ fans with some attending the regional matches and some refusing. Describing fellow Accies fan, Charlie, Aaron adds, “Charlie hates the Gunners. We’ve had arguments in the pub over this. He’ll ask me how I can go and watch them and I’ll say because I like to watch good rugby” (IT: 9).

Two main points emerged with specific regard to professionalism and the Accies’ identity. First, as highlighted, the loss of the ‘amateur’ ethos entrenched within much of the Accies’ history, and cherished for so long by many within British and Irish rugby union, has alienated some supporters. Second, the loss of club players to other clubs, often via the regional team – resulting in a weakened team and eroded identity - leads some supporters to oppose the regional team’s involvement in club affairs.

Aaron and Lesley bemoaned the loss of former pupils and other club players to the regional team and other rival clubs since professionalisation.
Aaron captures their sentiments fully:

So it's got to the stage now where you have got a two-tier system or maybe even a two and a half tier system. You've got Boroughmuir, Heriots and Watsonians who are in the premier division and who are perceived to be feeders in. But you've got other clubs like Accies who need players of their own and they end up losing their players to Heriots who need to get in bed with others (inaudible). To have your own players from Accies going from Accies to Heriots. To have Blair go from Accies to Boroughmuir and eventually get into Edinburgh Gunners side, oh (he sighs with frustration) and if he comes back to play for his local club, he'll come back to play for Boroughmuir. From the age of three he went to Edinburgh Academy and he only got to play for Edinburgh Accies for half a season before he was popped into the Heriots side, or Boroughmuir before playing for Scotland. And that I think is what has been lost (IT: 10).

Lesley highlights the potential long-term effects these developments will have on the identity of the Accies. She notes:

The clubs are what brings the young players through. And then you take them from the top but now you're putting in another layer and taking all the best players from the clubs and putting them into districts (regions) and now you have nobody for the kids to aspire to and their local club, they are now aspiring to Edinburgh or the other districts (regions) ... so your local best players are now being dispersed all over the place. All being told you've got to play in that club because it's better for your career to play there (IT: 10).

It also became apparent from the interviews that the increasingly 'professional' ethos underpinning modern club and regional rugby in Scotland has negatively affected the 'amateur' properties of the clubhouse, specifically its facilitation of (star) player-supporter rapport which promoted rapport between star performers and fans. Aaron and Lesley suggest that the dangers of having no celebrity or star players at club level, unlike in previous years, are likely to reduce future generations' attachment to the clubs. Aaron reminisces of 'sharing a beer' with up to ten current and former international players in the Raeburn Place clubhouse after club matches less than ten years ago, while Lesley wonders what effects will occur due to young fans not having star players that "everybody knows" at many club games now.

Scotland's Sporting and Political Identity

Two of the respondents (Lesley and Connor) grew up outside of the UK. Connor describes his national identity as 'Irish' and Lesley, raised in the Commonwealth country, Zimbabwe, describes herself as 'more British than Scottish'. The three other respondents describe themselves as 'more Scottish than British'. However,
Aaron, Angie and George share a national identity (‘more Scottish than British’), but their political identity differs. Angie and George prefer Westminster rule for Scotland with Angie expressing a lack of confidence in Scotland by confessing, “I don’t know if we could survive being independent” (IT: 9). Aaron, however, favours independence for Scotland, underlining the complexity of these identity markers. He asserts, “I’m not a nationalist. But I’m a passionate Scotsman and that’s quite hard to articulate ... I’m not a nationalist. I have feelings about Scotland but I’m not a nationalist. I despise nationalism but I’m a great patriot” (IT: 12). Aaron, a ‘passionate Scotsman’, is quite explicit in his disdain for nationalism illustrating one of the differences between patriotism and nationalism. The compatible nature of ‘being British’ yet desiring political independence for Scotland is shown by Aaron who simultaneously ‘despises’ nationalism, is happy to be British and yet desires political independence for Scotland.

All respondents expressed support for the Scotland national team, with all having attended international matches on a regular basis. Connor highlighted the increased cost of tickets in recent years affecting the attendances in numbers and type of supporter attending. A central theme throughout the interviews involved questioning the extent to which rugby union in Scotland has increased as a vehicle for the expression of a Scottish national identity, and to what extent this identity is expressed in either ‘patriotic’ or ‘nationalistic’ terms. Two central elements to the discussion emerged; the introduction by the SRU of Flower of Scotland as the official Scotland anthem, and an increased use and display of tartan symbols during Scotland fixtures.

Angie, George and Aaron highlighted the increasing levels of tartanry which for them have appeared in recent years. Aaron states, “it’s almost like a Scottish uniform is starting to appear now of a Scotland rugby shirt, a jersey, a pair of Timberland boots with socks down below the knees” (IT: 16). Angie and George locate this specifically within the last twenty years, adding, “I think it’s very much more [a] nationalistic message they are putting across in terms of dress” (IT: 14). When pressed to specify to what extent it was ‘nationalistic’ rather than ‘patriotic’, George concedes that it may simply be a patriotic rather than outright nationalistic
expression. However the degree of crossover between the two terms is obvious with George adding:

I think people are being patriotic and wearing the kilt they are wanting to show they are Scottish and that they are a Scottish side ... when devolution came, it took the fuse off that (nationalism) and I think it’s much receded again ... I think that devolution did defuse that. I don’t know why but I just have a perception that when devolution came in, that took the pressure off the situation that was growing and it’s now what I would call a much more healthy rivalry again. It was getting almost football like (IT: 15 - 16).

In discussing the increased tartanry, it was clear that all the respondents believe that new ‘non-traditional’ fans have appeared at both regional and international level. Angie and George highlight the new fans at regional matches, many of whom, in their opinion, do not have a local club allegiance. Connor links this to the perceived rise of a corporate type of fan attending international matches in an increasingly professionalised rugby union environment. However, the most common perception of the alleged new fan was summed up succinctly by Aaron:

There are certainly different people coming to the internationals now than perhaps ten years ago [when] you wouldn’t have seen them at Murrayfield. You sit next to them, you listen to them, you hear the language and you go, ‘these aren’t the people that we used to have here ten years ago’. Now is that a snobbery in me and a (inaudible) and yes, but actually (inaudible) there are lots coming to watch us and filling the stadium and that’s not a bad thing. So yeah, there is a broader a Scottish kinda support (IT: 15 - 16).

This idea of a ‘broader’ support, which engages in practises and behaviour frowned upon by Aaron, illuminates the subtle class tensions which are implicit within the Scotland support and are visible in the competing ways they acquire gains in distinction. On one level there appears to be the ‘new’ fans, the “parvenus” (Bourdieu, 1984) whose tastes are veering towards those of another class (Wilkes, 1990), but which simultaneously help to make pre-existing dominant class tastes paradoxically more negative symbols for the dominant class. Therefore, on another level, these previously accepted practices are suddenly being avoided rather than embraced by that dominant class and the existing dominant class fraction – embodied by Aaron in this case – shift their preferred preferences in order to maintain their distinction.
This is evidenced more clearly by Aaron who goes on to comment:

I used to wear a kilt [to matches] but now I wouldn’t be seen dead in it. I don’t want to be associated with that sort of em, almost false patriotism that seems to be walking around. I’m almost trying to disassociate myself from that now. I see those guys going around Paris and Dublin and all the rest of the internationals. They can go that way (he points to opposite corner) and I’m going to go this way thank you very much. You know I’m still supporting my country but I’m not going to be associated with that (IT: 16).

The second central theme to emerge in this section was the perceived significance of the SRU adopting the Flower of Scotland as its official anthem, replacing ‘Scotland The Brave’ and ‘God Save The Queen’. When probed on the extent to which the SRU ‘captured the Scottish mood’ by adopting the Flower of Scotland during such a politically significant period, a few themes emerged from the data. Aaron, Angela, George and Lesley suggest the adoption by the SRU was more to do with David Sole, the Scotland captain, wishing to rally the players with a more passionate anthem than any desire to express an overtly nationalistic message. Lesley states, “I don’t think it would be anything to do with that (increasing nationalism)” (IT: 20), while George adds, “I think it was David Sole who introduced it to the changing room when Scotland were being quite successful and so it was associated with success, and if you associate something with success it becomes more popular” (IT: 14). Aaron disputes the role the SRU had in adopting the anthem, claiming, “the SRU didn’t [decide to adopt it]. David Sole did and therefore we identify more with that” (IT: 14). Aaron, Connor and Lesley then illustrate the complexity of aligning cultural, political and national identity in any straightforward way. Aaron asserts:

I’m not a nationalist. I think Flower of Scotland is a dirge. I hate it with a passion. I do remember it being sung for the first time at the Grand Slam game in 1990. Whoah, what an experience, but to be honest they could have been singing ye know ‘Marie’s wedding’ sort of thing at the time (IT: 15).

Aaron, therefore, “despises nationalism”, is happy to be British and desires Scottish political independence (as outlined in his constitutional preference), yet he “hates Flower of Scotland with a passion” but is enamoured by the experience of hearing it sung at Murrayfield against England. Reflecting this position in part, Connor notes, “Yeah, Flower of Scotland, I think it’s a dirge and I don’t really like it but I will sing it heartily if we are at Murrayfield or wherever, and I think there are better songs” (IT: 19). Connor then claims, “the move was made very simply because people were booing God Save The Queen” (IT: 19), a claim corroborated by Lesley
The complexity of aligning the cultural, political and national identity in any neat way was then further evidenced by Lesley who, despite “being English” in her younger days, being happy being a UK citizen and describing herself as ‘British’, asserts that the Flower of Scotland helped create a sense of Scottish unity with which she can identify.

I think it was fantastic because it gave them a national identity and it has actually spread from rugby right across Scotland to become the anthem for Scotland which it isn’t an official anthem, but rugby made it like that I think definitely. And when it first played, people started singing it you could tell that there was finally, we had something which we could sing back to the English when they were singing their chariots song and it does create a sense of identity (IT: 10).

The non-nationalistic symbolism inherent in Lesley’s position is obvious and is further illustrated in the following transcript passage:

LG I think that Flower of Scotland is [a] very important part of how people feel about Scotland now and it definitely started with the rugby and it spread very quickly from there to other situations I think.

JK Princess Anne has been seen to sing it /

LG Exactly! And these are all, a lot of people who support rugby are not necessarily Scottish racist types either. You know a lot of them are educated. They travel down south, they don’t have that sort of feeling of ‘we’ve got to hate our neighbours’ and that sort of thing. And still it’s been taken up by them. It obviously resonates somewhere, the notion of being Scottish.

Therefore, Lesley clearly views the Flower of Scotland as completely compatible with a British national (civic) identity and a Scottish sporting (cultural) identity. She adds, “I wouldn’t say the [Scottish] Parliament would have changed it (anthem). It’s maybe more the feeling of wanting to be Scottish that was growing at the time perhaps (IT: 20).

Ascribing political significance to the growing cultural and sporting expressions of ‘Scottishness’, as evidenced in increasing displays of tartanry and the adoption of the Flower of Scotland (at the expense of God Save The Queen) by the SRU, is problematic. Some fans who describe themselves as something other than ‘Scottish’ appear equally happy as those describing themselves as ‘Scottish’ to embrace Flower of Scotland, while some who embrace it do so in a consciously apolitical manner, for symbolic and instrumental purposes as opposed to any nationalistic
expression. The motives behind the increase in tartanry among supporters and the official adoption of Flower of Scotland remain unclear and may differ. However, irrespective of motives, 'the extent to which these are capturing the Scottish mood' is a moot point. The pertinent question remains; what 'Scottish mood' – that of the 80 minute patriot or that of the political nationalist? Moreover, for the latter group it may be equally pertinent to ask 'what nation – Scotland or the United Kingdom?'

The 'Other'
In discussing the notion of the 'other' it became apparent in the responses of all respondents that the central aspect to Accies' rivalry with other clubs is an Edinburgh intra-city rivalry principally among the city's fee-paying schools' teams. All respondents agree that fellow Edinburgh club Heriots are the major 'other' to most supporters of the Accies. This intra-city rivalry appears to be based largely on 'joshing' other known associates from the other clubs. George captures the common sentiment most fully when explaining the reasons why fellow Edinburgh (fee-paying) school-based clubs are the major 'others':

> Cause you meet with them, their spectators in town and socially, so you like to put one on them. Likewise they are looking to put one on you in the most pleasant manner. You know, you are scoring points off each other jovially. It's a sort of social thing (IT: 11).

Indeed, such is the strength of the schools' identity and rivalry within the clubs, Connor points out that even in the merged Stewart's Melville club, there are members from the old clubs who will "not necessarily associate with one another" (IT: 14).

In discussing the extent to which the Accies rivalry extended to Glasgow, the general consensus was that there is not a significant degree of rugby rivalry between the cities but is rather mainly between the schools. Aaron claims any rivalry between the cities is largely schools based, while Connor agrees there is a rivalry but adds, "I don't think the rugby guys necessarily identify themselves with the cities to the same extent as ... football supporters do" (IT: 15). George demonstrates an instrumental approach to the club's major rivalries, noting, "Glasgow's generally an inferior rugby playing area so we much prefer to beat an Edinburgh team" (IT: 12). While originally stating she was "unaware" of an inter-city rivalry, Lesley later
adds, “I think the rivalry is much more from them to Edinburgh than it is the other way round ... I think the Glaswegians ... they think Edinburgh people are bit stuck up ye know” (IT: 14).

In international terms, England was deemed the major ‘other’ by all respondents, with George expressing an instrumental rationale to this too, claiming it is largely due to England’s status as a top class team. George claims that in the 1970s and 1980s his major international ‘other’ would have been Wales. Perhaps the most revealing aspects of the England rivalry came from the two respondents who were born and raised outwith Scotland, Lesley and Connor. Both agree England are the main ‘other’ largely as a result of what Lesley terms, “Chippy Scots’ Syndrome” (IT: 24). Lesley explains this relates to a chip on the shoulder that many Scots appear to have regarding England. Connor concurs, noting, “it’s because the Scots have a huge inferiority complex ... I think the sad thing about it is the Scots don’t have a chip on their shoulder, they have a tree trunk on either shoulder” (IT: 20).

None of the respondents attend football regularly at present. However, George did express support for Hearts and noted that he used to attend their matches on a regular basis. George suggests that if Accies fans support any football team then it is likely to be Hearts. Both George and Aaron demonstrated their perception of Scottish football being circumscribed by ethno-religious markers:

You’ll probably find that a few [Accies fans] have a soft spot for Hearts. I suppose that Hearts are the right side of town. Hibs are more East. Mmmm, and there’s potentially a religious bent because your Catholics do tend to support Hibs and Protestants support Hearts (IT: 21).

Meanwhile, Aaron expressing support for Celtic, adds:

I was brought up in Glasgow and one of my father’s best friends was a director of Celtic and I used to be taken to all the games. But you know I am a WASP, white anglo-saxon Protestant so I’m very confused. But I’m still very loyal to Celtic (IT: 17).

Angela, George and Aaron believe football fans are more likely to be expressive of Scottish nationalistic feelings than rugby fans. Aaron summarises:

I would suggest that probably more of the Scottish [rugby] supporters would be less prone to independence and (inaudible) than your football supporter would have been. In other words they hate the English and can’t wait to get away from them. It’s just the fact that we’re all passionate Scottish rugby
supporters and we want to have an identity that say we can sing a Scottish song, eh, rather than some sort of anti-English song that would be sung at some football game. So I would say it certainly is, we are very patriotic at the rugby (IT: 14).

3. Glasgow Hawks Rugby Union Club

Hawks Sporting Identity

The Hawks ethos proved to be a slightly problematic concept for some of the respondents. Two major themes emerged from the data. First, there appears to be particular club linkages which are governed by personal or family ties through being a former pupil of a school associated to the club or having links to players, coaches or officials. Second, the Hawks ethos is problematic as a result of being a recently formed club and by being an amalgamation of other clubs resulting in a number of competing and paradoxical allegiances within the Hawks ethos.

In discussing the personal linkages to the Hawks ethos, Derek states:

a lot of the supporters tend to be from the former pupils and former players of the clubs ... I would say the spectators are either in that category or will be parents of the boys involved. There is little unattached support at the moment for Hawks (IT: 4).

Susan adds, “I know so many of the boys you know who played with my own sons” (IT: 10). Recognising that Hawks have a high proportion of female fans, Derek comments, “They would generally be the wives or mothers or girlfriends or something yes, of people who are also attached to the club” (IT: 10). Josh reiterates the belief in Hawks having a high proportion of female supporters, and suggesting that times have changed, adds, “it’s totally different from what it used to be ... Just about every club, eh, the ladies did the catering. Wives of players, wives of committee men, still do it at the [Glasgow] Accies, they still do teas after the game and it used to be that in every club” (IT: 19 - 20).

The problematic nature of the Hawks ethos was apparent throughout the interviews with each respondent expressing a duality of support for Hawks and one of their feeder clubs. Andrea admits to traditionally being a GHK supporter, occasionally
still attending their matches, and, in relation to Hawks, notes, “it’s taken a while to establish an identity” (IT: 4). Explaining the Hawks concept further, Josh says:

There are two shares; Glasgow Accies have one and Glasgow High Kelvinside have the other and they allowed Glasgow Hawks to occupy the highest level of their two clubs ... [But] they still exist. They still play as separate clubs (IT: 2).

The feeder clubs appear to retain a level of support from Hawks fans and additionally, within the confines of the club (and its feeder clubs), there appears to be lingering expressions of feeder club identity superseding the Hawks identity. Derek states:

I know that within both of the principal feeder organisations, eh, Glasgow Accies and GHK, there are factions which jealously guard their own identity and aren't really, in my view, correctly concerned with the well-being of Hawks ... I know one or two people in each of these clubs who disapprove of the Hawks concept (IT: 3).

Derek further notes that the Accies contingent among the Hawks support has dissipated in recent times, leaving a majority of GHK fans to maintain the Hawks support base. The extent to which the old rivalries remain potent and retain currency is demonstrated by Derek’s explanation of this:

The support from Accies has fallen away. Probably because the Hawks are now using the facilities at Old Anniesland which belonged to the Glasgow High School Club which has traditionally numbered among its enemies the Glasgow Academy and Glasgow Academicals, so the antipathy between the two feeder clubs is em, is still apparent in some quarters (IT: 4).

These traditional rivalries are closely aligned to the fee-paying schools in Glasgow. Susan illustrates the pull of the old school tie by explaining her late husband’s reluctance to see GHK merge with Accies. Explaining his links to Glasgow High School, she explains:

my husband wasn’t terribly keen on it because it was joining with Glasgow Academicals which originally that was what the Hawks was ... The schools were like this (gestures to suggest at war or battle and laughs). The old school tie. So was Kelvinside ... but my husband came round (IT: 5).

In exploring these themes further, Susan is asked about the possible sub-divisions within the Hawks, including earlier divisions within the amalgamated GHK, and she responds that they do exist and that this is partly why the original idea of Hawks representing Glasgow as the premier club in the pyramid “never really got off the ground” (IT: 7). In response to a direct question of whether the blame lay with financial problems, lack of top class players or due to supporter factions, Susan
responds “I think it’s supporter wise. I think it’s the old school ties again. You see I’m an incomer to Glasgow. I wasn’t brought up in Glasgow so I don’t have the same loyalty to the school” (IT: 7).

The importance of the ‘old school tie’, alluded to by Josh too, is illustrative of an underlying middle-class habitus existing within the Hawks club and this surfaced, consciously and subconsciously perhaps, on a couple of occasions. Two respondents, Andrea and Josh, expressed the potential for Hawks to capitalise on the number of universities within and around Glasgow by recruiting potential players. It could be suggested this is merely casting the net wide in order to capture the best potential. However, given the history and context of club rugby in the cities of Scotland and their linkages to ‘the schools and universities’, together with a lack of any expressed desire to capitalise on other potential reservoirs of talent in an age of labour migration, the obvious class habitus can be assumed. It is reinforced further by Josh who unambiguously makes the middle-class habitus explicit when discussing the supporter potential for the club:

I believe we could get a lot more people locally ... The west end of Glasgow is a fairly affluent area eh, houses are dear, there’s private schools blah, blah, blah, so ye have if ye like, a ready made rugby audience (IT: 8).

This ‘ready made’ audience is further situated within a middle-class habitus by Josh when explaining the dearth of competing activities available for such an audience on a Saturday afternoon. “It’s winter time don’t forget and we (Hawks) play in the winter. No many people go out and play golf at the weekends and certainly in the middle of winter they don’t go out fishing” (IT: 8). It is revealing that despite residing in one of the major football oriented cities in Britain, no suggestion is made that football could be a potential rival for the desired rugby audience being constructed by Josh. Furthermore, it may be revealing that the two rival activities suggested are often associated with middle-class pursuits.xxxii

The Hawks’ ethos remains problematic then as a result of the club being in its relative infancy, being an amalgamation of other traditional (rival) clubs, and because of the demands of attracting new supporters to the club in an increasingly professionalised environment.
Perhaps the following passage from Josh sums up the challenges facing the Hawks ethos:

the High School probably had 5 internationals in their side including the Scotland captain. And ye used to queue up on the payment out there and there was turnstiles and there was huge queues. Even before, even going back into the 30s, when Accies played over the fence, when Heriots came through they used to run special bloody trains for club games eh.... But people have found other things to do and more people have more disposable income so instead of going to watch rugby, most of them are members, they were mostly school FP's, Scottish rugby is mostly FP clubs and as such eehh, it was the old school tie thing. They followed the fortunes of the club and they obviously went to the school. And each year more folk left school and they would get big crowds. Big crowds here. So it's just a process of evolution and the professional thing has virtually wiped the support away. Cause a lot of them just said 'we're no doing things eh, before they get paid, I'm no doing things to keep the club running'. A lot of the volunteer support for club rugby has disappeared because people are unwilling to be a volunteer (IT: 5).

Josh further noted the loss of the interchangeability between player and fan, suggesting that the loss of a nostalgic 'amateur' past has resulted in a reduced bond between players and fans:

I remember at the end of the game Gavin Hastings was stood at the posts of this end of the field for at least 20 minutes after the game signing autographs, talking to kids. It just doesn't happen anymore. That doesn't happen anymore ... There's no hero worship and ye need hero worship. It doesn't happen because the pros are playing on a Friday night at Huenden. Kids aren't going to be hanging about in the dark. That whole social aspect of rugby where everyone was welcome and it didn't make any difference and ye could touch yer heroes, the kids could touch their heroes. And even at Murrayfield it was the same, outside the dressing rooms after internationals. Thousands of kids hanging about and the guys would always sign as many autographs as they could. That probably doesn't / it still does happen at Murrayfield but it doesn't happen at club grounds and I mean there wis folk here and we used to come down when I was at school and they would be practising and Angus Cameron was Scotland captain at that time and was the captain of the British Lions and he was standing watching schoolkids training and ye knew who he was ye know. And rugby wisnae televised then but this guy wis a legend (IT: 12 - 13).

Scotland's Sporting and Political Identity

All four respondents described themselves as “more Scottish than British” and, reflecting this preference, three out of four prefer devolution as their preferred political choice. Illustrating the often complex and occasionally paradoxical nature of cultural and political identity formation, one respondent expresses a political preference for independence despite describing himself as Scottish and British ('More Scottish than British'). This respondent demonstrates the complex nature of identity construction further by reinforcing Scotland's right to sporting autonomy
whilst expressing a desire to see British and English sports teams do well. The following transcript section captures his views:

JR If it came to Scotland having to dissolve into ehhh a ... if it came to it there being ... as they've tried to do and suggested they might do in soccer terms that there should be a British team, with English, Scottish, Welsh, Irish, Northern Ireland, if there was something to that extent muted for rugby I'd be against it ... And yes I support England eh, I'll be supporting England when they play Australia in the Ashes.

JK And did you support them in the rugby World Cup? When they won it for example.

JR No, no. (inaudible) (and laughs)

JK So you'll support them at cricket, you won't support them at rugby in any or under no circumstances?

JR ... no. I like to see them getting beat at rugby because they're such twats haha.

JK And what about the England football team?

JR Yeah I would tend to support them. I'm strange, yes I would tend to support England playing football other than playing against Scotland /

JK Yes, of course /

JR Or if they were playing against Wales, I would be supporting the underdog if ye like. I would support Wales soccer wise and (emphasis) rugby wise playing against England. In fact I would support anyone (emphasis) beating England at rugby.

JK What is the difference between the rugby and the football though?

JR I don't know /

JK Or cricket for that matter? /

JR I don't know, I don't know. It's mibee because I have been more exposed to the rugby (inaudible) because there are some right arseholes that I've come across.

(IT: 25 - 26).

All respondents support the Scotland national team and the British and Irish Lions select team, demonstrating a dual Scottish / British sporting identity. Clearly linking sporting identity with national identity, Andrea asserts, "why do I support Scotland? Because I'm patriotic" (IT: 19), while Susan and Derek both support Scotland because they are "proud to be Scottish" (Derek, IT: 15; Susan, IT: 13). Josh states his reason as "because I'm Scottish" (IT: 38). Reinforcing the duality, David is confident that most if not all Hawks fans would support the Lions while
Andrea recognises the ‘tourist’ element among the Lions support, guessing around 30% to be there primarily “for the holiday”. Susan, the only respondent not born and raised in Scotland, appears to view the Lions as an extension of her Scottish sporting identity, commenting, “I’m interested in the Lions. I’m a bit miffed that they’ve got so few Scottish boys ... Two I think. There’s Gordon and Chris Cusiter" (IT: 19). Susan’s Lions affinity may be less to do with a national expression, however, and more to do with a personal affinity with the “Scottish boys” like ‘Gordon’ she speaks of in such personalised terms throughout her interview.

The demography of Scottish rugby support – Scotland, regional and club to varying degrees - is perceived to be changing by some of the respondents with two major inter-connected explanations being given. First, professionalism has brought about changes including more expensive match tickets, and non-traditional match days, times, and match day practices. This is linked to an increasingly ‘marketed business’ approach to producing commodified Scottish rugby. Second, these effects have led to a perceived increase in non-traditional fans attending fixtures as well as a reduction in the ‘traditional’ supporter numbers. All respondents indicated their reluctance to pay the present price of a Murrayfield match day ticket with Derek stating, “I won’t be doing that anymore” (IT: 16) and Josh suggests, “the thing that will put people off going to Murrayfield to watch rugby is the cost of a ticket. Because they are pricing themselves out of the market” (IT: 33). Expressing sentiments shared by some of the others, Josh adds, “if I didn’t get two complementary tickets for each game at Murrayfield as a retired official I would not pay the price” (IT: 34). These changing attitudes among sections of the ‘traditional’ Scotland support should be contrasted to the perceived increase in non-traditional support. Josh believes both the regional and international teams in Scotland are attracting increasing numbers of non-traditional supporters, while Susan agrees that the international team has increased its non-traditional contingent in recent years. Andrea suggests that Hawks themselves have also attracted some non-traditional supporters to their club, stating, “I’m not sure that a lot of the Hawks fans are aware of the traditions because they are ... I would say there are probably a reasonable number of new-ish fans” (IT: 11). These new fan developments appear to be linked to two overlapping conceptual elements within the Scottish rugby support. There is
a perceived increase in the prevalence of tartanry and ‘the carnavalesque’ to sections of Scotland’s rugby supporters. Many supporters are aware of their own role in the actual event as demonstrated by Derek who bemoans the lack of spectacle during trips to Twickenham compared with stadia in other cities, stating:

unlike the other cities there is no identity of the game having, you know about to take place ... it’s very evident in Rome and Dublin and in Paris, ye know there is a Scottish rugby game on in the middle of the city whereas in London the Scottish rugby supporter will just disappear unless you went to Richmond area there would be no evidence of it at all. It’s just a soulless city in which to be a rugby fan (IT: 14).

Reflecting the importance of the spectacle, Andrea notes the increased tartanry, stating, “when I first went to rugby you didn’t see that many people wearing kilts and I mean a lot of people wear kilts now” (IT: 28). This public demonstration of the spectacle appears to have coincided with more ‘tourist’ fans attending away matches. Andrea asserts that increasing numbers of women attend home and away Scotland fixtures, with away matches being particularly attractive to female supporters and couples. “Rome is the new place, you know women like to go there and do the shopping. I think that’s probably the favourite place for people to go now” (IT: 27).

Scottish rugby union was perceived by all the respondents to have a history of lacking progressive thinking and of disliking change, with Josh and Susan describing it as conservatively natured, and Andrea suggesting it is male dominated. Derek alluded to the perception that the SRU has become more progressive in its thinking in recent years. Perhaps this progression is demonstrated by the SRU adopting Flower of Scotland as its national anthem in place of God Save the Queen. However, two interlinked points of interest emerge from this. Rather than simply expressing a nationalistic form of Scottish patriotism, Flower of Scotland’s adoption perhaps reinforced and protected a dual Scottish / British identity. It may have been adopted in order to protect God Save the Queen from being disrupted as opposed to reflecting an outright expression of patriotism or nationalist sentiment:

It was suitable at the time to adopt something as an anthem because the, because of the poor performance of the singing of the UK national anthem emm, which used to take place before all home internationals. That left a lot to be desired so the SRU decision probably was unusually progressive of them and it’s worked quite well since then (Derek, IT: 16).
Furthermore, far from ‘capturing the Scottish mood’ with this progressive act, Flower of Scotland is not overwhelmingly accepted as appropriate or desirable among sections of the Scottish rugby union establishment. Although describing its adoption by the SRU as progressive, Derek himself notes, “I mean I and others recognise that it’s not the answer but there is no obvious answer at present so eh it will do meantime” (IT: 16), Similar comments were expressed by Josh. Meanwhile Susan who likes the Flower of Scotland concedes, “I know a lot of people don’t like it ... It’s more my husband’s generation I think that don’t like change. My husband’s a bit older than me” (IT: 13).

The Other
Two respondents perceive an anti-Glasgow belief structure to exist in Edinburgh discourse. In discussing the perceived Edinburgh reluctance to travel to Glasgow for sporting fixtures, Andrea responds:

ah, that’s because it’s in Glasgow. Now you see, that’s typical Edinburgh ... They don’t like coming through to Glasgow and funnily enough my husband has always said that about Edinburgh people. They won’t travel to the west to watch anything (IT: 19 - 20).

Although recognising the existence of a Glasgow - Edinburgh rivalry, Josh explains the Glasgow rationale in instrumental terms (reflecting the general rationale expressed for having an ‘other’). However, he perceives the Edinburgh rationale for the rivalry as being more grounded in genuine antipathy towards Glasgow and Glaswegian as shown in the following transcript:

JK    Is there a big rivalry when you play Edinburgh [clubs]?
JK    And would that be based on the traditions of the clubs or would that be a bit of the Glasgow Edinburgh rivalry?
JR    Well Peter Rider has just finished being our coach and he went to watch Heriots ... and he was astonished. He sat there (points to a chair) the next Tuesday and said I didn’t realise there was so much hatred between Edinburgh and Glasgow clubs. I said what do you mean? He said I was sitting at Goldenacre and ... they’re talking about getting these Weegie bastards next week. That’s us. /
JK    Sorry Goldenacre is Heriots?
JR    Yes Heriots’s place. Get these Weegie bastards next week hahaha. Glaswegian, weegies.
JK Yep, yep /

JR And one of them says ‘that’s the coach sitting behind ye’ hahahaha. Oh there’s
terrific rivalry. Heriots, Watsonians, Boroughmuir.

JK And does that work from your point of view do you think as well?

JR Ehh, we know they’re going to be tough games.

JK But could you see a situation or have you seen a situation, or could you foresee one
where your committee could be sitting there and saying let’s get these Edinburgh
buggers next week?

JR No.

JK It’s less than equal? Edinburgh is more ... /

JR Well Edinburgh is the HQ. Because Murrayfield is in Edinburgh. The headquarters
of rugby. /

JK But why are they so desperate to beat the weegies as they call them when the
weegies are perhaps less worried or bothered about beating the Edinburgh lot, or
are they?

JR No we want to beat them. But it’s the same when we go to the Borders. We want to
beat them.

All four respondents describe England as their main ‘other’ in rugby union terms
with Andrea, Derek and Susan expressing surprise at the question even having to be
asked. Susan responds with “what a silly question” (IT: 20) and Andrea and Derek
both say “England of course” while Derek’s demeanour and tone clearly exuded
mild disdain for the interviewer for asking such a question. Expanding on their view
of England as the main other, Andrea, Derek and Josh explain it as a perceived
“English arrogance”. Derek likes England to lose against everyone at rugby
“because of their perpetual arrogance ... they have a lot to learn about being
humble, being a bit more realistic” (IT: 18). Josh comments, “I like to see them
getting beat at rugby because they’re such twats” (IT: 26). He adds, “because they
regard themselves as the best ... the bastards hate losing” (IT: 36). Although
agreeing about the English arrogance in relation to rugby, Andrea associated the
rivalry with wider historical and political issues, noting, “they’ve always been,
always been centuries back they have been the enemy haven’t they. I mean
Bannockburn and (inaudible)” (IT: 30). Derek and Josh clearly suggest that major
rivalries can change and, in relation more to club level than national, all four
respondents express a degree of ‘instrumental rivalry’. This instrumental rivalry
depends on the perceived danger posed by a club to Hawks in terms of league or cup success and therefore tends to change. Andrea sums this up in response to a question about the wider Hawks fan base and who they really like to beat the most. “It’s really difficult to say because I think probably most just want to beat every team they play” (IT: 11).

4. Heart of Midlothian Football Club

Heart of Midlothian Sporting Identity

All four respondents have family ties associated with their support for Hearts, with all but Fred having had either a father or uncle take them to their first match. Fred and Jack, the only parents among the respondents, have children with whom they regularly attend matches. In addition to a clear family habitus the importance of Edinburgh to their Hearts identity appears strong and significant for three of the respondents. Andy emphasises the centrality of Edinburgh to his Hearts identity (IT: 5) commenting, “anybody that’s in Edinburgh knows it is Hearts or Hibs. I don’t know how to explain this but it’s just that it’s local” (IT: 7). Diane explains the rivalry with Hibs largely in terms of coming from “different sides of Edinburgh” (IT: 3) and is supported by Fred who suggests that the outskirts and west of Edinburgh tend to be populated by Hearts fans while Hibs fans largely reside in the east of the city (IT: 43). Fred, whose comments are partially endorsed by Andy and Diane, describes the Edinburgh links most fully, noting Hearts being “as big a part of the city as the castle”, adding “when I was growing up it always seemed to me that Hearts were Edinburgh’s team. Even the colours of the buses were maroon” (IT: 4). It should be noted that green and white, the colours of Edinburgh rivals Hibs, have also been prominent colours of buses in Edinburgh and the Lothians more generallyxxv.

Although cursory analysis of some interviewees’ comments suggests a geographically bounded identity, on closer inspection the geographical habitus incorporates other associated factors including clear social class and ethno-religious dimensions which intersect the stated ‘Edinburgh’ identity marker. Social class
division is illustrated clearly by Fred who replies to a question about his Hearts identity responding:

Eh, it’s the biggest club in Edinburgh, it’s the poshest. It’s the club in Edinburgh that has got a bit of class. As far as I’m concerned it’s, I suppose there might be a wee bit of snobbery involved. I mean where I came from in Edinburgh was a very, very working-class area but if ye had to pick one of the two teams and say which was the working-class team ye would probably say Hibs and I dunno, we just, ye always felt that ye were a wee bit better than them. I dunno why (IT: 3).

Fred’s subsequent comments unambiguously illustrate the ethno-religious division that intersects across the geographical and class habitus as demonstrated in the following:

For me it was the club that identified with Edinburgh whereas Hibs were in Leith ... oh they’re from Leith ... so as far as I’m concerned Hearts is Edinburgh’s club. Hibs came later. I dunno, maybe it’s the Irish connection with Hibs and the roots they came fae and everything else. I mean Hearts were formed in Edinburgh, Edinburgh people and it’s a bit of that I think (IT: 4).

The obvious implication therefore is that Hearts and its supporters are seen by Fred as the established group while Hibs and its supporters are seen as outsiders as a result of “coming from Leith”, “having an Irish connection”, and “not being formed in Edinburgh for Edinburgh people”. Although it seems fair to assert that for Hearts and Hibs the ethno-religious dynamic is distinct from that exhibited in Glasgow between the Old Firm, the Edinburgh version remains a significant aspect in the construction of imagined identities (and differences) for some of their supporters.

The extent to which Hearts (and Hibs) supporters are representative or expressive of an Edinburgh version of the Old Firm was discussed in terms of Hearts’ sporting identity with revealing insight, as Fred, the only respondent to deny that Hearts and Hibs are a mini version of Glasgow’s Old Firm, demonstrates. As to whether or not he views Hearts and Hibs as the ‘Edinburgh Old Firm’, Fred asserts, “no, they hate each other. Hearts and Hibs hate each other but there’s not the same bitterness and the rivalry is very much a football rivalry” (IT: 11). One requires obvious caution in blindly accepting this “football rivalry” claim at face value, particularly when considering the previous comments by Fred – “maybe it’s the Irish connection with Hibs and the roots they came fae and everything else ... Hearts were formed in Edinburgh, by Edinburgh people” - which are inescapably linked to wider ethno-religious and geographical identity markers.
Andy, Jack and Diane all explicitly expressed the view that Hearts and Hibs are a smaller and less bigoted version of their Glasgow counterparts. Debbie admits that “a lot of Hearts supporters can become sectarian ... there is a lot of Union Jacks that fly about and what have you but that is where the, because that’s just the way they have been” (IT: 15). Perhaps this view is unsurprising if one considers the claims, mentioned earlier, that Hearts and Hibs represent the Scots-Irish and Hearts the Protestants (Kowalski, 2004: 73) and that they both construct an imagined identity by utilising ‘sectarian’ songs and symbols (Hognestad, 1997: 195). However, in moving beyond naive accounts, the complex and highly specific nature of the Edinburgh clubs’ rivalry and the differences between them and their Old Firm counterparts is further explicated. The nature of this specific Edinburgh ‘Old Firm’ rivalry becomes revealed when the Hearts supporters discuss three inter-related areas of their own perceptions as fans; how they and their wider support base view themselves, how they view their Edinburgh rivals Hibs, and how they perceive Glasgow rivals Celtic and Rangers. It is mainly during these discussions that the complexity of the Hearts identity and its relationship to Hibs is revealed and, therefore, are fully discussed in the subsequent section entitled ‘the other’.

Scotland’s Sporting and Political Identity

Fred and Jack describe themselves as ‘more Scottish than British’, with Fred preferring a Westminster government and Jack devolution. Andy describes himself as ‘Scottish not British’ and unsurprisingly perhaps desires independence for Scotland. Diane, who despite describing herself as ‘equally Scottish and British’, shares Andy’s preference for Scottish independence demonstrating once more the possible complexities inherent in political and national identity construction. These complexities are further reinforced when Diane and Fred both admit to supporting England at football and cricket respectively.

Diane, in her late teens and Andy, in his early twenties, are the youngest respondents from Hearts. Fifty two year old Fred’s explanation for his response (‘more Scottish than British’) suggests that a youthful ideological outlook contributed to a previous political desire for Scottish independence:
I think everybody dabbles with nationalism and the SNP, although it was before I was old enough to vote ... I think as ye grow up ye sort of ... ye start to look at things from a broader perspective rather than just this sort of insular sort of nationalism and the shortbread tins sort of thing (IT: 25).

The multi-faceted nature of identity construction is further illustrated if one analyses Fred’s personal and political maturation process. At the basic level there is a slight correlation between his expressed national identity (‘more Scottish than British’) and his current constitutional political preference (Westminster government). However, in analysing his constitutional ‘journey’ from independence to Westminster rule, it becomes clear that more than mere national identity is informing his constitutional preferences. Elucidating the primacy of his socialist principles, Fred explains his political journey further, showing that his class habitus overrides his national identity habitus:

I mean the only time I had seen England at all was Wembley and ye went doon there to win and ye hated them and ye came back. But as soon as ye start to travel. We went doon to Anglo Scottish Cup ties with Hearts. We went doon to Newcastle, to Liverpool etc and ye start to meet people in the pubs as ye get a wee bit older and ye get to eighteen or nineteen and ye are having a couple of pints with them and ye realise they are no any different from what you are. Ok they have a different accent but their outlook on life tends to be the same (IT: 26).

The extent to which Fred’s constitutional preference is governed by his self-defined socialist desires rather than national identity is further illustrated in the following comments which simultaneously highlight the complex nature of unionism as an analytical concept:

When I was younger I could only see socialism ever being achieved with a separate Scotland. I looked at the perception that England was always going to be ruled by the Tories and the only way we were going to get a socialist government was in our own little area sort of thing. And as I got older I had this thing in my mind that to me socialism wasn’t a local thing, that I would have preferred to go out and see socialism everywhere rather than just keep it to myself in my own wee area ... I wanted Scotland to be socialist but I wanted it to be part of a broader socialism if ye like ... I wanted to see a socialist Britain and a socialist Europe. Not just a socialist Scotland (IT: 26 - 27).

Fred’s desire for a UK identity, therefore, appears to be grounded more in internationalism (and socialism) than any ‘unionist’ or nationalist doctrine.

All four respondents support Scotland’s football team in terms of wanting them to win, with only Diane having never attended a Scotland fixture.
Diane notes:

I wouldn't go out of my way to buy a ticket ... I just haven't been interested to go and watch them. I've never really wanted to be part of the tartan army. Just because of the way I've been brought up as well, cause all my family, they don't go out and watch Scotland either (IT: 11).

Diane partly attributes her lukewarm attitude to lack of success, commenting, “it's also because of the record we've got as well, cause we're not very successful” (IT: 11). Jack and Andy bemoan having to travel to Glasgow to watch Scotland fixtures, with Jack happier to go to local rivals Hibs' stadium to watch under-21 Scotland fixtures than travel to Hampden for full internationals. Andy confesses he does not attend Scotland fixtures as much as he would wish, adding, “if Scotland played at Murrayfield I would be there every time” (IT: 16). Fred and Jack both expressed an increased reluctance to attend Scotland fixtures from previous years. Fred, who admits to “never missing a game” when he was younger, now describes Scotland fixtures as an “inconvenience” to Hearts (IT: 8), admitting, “I wouldn’t cross the road to watch them” (IT: 24). Fred describes this as a result of poor performances and “boring, slow and predictable” playing style (IT: 24). All respondents agreed that Hearts are more important to them than the Scotland side, with Fred suggesting this has altered during his lifetime, claiming most fans used to put Scotland before their respective clubs. Jack's reasoning for placing more importance on his club is emblematic of a wider antipathy towards Glasgow, and he makes the following comments with specific reference to Celtic and Rangers:

A lot of times I never liked going to Scotland games and the Hearts players that should be involved were never involved. There were guys playing that I didn't like. I didn't like them when they played for their clubs (Celtic and Rangers) (IT: 16).

All Hearts respondents believe a Glasgow bias exists. Jack and Diane attribute this mainly to a “Glasgow mentality” (Jack, IT: 21) which reinforces an east / west divide. Meanwhile, Andy and Fred's rationale is more linked to 'pressure' applied from the 'Glasgow based' media and SFA. Both these respondents suggest that once Scottish players join either Rangers or Celtic they have an almost automatic entry into the Scotland set-up.
Moreover, Fred, who discussed the ‘Glasgow bias’ at most length, notes:

Rangers and Celtic to me get 90% of the fifty fifty decisions. Now that’s a fact of life. It’s been like that for as long as I can remember ... That’s why I hate them if ye like ... Scottish football is bent from top to bottom purely and simply because, well it’s just for Rangers and Celtic. Everything is just run to suit Rangers and Celtic (IT: 19 - 22).

In terms of the tartan army, the two most experienced Scotland attendees, Fred and Jack both claim that in the last twenty years Scotland supporters have been better behaved. Jack makes the additional claim that this improved behaviour is replicated at club level with Hearts. Fred discusses these points at greatest length, comparing the 1970s period to the present day:

It was a notoriety thing. It was a let’s make them scared of us when we went before. Now it’s they’ve gained a reputation for being fun guys, harmless and no bother and oot to have a good time and get pissed and no bother anybody and they go oot now and try and enhance that reputation. Whereas when we were younger we had a reputation as well and we went oot to try and enhance that one and it wisnae a particularly good one. It was notoriety then and now they have a good reputation and they like to let everybody know how much noise they can make and leave a good impression (IT: 32).

As identified earlier, Goffman’s ‘dramaturgical model’ helps explain this type of ‘impression management’ with ‘team members’ (fans) ‘enhancing’ the preferred reputation. Linked to this newly fostered impression is an increased self-parodying behaviour as prompted by low expectations of achieving playing success and expressed through added commitment to dressing outlandishly. Fred expands on these issues:

It’s a social thing as much as the football. Most of them go for the trips ... Because they have no expectations of winning anymore they go out to enjoy themselves ... When we went to Scotland games it was only a few, very few ... There wisnae that many wore kilts. Everybody wore tartan scarves and that wis it ... Now it’s like let’s be as outlandish and let’s make sure everybody knows exactly where we come from. It’s because they are proud of it now (IT: 31 - 32)

The ‘Other’
All respondents highlighted Hibs as a major other with only Andy disagreeing about its status as the primary rival to Hearts (for him personally and for the wider supporter base). Andy cites Celtic as the major other for most Hearts fans. The nature of Hearts rivalry with its major ‘other/s’ appears slightly unclear. While Jim and Diane both admit that most Hearts fans view Rangers and Celtic as important rivals – Celtic being slightly bigger rivals - they appear certain that Hibs are the
major rival and the team most Hearts supporters like to beat. However, Fred, who agrees Hibs are “without doubt” (IT: 16) Hearts’ biggest rivals, concedes, “more and more Hearts fans” (IT: 17) dislike both Celtic and Rangers. Also perceiving Celtic to be a slightly bigger ‘other’ than Rangers for most Hearts supporters, Fred then reveals that most Hearts supporters would rather see their major ‘rival’ Hibs beat Celtic or Rangers in a hypothetical cup final. He notes:

Now, if it came to Rangers or Celtic playing Hibs in a cup final, I’m not sure how that would work out. I think most of them (Hearts supporters) would have a sneaky feeling in the back of their minds that they would actually like to see Hibs win it (IT: 18).

Andy is unequivocal, responding to being asked who Hearts’ major other is by asserting, “Celtic. Celtic. In my eyes it’s Celtic. I’d rather be a Hibs fan than a Celtic fan” (IT: 11). He adds that “99% of [Hearts] fans” (IT: 13) agree that Celtic are the major other. Reflecting some of his fellow respondents’ views, he then adds, “sometimes it’s Celtic and Rangers. A lot of Hearts fans will say they hate Rangers just as much as they hate Celtic” (IT: 13). Andy demonstrates the multi-faceted nature of the rivalry by endorsing Fred’s view that he would rather see local rivals Hibs beat Celtic. But when asked about Rangers (and Hibs), he diverged from Fred, admitting, he would prefer Rangers to win.

In analysing the respondents’ perception of Hearts as a club and its support, it was agreed (even by Fred who refutes any suggestion of ‘Edinburgh’s Old Firm’) that an element of Hearts supporters flies the Union Flag primarily at matches involving Hibs and Celtic as a way of reinforcing their Scottish-British identity against a perceived (Irish-Catholic) ‘other’. Additionally, Andy, Jack and Diane all admitted that Hearts are or have been perceived as a ‘Protestant club’. All respondents agreed that Hearts are perceived by others as well as by many of their own supporters as being ‘more British’ in their identity than most other clubs. Diane remarks, “I mean they are British and the supporters like to get that over to people” (IT: 7) Andy and Fred expressed similar opinions to one another, though they noted the particular Scottish dimension to the club’s British identity, as neatly summarised by Fred:
I would say there is more a sense of Scottishness than a sense of Britishness. I would say the Britishness thing goes in cycles. I think it tends to revolve around other circumstances and what is happening elsewhere, whether it's a war or whether it's the Gulf conflict or whatever ... I would say if you were to ask 90% of Hearts supporters, the badge has a St. Andrews cross in it and that's not coincidence (IT: 5).

The Hearts supporters' perception of themselves was further revealed in discussing their relationship with Hibs, and to other Scottish clubs. In agreeing that Hearts and Hibs are an 'Edinburgh Old Firm', Andy notes:

they probably are but I wish they weren't. Because Rangers and Celtic and the reasons they hate each other, that is not what football is about. Football is about competing for football, not about religion ... but there is a certain aspect in our support and the same with Hibs fans who take it to that level (IT: 7).

Andy then suggested that Hibs are still very much seen to be representative of an Irish-Catholic identity albeit less so than in the 1980s and 1990s, noting the Hibs supporters waving Irish Tricolours at Hearts supporters who fly the Union Flag. Illustrating the perceived Irish-Catholic identity of Hibs further, all respondents agreed that Hibs supporters fly the Irish Tricolour more widely during matches with Hearts and Rangers whom they believe are widely viewed as British-Protestant clubs. Diane emphasises the religious connotations attached to the green and white colours of Hibs, stating, "to the wider Hearts supporters it's seen as Catholic" (IT: 4). In response to whether or not the Hibs supporters feel that way, Diane remarked, "some of them do. You'll see some of them going to football matches with Ireland tops on and stuff like that" (IT: 4). Demonstrating her particular interpretation of "vocabulary of fronts" (Goffman, 1959: 36), Diane clearly equates the performed cue of wearing a Republic of Ireland top as representative of 'Catholicism'. Similarly, Andy describes the flying of Union Flags and Tricolours at Hearts and Hibs fixtures as "basically sick" (IT: 8), equating it to bigotry and provocation (on both sides). This form of (mis)representation is discussed by Goffman (1959) and enables us to understand Debbie's and Andy's perceptions as Goffman informs us:

The representation of an activity will vary in some degree from the activity itself and therefore inevitably misrepresent it. And since the individual will be required to rely on signs in order to construct a representation of his activity, the image he constructs, however faithful to the facts, will be subject to all the disruptions that impressions are subject to (p. 72).
Goffman (1959) helps us understand these conflicting “sign-accepting” tendencies further, stating:

An audience is able to orient itself in a situation by accepting performed cues on faith, treating these signs as evidence of something greater than or different from the sign-vehicles themselves ... so also this sign-accepting tendency puts the audience in a position to be duped and misled, for there are few signs that cannot be used to attest to the presence of something that is not really there. And it is plain that many performers have ample capacity and motive to misrepresent the facts (p. 65).

We may add that many audience members also have ample capacity (and perhaps motive in certain cases) to misrepresent the facts. The question remains, however, as to whether or not Diane’s and Andy’s “sign-accepting tendency” is indeed misleading or duping in this instance. What is not in question, yet is of vital significance, is that other Hearts supporting audience members have different “sign accepting tendencies” regarding the performed cue of Hibs supporters displaying Republic of Ireland symbols. Fred who agrees that some Hibs supporters wear Republic of Ireland tops to matches, disagrees with Diane’s ‘religious’ or ‘sectarian’ reading of this practice:

Ye still get Hibs supporters that go to the game with the Eire, the Republic of Ireland tops on. Aye, not to be inflammatory or anything like that, but just because they wear them as sort of leisure tops. And I think because there is probably a small percentage of Hibs supporters that possibly because of their family and the family roots as much as the club roots and everything else, will have a sort of sneaking sympathy for the Republic of Ireland (IT: 31).

Another illustrative aspect to understanding the Hearts supporters more fully involves analysing their views on the increasingly disliked Rangers and Celtic, and the Hearts fans’ perceptions of how Rangers and Celtic supporters view them. The differences between Hearts’ and Rangers’ respective British Protestant identities begin to emerge. Additionally, the fluid and dynamic nature of Hearts supporters’ imagined identity become obvious with evidence of Goffman’s ‘audience segregation’ emerging.

Fred, Andy and Jack demonstrate that supporter behaviour depends largely upon the perceived identity of the opposition, and on fostering the preferred impression of themselves in the company of the opposition. Thus, it is common to discover the overt displaying of separate symbols (flags and songs) by Hearts supporters when they play Rangers and Celtic. Against Celtic, Fred, Andy and Jack explain that more
unionist symbols will be utilised against the perceived Irish-Catholic Celtic supporters. Fred comments, “I think in many cases the Hearts fans will sing songs back that they would never consider singing under any other circumstances” (IT: 17). Fred highlights the flying of the Union Flag by Hearts supporters, noting a section of them will “bring those flags out against Celtic and no against anybody else ... I suppose it’s for them to hold onto their British identity” (IT: 12). Andy adds, “yes there is an element of the Hearts support that will happily wear an England top and support England, quite happily, because they see themselves as English just to antagonise Celtic because they support Ireland” (IT: 19). Jack concurs, adding, “it's no like at Ibrox where ye see them (Rangers supporters) all wearing England tops. I've seen the odd Hearts fan wearing an England top but it's usually at Parkhead” (IT: 17). This modified behaviour occurs against Rangers too but with a different identity constructed to suit the preferred impression being fostered for the particular audience – the Hearts supporters construct a more Scottish-centred identity against the perceived Ulster-British identity attributed to Rangers. Andy states:

The Hearts fans sang Flower of Scotland when the Rangers fans sang Rule Britannia. We sang Flower of Scotland to show we are a Scottish club and that. See, that’s all it is, they sing God Save the Queen and Rule Britannia and all this (IT: 20).

Explicitly illustrating the ‘audience segregation’ impression management maintained by Hearts supporters, Jack adds, “the only time ye hear Flower of Scotland getting sung by Hearts fans is when it’s in retaliation to a Rangers song” (IT: 22).

The multi-layered nature of Hearts’ constructed identity/ies is further shown by analysing the Protestant Unionist identity fostered by some Hearts supporters. Although not personally representative of these views, Jack believes the wider Hearts support base share Andy and Debbie’s preference for Rangers over Celtic, which Andy and Jack explain is linked to the perceived similarities between Hearts and Rangers in their political and religious identity markers.
The clearest expression of this came from Andy who also illustrates the perception that Celtic and Hibs share aspects of their identity:

Some fans, a lot of Hearts fans think there's a connection between Hearts and Rangers. A lot of Hearts fans. They think that because, well they used to think that anyway because it used to be Hibs and Celtic and then it's Hearts and Rangers. Hearts and Rangers are the two Protestant clubs and Hibs, Celtic are the two Catholic clubs. When Hearts visit Ibrox there are virtually no police there. And you can walk through the Rangers fans. And when you go to Celtic Park, we are cordoned off and we are marched to our bus ... they hate Hearts fans because they see us as a little Rangers. And with Hibs it’s the other way about (IT: 9 - 10).

Andy then adds:

I see Rangers as not as bad as Celtic ... I hate Celtic much more than I do Rangers ... it's maybe just because of the Hearts Rangers thing, because we sing one of their songs, emm, Rangers fans and Hearts fans have a special thing with their scarves ... They share some of their songs, they're both Protestant as well their clubs originally (IT: 13).

Although sharing aspects of a British Protestant identity, evidence emerged which differentiated the type of unionism linked to Hearts and Rangers respectively. Diane and Fred explicitly suggest that Hearts' Britishness is a Scottish-Britishness as opposed to Rangers' which they see as more Ulster-British. Fred and Andy both explain that although some Union Flags are present at European away matches, most Hearts supporters prefer to display the Scottish Saltire when playing abroad. Andy suggests that their Scottish identity becomes reinforced abroad as a result of being 'foreign' and he notes the desire of the Hearts supporters to portray Scottish football supporters in a positive light. Such behaviour can be better understood by considering Goffman's (1959) "standard – maintaining routines" (p. 81), that sustain the definition of the performance by avoiding "destructive information" (p.141), which may "discredit, disrupt, or make useless the impression that the performance fosters" (p. 141). The divergent British Unionism between Hearts and Rangers was perhaps most sharply illustrated by Jack’s comments regarding whether or not the Hearts supporters display the Red Hand of Ulster flag:
Ehh, there has been the odd occasion. There is an Ulster Hearts supporters club who did have a Red Hand of Ulster flag. They stopped bringing it because Hearts asked them to. But they did have a flag, 'Ulster Hearts' which people took exception to as well. It was a Hearts flag with Ulster Hearts. I remember it at East End Park a couple of years ago and the flag had to get taken down. Well it was at East End Park and some Hearts fans were going a wee bit over, seeing something that wasn't there, coming to the conclusion that anything with any association with Ulster may have other ulterior motives. I didn't see the Red Hand of Ulster very often. Maybe one or two maximum at a big game but Union Jack is more prevalent than any Red Hand of Ulster (IT: 22).

Clearly the nature of Hearts' rivalry with its major 'others' contributes to the self-identity constructed, imagined and fostered by sections of the club's fans. Moreover, this 'identity' changes according to which club is in direct opposition at a given moment and is largely circumscribed in ethno-religious symbolism which is used to project and interpret the preferred version of both a Hearts identity and that of the rival. The extent to which these fostered impressions rely on shifting notions of 'Scottishness' against a perceived (non-Scottish) 'other' appears important in understanding more than mediated accounts of Hearts supporters' club identity.

The respondents' opinions on Scottish rugby highlighted a clear class dimension as shown in the following comments. Jack and Fred believe rugby fans get 'special' treatment from the governing authorities compared with that doled out to football supporters. Jack notes:

Rugby fans seem to go to, they get to drink at the venue more than football fans are. Whether they are more civilised and can be trusted, and didn't have deep embedded dislike for their rivals. I think rugby fans can mix with one another without segregation. In fact I don't know if there is such a thing in rugby as segregation (IT: 23).

Fred widens this special treatment to include media reporting:

I think football fans get a raw deal from the press and the media compared to rugby fans. I've seen rugby fans urinating in the street, broken glasses, flashing their arse with their kilts etc, and it's boisterous high spirits. Football fans do it and they are hooligans. Exactly the same behaviour (IT: 41).

Andy and Fred describe the typical Scottish rugby supporter as a 'wax jacket type' with "green wellies and Barbour jackets" (Fred, IT: 41). Andy and Fred, who in discussing rugby supporters, reveal the subtle class distinctions inherent within their Hearts identity perception. Both claim that Hearts supporters are more likely than Hibs supporters to be rugby fans due to subtle class habitus distinctions as suggested by Fred:
If any of them are going to go, Hearts and Hibs supporters to go and watch rugby, then it would be Hearts supporters rather than Hibs supporters simply because it's the perceived class thing and the schools they go to etc (IT: 42).

There was only one other meaningful insight from the respondents during the discussion of rugby and this was offered by Fred who believes that football and rugby fans in Scotland are different types of sports fan. Expanding on his view that rugby fans are “all Barbour jackets and green wellies” (IT: 41), Fred adds:

What I would say sets them apart from football fans more than anything else is to me the football fan goes to watch the Scotland international football side, also go and watch a club side ... Now I look at rugby fans and I look at the crowds at some of the rugby matches and there are two hundred people sat there and suddenly they can get seventy thousand when they are playing England in a Calcutta match. I don’t see them as being sports fans the same as, I wouldn’t class them the same as I would class football fans (IT: 41 - 42).

5. Hibernian Football Club

Hibernian Sporting Identity

There are really two camps at Easter Road. Eh, there are some who still see themselves as a, an Irish team if ye like playing in Scotland and there are others who want to disassociate themselves from that. And there’s two quite strong camps. (John, IT: 5).

There appears to be a dual identity within the supporters of Hibs. This dichotomous relationship manifests itself according to the particular situation and context in which Hibs supporters find themselves, with either an embracing or eschewing of Irishness occurring. The situational nature of this eschewing or embracing changes over time and space, with reports of periods when Irishness has been less emphasised by club and fans, and more recently, of its being re-discovered. Additionally, the levels of Irishness expressed by Hibs supporters often depends upon the opposition and its perceived identity.
In discussing the heightened sense of Irishness that is exhibited by Hibs when playing against Rangers, Hibs fan Kenny admits:

> It's strange because I think Hibs fans have a dual personality. You know if you say to a Hibs fan 'you're a wee Celtic', that's almost as offensive a thing as you could say but equally, in many ways they are very similar ... If you put a Hibs fan in a room with a Celtic fan, you'll probably find they would be a lot more Scottish in their identity and yet equally, if you put a Hibs fan in a room with a Rangers fan, you'd probably find the opposite. (IT: 7 - 11).

As previously stated, Erving Goffman (1959) describes this type of impression management as “audience segregation” in which the actor “ensures that those before whom he plays one of his parts will not be the same individuals before whom he plays a different part in another setting” (p. 57). Goffman cites William James's (1917) well-known quotation:

> We may practically say that he has as many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these different groups (p. 57).

The same fan then discusses the Hibs Historical Trust and its renewed interest in the Irish Catholic origins of the club, adding:

> I don't think any Hibs fans would have a problem with it at all ... A sculptor recently donated and made a replica of the Hibs mosaics and it's now in the stadium. It's a mosaic and it's a harp and it's got the shamrock round about it and everything, and he donated that to the club. You know, most Hibs fans welcomed that yet equally some Hibs fans would see that as a sectarian symbol ... Yeah, (it's) almost sort of schizophrenic and I think a lot of it would depend on the context (IT: 10 - 11).

This schizophrenic element of Hibernian fans' identity is an example of a (perceived) minority group accumulating 'symbolic capital' (Bourdieu, 1984) in a way that is consonant with the immediate expectations (of both sets of supporters) associated within a particular environment ("field"). Moreover, understanding these expectations can help explain what these particular groups determine to be appropriate in acquiring symbolic capital as well as how to acquire it. It is clear that for many Hibs supporters, disassociating themselves from the 'sectarianised' Rangers and Celtic is a major contributor to acquiring symbolic capital and it is this determination to set themselves apart, in the pursuit of acquiring such capital, that contributes to the situational eschewing of Irishness - dependent upon the audience - among the Hibs support. Furthermore, the inter-changeability between religion and ethnicity is implicitly accepted as a given. John, an extremely aware interviewee
with previous interview experience, demonstrates his keenness to distance Hibs from being seen as part of a mini Old Firm while seamlessly moving from religion to ethnicity with little or no conceptual distinction. When asked broadly about ‘Hibs Identity’ he responds with ‘I don’t know if you are trying to go onto the religious aspect here” (IT: 5) and later adds:

Some people see Hibs and Hearts as a mini Rangers and Celtic, with Hibs being the Catholic team and Hearts being the Protestants. I can’t speak for Hearts but I mean when I went to Musselburgh grammar school all the lads that supported them (Hibs) were all Protestants. And Hibs, Hibs have a unique identity in that they came ye know they’ve got this Irish heritage that they were founded by you know, basically by Irish immigrants but that the difference between us and Celtic is we’re proud of our history and we’ve got it there but we don’t let it sort of impact on the present if ye like (IT: 5).

Still emphasising their symbolic capital as being separate from religious markers, and keen to reinforce Hibs’ secularised identity, John adds:

I don’t think you could identify that Hibs have got a Catholic support as opposed to a Protestant support ... Hibs are not seen as a Catholic club by Hibs fans ... the religious aspect disnae come into it in any way shape or form. I can state that without fear of contradiction (IT: 8 - 9).

Although attempting to distinguish between ethnicity and religious markers, Greg demonstrates that Hibs fans are uneasy with the juxtaposition of accruing symbolic capital while embracing the contemporary manifestation of their origins. He describes it as a “problem” and echoing John, tries to illustrate Hibernian’s place in ‘modern’ Edinburgh society as one absent of modern day Irish or Catholic associations. Moreover, he ends up conflating the two by reducing Hibs’ ‘Irish’ heritage to religion (Catholicism):

The problem of the Hibs ethos is that, from my perspective, it is ... given the history of the club coming from the Catholic community of Edinburgh and also from the Irish community is that it’s seen as being in the past, part of the Irish community and part Catholic, but today I think, given the nature of Edinburgh and society, I think that is a historical part of the club. And I think you will find that when people support Hibs, anything that has to do with religion is not seen as such a big part of it. Although there may be fans that see that heritage as being important, I don’t place such a big emphasis on it (IT: 4).

This apparent ease with which religion and ethnicity are conflated, in addition to the polysemous nature of ‘sectarianism’, contributes to the Hibs fans within this camp eschewing meaningful identification with Irishness. The dichotomous personality of Hibs fans grappling with their Leith, Edinburgh, Scottish and Irish Catholic identities is most sharply demonstrated by the following two accounts which discuss
Hibs (club and fans) eschewing their Irishness and which broadly represent the two polar positions of argument expressed during interviews. Andi, the strongest critic of those Hibs supporters who embrace Irishness states:

Although there is the Irish heritage ... you don’t have to go in for all that plastic Paddy stuff to be a Hibs fan. In fact most people are actually anti-that. They see themselves as an Edinburgh club. And with an Edinburgh identity and Scottish despite the roots and it’s nothing to be ashamed of. It’s not wanting to get away from the roots (IT: 4).

Explaining the origins of Hibs as being linked to Irish Catholic immigrants overcoming poverty and prejudice, Andi explains, “but Hibs did actually turn away from that quite early on in their existence. Hhhhhmmm, they’ve been a lot quicker to let go of that kind of background than certain other clubs in Scotland” (IT: 7). Andi adds:

And I must admit that’s one of my pet hates. I can’t stand sectarianism or racism in any form at all. And if I felt the club was going down that route in any way I would be disillusioned with it (IT: 7).

Andy believes, therefore, that in order to be ‘non-sectarian’ one has to reject the club’s original identity and assimilate fully. Furthermore, in this context, ‘Irishness’ is clearly equated with ‘sectarian’.

Andi then highlights that recently Hibs fans have been engaged in debating the legitimacy of their fans waving the Irish Tricolour and echoing John and Fraser who equate Catholic or Irish symbols in modern Scotland as ‘sectarian’, she argues, “in the modern day Edinburgh club it has no place” (IT: 8). She adds, “the whole Irish ... I don’t think it does Hibs any favours” (IT: 9), and then in discussing the name of the supporters’ group she is attached to, ‘The Erin Hibernian Supporters Trust’, Andi adds:

I don’t like the name. And in fact we had a big debate about it. I actually thought we should change it because I felt it gave the wrong message. I did find that when we were trying to encourage people it was putting off a large amount of the Hibs support by the fact that they thought that in some way it was linked to (long pause) the whole Irish ... (long pause) (IT: 9).

Meanwhile, although Kenny personally embraces the club’s Irishness enthusiastically, he concedes that “there is a large number of Hibs fans who do actively go out of their way” to eschew Irish associations (IT: 1). Linking the club’s original renunciation of Irishness to ex-chairman Harry Swan, Kenny adds, “I do think he (Swan) did try to take Hibs away from the tradition which up until the
thirties Hibs were still predominantly owned by Irish families in Ireland (IT: 4).

Kenny also claimed the club has previously had a policy of not selling scarves with the Irish Harp symbol on them and of banning the display of the Irish Tricolour at Easter Road in an attempt to avoid 'sectarianism' (IT: 4). He adds:

if you read the Hibs history books from the eighties right up until ye know, the mid to late nineties, there'll be mibee a page about how Hibs were formed by Irish immigrants moving into Edinburgh and that was it ... it's like the sort of embarrassing uncle that they keep away and they don't like to talk about (IT: 13).

Departing from the others, Kenny views Irish and Catholic symbolism in modern Edinburgh as potentially positive, adding:

there was a whole generation of Hibs fans who were actively discouraged from it (embracing Hibs's Irish roots) and I don't see how encouraging it is sectarianism. To me the way to beat bigotry and sectarianism is by bringing it out into the open ... To me the way for Hibs to move away from it annoys me, it's childish and it annoys me. It's a puerile debate, you know everything gets dragged down to the problematic world of sectarianism in Scotland. And I don't see why Hibs can't celebrate that Irish history or roots to whatever extent they decide to and just be that for what it is. It's a Scottish club with a strong Irish history (IT: 13).

He rejects any claims of these symbols being 'sectarian', noting:

Someone might perceive (emphasis) it to be sectarian in the same way a nazi would perceive the star of St David to be ... I mean I think that that is just stupid. I mean surely the point of a tolerant society is ... I mean if you have a group who have integrated they have a right to express themselves and nobody should have an issue with that. To me if you perceive that as sectarian then you are the one who has the problem (IT: 9).

Although critical of Hibs fans (and others) who perceive Irish symbolism as 'sectarian', he accurately rationalises the critics' perceptions by suggesting:

I think they would probably see it as provoking, as being too or overtly Irish, which would provoke a response. But that could also be because in the football context I think Irish and Catholic are really one and the same thing, seen as the same, so I think they would probably see it as being perhaps anti-Protestant and anti-Scotland, even though it's not meant like that at all. But I think that's what they would see that as, almost an inflammatory symbol that's stoking up feelings (IT: 9).

Reflecting upon these various comments reinforces the competing views of what are acceptable and legitimate signifiers of Hibs' present identity; of what is and is not desirable in acquiring symbolic capital in twenty first century Edinburgh / Scotland for sections of Hibs' support. Although John, Andi, Vera, Greg and Fraser expressed little if any personal identification with the Irishness of Hibs, associating it with mere ahistorical fact and / or 'sectarianism' in modern Scotland, they did, to varying degrees, acknowledge its importance for other sections of the Hibs support
base. Kenny claims that in the last five to six years an Irish renaissance has been occurring at Hibs at both club and supporter levels. Highlighting the three book collection by Alan Lugton (1999) as the major catalyst, Kenny states:

Since they came out there's almost sort eh been a mini renaissance of Hibernianism for want of a better word. Since then the club, I mean you could say it's cynical marketing, but they have made a genuine attempt to take it back to its roots. They have brought the harp back onto the club crest (IT: 4).

The club then are recognised as playing a key role in this alleged renaissance of Irishness to the extent that Kenny states the pre-season tour of Ireland in 2005 was “heralded as Hibs going back to their roots” (IT: 33) with officially marketed club merchandise emblazoned with ‘Hibernian’s Tour of Hibernia’. Demonstrating this Irish renaissance further, Kenny suggests that Hearts and Hibs have both become more ‘sectariansed’ in recent years. Discussing the supporters specifically, Kenny states:

I would say there has been a growing awareness of em Irishness, you know, for want of a better phrase, and actually at a Hibs Hearts game now you'll get more, you know problematical phrase, but sectarian baggage or regalia or singing than ye did ten years ago; from both fans. You'll see a lot more Irish flags in the Hibs end and scarves, t-shirts and that kind of thing. And equally, I mean Hearts fans have always kinda had it but more so lately there's been a lot of Union Jacks and Northern Irish flags and giving it the Red Hand salute and all that kind of thing. And that's definitely increased without doubt (IT: 12).

The nature of Hibs' local rivalry with Hearts bears an obvious significance on both sets of supporters regarding their identity perceptions with Goffman's 'audience segregation' appearing to influence behaviour. The sense of place and time is important to the supporters of Hibs in determining and shaping their Hibs identity, with Ireland, Scotland, Edinburgh, Cowgate and Leith all playing a part in the geographical significance of the club. John, Andi, Vera and Greg expressed to varying degrees the importance of Edinburgh to the Hibs identity while every respondent expressed the importance of Leith. Despite Kenny's observations, Fraser believes the Hibs identity and subsequent rivalry with Hearts is based “more on location now as opposed to religion” (IT: 7), and broadly representing all the respondents apart from Kenny, John adds:

Leith is seen as having a separate identity from Edinburgh ... and people from Leith regard themselves as sort eh separate, as totally separate from Edinburgh. Leithers is what everybody's called. So Hibs play in Leith now and I think it is important that if ye ever move the club from this area of Edinburgh, I think the club would die pretty rapidly (IT: 11).
The nuances and subtleties of the Hibs supporters' geographical identifiers contribute to their 'dual personality', with both Edinburgh and Leith being proud badges of identity whilst simultaneously being seen to be distinct too. Kenny sums this up succinctly by noting:

it's another part of the Hibs dual identity is that they are seen as this big Leith club and they are in many ways. Yet they come from the Cowgate and their traditional support was always from the Southside of Edinburgh which was where the Irish immigrant population lived (IT: 14).

Sections of Hibernian fans can perceive modern linkages to Irish / Catholic symbols as inherently 'sectarian' viewing them as purely historical fact, while for others, Irish / Catholic signifiers are unproblematic, perhaps even desirable. The embracing or eschewing of Irishness and Catholicism among Hibs fans is often associated with its main 'others' – Hearts, Rangers and Celtic – particularly Hibs fans' perception of their rivals' identities. Some view Hearts as the main 'other', as Andi explains. “I actually see Hibs and Hearts as two sides of the same coin and actually if I had to tell you who did I … if you were talking about disliking more, I would say Rangers or Celtic.” Vera corroborates with, “Yeah, ye hate the Old Firm more than ye hate Hearts.”

Scotland's Sporting and Political Identity

John and Kenny who were the only respondents to describe themselves as 'Scottish not British' actively support the Scotland football team. Although the others support Scotland's football team too, some also expressed varying degrees of support for England and / or UK sports teams, which neither Kenny nor John did in keeping with their broader political and personal self-identification. Additionally, Kenny admitted to actively hoping for the British and Irish Lions rugby union team to lose every match, stating:

I would support whoever they were playing against just because I hate the idea of a British team ... I don't really like British institutions, even the British Lions where I know it's at a different level from the Scotland national team. But I still see it, the British Lions to many are kinda like the English Lions (IT: 33).

Again, reinforcing the genuine linkages between sporting, political and national identification, Greg and Fraser, the only two respondents to define themselves as 'equally Scottish and British', were the only subjects who, in addition to supporting UK sports teams, expressed support for England's sporting teams. This corresponds
closely to their respective political preferences, with Greg being a devotee of the Union and Fraser also preferring Westminster rule. The remaining two subjects, Andi and Vera expressed support for UK sports teams.

All but one respondent (Kenny) expressed varying degrees of a lack of confidence in Scotland’s abilities, in both political and sporting spheres. Politically, Andi, Vera and Greg were critical of the Scottish Parliament with Vera stating, “I don’t think we’d be good enough for full autonomy ... It’s (the Parliament) full of numptees” (IT: 2 - 3). Greg accords with, “the idea of Scotland having its own autonomy or Parliament I think would be an absolute disaster ... So I’m afraid to say I don’t have confidence in the people who run this country” (IT: 22).

A number of themes emerged relating to Scotland’s sporting identity. Although agreeing their club comes before their country in terms of sporting allegiance, all of the respondents expressed support for Scotland’s football team. John, Andi and Vera believe the tartan army to have more female members than previously, with Vera and Andi linking this to more couples going for short breaks together. Andi notes:

There’s been a big upsurge in the last couple of years in people going with the tartan army and a lot of people have just got no interest in football. I wis standing in a pub in Cardiff and a wee guy at the bar going on and on and I said ‘how do you think we will do today?’ And he said, ‘I dunno, I dunno anything about football’. And I said ‘well why are you here then?’ He said ‘I like going on the rugby trips so I thought I’d come on this one’ (IT: 24 - 25).

Andi, Vera and John also believe the tartan army experience to be less enjoyable than previously, with the inter-related perception of the tartan army being less exclusive and more demonstrative of a “kilted clown” post-fan syndrome. John explains the less exclusive perception of the tartan army experience:

Ye would go to Estonia for the first time and it was a different world. Two to three thousand people there and it was brilliant. But now if you played in Estonia next week there’d be five thousand Scots fans there and it woudnae be the same. But maybe that’s a wee bit elitist and maybe that’s part of it. Oh everybody does it now so it’s no’ quite got the same buzz to it. But that was part of it but yeah (IT: 25).

Bourdieu (1984) explains this ‘de-valuing’ according to increasing popularity in highlighting Vivaldi’s works “which [in] less than twenty years have fallen from the
prestigious status of musicologists' discoveries to the status of jingles on popular radio stations and petit bourgeois record-players” (p. 563).

Additionally, the carnivalesque nature of the tartan army has been linked to the political lack of confidence expressed in some quarters of the Scottish public with John’s comments being instructive:

There’s some kilted clowns that really just go to dress up and to say ‘here I am. I’m Scottish’ and they actually go abroad and they celebrate the fact that look how bad we are but we don’t care, we’ll just get bevved and have a party anyway and it’ll be wonderful. And I’m afraid that attitude completely does me head in and it’s becoming more and more prevalent as ye follow Scotland ... It wis the usual syndrome. Ye know, we’re Scottish and we don’t give a damn [about defeat]. It wis a husband and wife it wis too, and they both dressed up in the same tartan gear and which made it like fuckin Fran and Anne. They jist like going abroad and getting dressed up (IT: 23 and 32).

Later, in discussing the same theme, John adds, “we’ve turned into caricatures of ourselves ... It’s just become totally embarrassing now” (IT: 24). Giulianotti (1991) explains this as the Scotland supporters becoming “instrumental ambassadors” fostering and exhibiting “ambassadorial bonhomie” in contrast to the (perceived) “hooliganism” practised by the “English” (p. 504).

John, Fraser and Kenny all expressed the belief that few Rangers and Celtic fans are in the tartan army, preferring to focus on their club fortunes instead. This appears linked to the perception – that is supported by Giulianotti’s (1994) empirical findings – expressed by all respondents that provincial clubs have a higher percentage of their average support base attending Scotland matches, particularly away matches as a result of having the opportunity for a foreign football centred trip which is unlikely or impossible for their club side to facilitate. John believes that previously Rangers fans made up the majority of the Scotland support but that they have been largely conspicuous by their absence since the late 1980s.

The ‘Other’
The notion of the ‘other’ resulted in each respondent expressing varying degrees of antipathy towards Hearts, the local Edinburgh rival club and Glasgow clubs Rangers and Celtic. John, Greg, Fraser and Kenny all agreed that Hearts are the primary ‘other’ mainly due to their being a local rival. Fraser explains, “I suppose the
biggest rivals at the moment have got to be Hearts simply because they come from the same city. So I think your biggest rivals are going to be your local rivals” (IT: 8 - 9). John perceives the rivalry as being intensified in recent years due to the aborted amalgamation of Hearts and Hibs, which some Hibs fans see as a failed takeover. John comments:

For a lot of Hibs fans, myself included, if ye finish above Hearts then that’s success for a season. Ye want Hibs to win all the time and Hearts to get beat all the time and there’s this added animosity since they tried to put us out of business in 1990. But ehhh, it’s down to eh, they are ‘the other’ (emphasis) without any shadow of a doubt (IT: 15 - 16).

Vera and Andi, although agreeing that Hearts are the primary local rival, paradoxically expressed a large degree of camaraderie with them, subsequently viewing both Rangers and Celtic as the primary ‘other’. Andi notes, “I actually see Hibs and Hearts as two sides of the same coin and actually if I had to tell you who did I, if you were talking about disliking more, I would say Rangers or Celtic” (Andi IT: 12) Vera corroborates with, “Yeah, ye hate the Old Firm more than ye hate Hearts” (IT: 12). Clarifying this position, Andi adds:

I would rather see the Old Firm get beat because it’s always funny ... I actually don’t mind the ... the Hearts fans are like Hibs fans in a lot of ways. They could go through to Ibrox and Parkhead like half the people in Scotland do but they don’t, so ye’ve got to give them some kind of respect for that (Andi IT: 14).

The general antipathy towards Celtic and Rangers was evident throughout all of the interviews with the exception of Kenny who expressed antipathy exclusively towards Rangers. There appears to be two major processes at work here. First, there is an almost overwhelming perception among the Hibs respondents of Rangers and Celtic being almost equally ‘sectarian’, and Celtic, it is further claimed, are ‘patronising’ towards Hibs. Second, there is a general antipathy and dislike of Glasgow as a city and this is expressed through sporting attachments.

Expressing the ‘sectarian’ perceptions surrounding Celtic and Rangers, the most critical voice was John, whose views, largely supported by all others apart from Kenny, were the most forceful. Believing nearly one hundred percent of Rangers and Celtic fans to be ‘sectarian’ (IT: 18), John states:

We’re now in the 21st century and people are still. I’m talking about both Rangers and Celtic here, ye know the obscenity of still fighting battles that happened three or four hundred years ago just does ma head in to be honest with ye. I think the
present First Minister Jack McConnell has summed it up with calling it Scotland's Shame... The people that attach themselves to the two Glasgow clubs continue to promote it every Saturday and ye go there yesterday (Hibs played Rangers at Ibrox) where ye have the obscenity of going to see the Scottish people wearing England football shirts and singing the songs, even promoted by the club. Ye have Andy Cameron coming on five minutes before the game and he leads a sing song flying the Union Jacks and they play a medley of songs over the loudspeakers and it's the Dambusters and the Great Escape and they've got a fuckin German goalkeeper. And it's the same when ye go to Parkhead ... the bigot brothers, i'm afraid they've certainly destroyed Scottish football to a certain extent and they are a blight on Scottish society as far as i'm concerned (IT: 17).

In addition to being seen as the “sectarian bigot brothers” of the collective Old Firm Rangers and Celtic are each viewed separately in particular respects with John, Andi and Vera all perceiving Celtic supporters to be patronising towards Hibs, therefore, meriting disdain. Andi comments that Celtic fans “treat us like their little Irish brothers” (IT: 16) and John comments:

I think that Celtic see it almost patronising slightly at times if ye like. Ye know they see ye as their wee cousins if ye like, ye know their wee cousins from Edinburgh because we play in green and white or some crap like that” (IT: 18).

Meanwhile Kenny and Greg highlight Hibs’ particularly intense rivalry with Rangers, a theme tacitly acknowledged by Fraser and Andi. While Fraser associated it with the 1970s period when Hearts were doing poorly and “Rangers became our biggest rivals” (IT: 9), Greg and Kenny made the ‘sectarian’ connection between the two clubs more explicit. Perhaps it is revealing that Greg and Kenny are the only two respondents from a Catholic background, both having Irish Catholic ancestry, and appear sensitive to both the anti-Irish and anti-Catholic elements of Rangers as well as the Irish Catholic heritage of Hibs. Kenny concurs to a degree with Fraser, citing his father's tales that during the 1970s the rivalry with Rangers was strong. However, Kenny sees this as largely due to the higher levels of 'Irishness' among the Hibs support during this period – a period when Irish 'rebel tunes' were not uncommon (Fraser IT: 6; Kenny IT: 13). Kenny adds:

I mean he (his father) doesn’t like Hearts in the footballing sense but he has a much more visceral hatred for Rangers and that’s purely religious, with the way he was brought up. He always seen Rangers as more of a ...(long pause and he sighs) (IT: 20).
Recognising the Hibs fans' 'sectarianised' identity, Greg adds:

I don't say Hibs are any angels in this. There is a section of Rangers fans who know that the club (Hibs) is from an Irish background and they know that there are people who support Hibs who are Catholic and perhaps they may even attend Church, but the perception is that they are Catholic. And given the nature that Rangers is predominantly a club that people who are Protestant will tend to support, they will come with the intention of winding Hibs fans up ... And when Rangers start singing songs that they know will antagonise the Hibs fans, when they start singing things like Rule Britannia and singing the Sash they do it because they want to wind Hibs fans up (IT: 14).

Broadening the attitudes shown towards the two major Glasgow clubs, the wider antipathy regarding Glasgow as a city was expressed by John, Andi, Vera and Fraser, with Vera bemoaning the fact that Scotland's football fixtures are usually played at the Glasgow based Hampden Park. Vera asks “why does it have to be in Glasgow all the time?” (IT: 26) Andi expresses puzzlement at Glasgow rather than Edinburgh housing the three largest football stadia in Scotland, asking “why are three of the biggest football stadiums in Scotland all in one city and it’s not even the capital?” (IT: 26) John adds, “I've no time for the city” (IT: 19). The respondents did perceive their antipathy towards Glasgow as being reciprocated with the following transcript from Fraser being a typical representation of views expressed:

JK Do you think it (rivalry with Rangers and Celtic) is purely football or is there an Edinburgh Glasgow divide?

FS Aye it's bound to be an Edinburgh Glasgow divide as well ... But there is competition of course between Edinburgh and Glasgow and I buy into that as well. Ah'm no keen on Glasgow.

JK Can I ask why that is?

FS Ah don't really know. Don't know. I mean I am part of the people of Edinburgh that dislike Glasgow and the people in Glasgow that dislike Edinburgh.

JK Do you think that is replicated, in that do you think that Glasgow /

FS Yeah. I think that as well. I think the people in Glasgow are exactly the same about the people in Edinburgh as the people in Edinburgh are against the people in Glasgow.

(IT: 11).
The major 'other' then for Hibs supporters can either be Hearts or Rangers and Celtic, depending on the particular preferences and experiences of the respective supporter one asks. Paradoxically, even though some concede that Hearts are the main 'local rival', these fans simultaneously express a large degree of camaraderie with Hearts to such an extent that they prefer to see Hearts win than either Celtic or Rangers.

All of the respondents perceive Scottish rugby to be largely supported by a middle-class fanbase, with only Kenny and Fraser showing any interest in the Scotland team. Greg has attended Scotland matches as a schoolboy with his private school organising trips for the whole class.

6. Partick Thistle Football Club

Partick Thistle Sporting Identity

All respondents live in the west end of Glasgow near to Partick Thistle's Firhill stadium and appear to perceive the local area as a major feature of the Partick Thistle identity (for themselves and the wider supporter base). Ellen defines 'local' players and fans as those from the west end, noting that greater Glasgow would only be considered local “at a push” (IT: 6). Davie highlights that the club enjoys a mainly 'local' support base, explaining that even the few dispersed supporters' clubs are mainly made up of former west end residents. Pat notes, “the reason I go is that I was born in Maryhill ... and it was just natural to go” (IT: 8). The importance of the west end in constituting part of the Partick Thistle identity was perhaps most sharply expressed by Davie’s criticism of Glaswegian comedian Billy Connolly for failing to reply to a request on behalf of the Save The Jags campaign xxxvii. “I wrote to his management at Tickety Boo and they said they couldn’t do anything to help. Ye know, a guy from the west end of Glasgow” (He shakes his head from side to side) (IT: 4). This criticism of the well-known Celtic supporter Connolly implies a belief in the primacy of ‘west end’ identity over other factors.

Three out of four respondents have immediate family members who support either Celtic or Rangers and all respondents attended their first Partick Thistle match.
accompanied by either a close relative or family friend. Pat explains that when he was a small child he used to attend Celtic matches with his Celtic supporting father, but adds when he was old enough to attend matches on his own, fearing for his safety, his mother “decided that I wasn’t going to Parkhead” (IT: 1). Pat’s next door neighbour then began taking him to Firhill. Davie’s father was a Rangers supporter but he adds, “my old man never used to take me to Ibrox which was good” (IT: 1).

Davie was introduced to Firhill by an uncle who took him to watch Partick Thistle during a period when he lived with his uncle and aunt. In addition to having a Rangers supporting father, Davie also stressed that his brother is a Rangers supporter. Meanwhile, Steve had a granddad who used to take him to watch Partick Thistle, though he remembered with amusement that:

> two or three years before that (regularly attending Partick Thistle with granddad) some uncle or something must have bought me a Rangers top because my mother and father take great delight in producing this photo when I was five or six with a Rangers top on (IT: 2).

Steve added that his daughter is a Rangers supporter. Ellen was introduced to Partick Thistle by her father and was the only respondent with no stated family linkages to either Rangers or Celtic. Yet she pointed out the subtle demarcating process inherent within aspects of Glasgow sporting discourse, stating:

> it’s part of the Glasgow thing ... when people say ‘what team do you support?’ You just feel so good saying Partick Thistle cause you know ye are not going to get any bother or anything. And then people will say to you ‘but who do you really support?’ And I say ‘I really support Partick Thistle’ (IT: 3: Original emphasis).

Davie also alluded to this ‘Glasgow’ peculiarity, and linking this to his support for Partick Thistle, boasts of “rebelling against the Old Firm” because there “is always this thing in Glasgow that is said, ‘but who do you really support?’” (IT: 2) This major feature of the Partick Thistle identity, defining self as ‘not being’ Rangers or Celtic was elucidated further by all the other respondents. Steve adds, “I think we are the great Glasgow alternative to Rangers or Celtic” (IT: 4). The major reason behind this was best summed up by Pat who suggests that most Partick Thistle fans “will tell you that they are anti-sectarian” (IT: 2). Ellen also captures these sentiments admitting, “I think a lot of it (Partick Thistle identity) is wanting to shy away from the Old Firm and everything that is involved in that ... I don’t think it’s more a Thistle identity. I think it’s more what we’re not than what we are” (IT: 3).
Another central element of the Partick Thistle identity alluded to by all respondents was the importance of retaining a sense of humour whilst being the 'eternal' underdog. Davie views being the underdog as desirable, asserting, “the less successful your team is, the more attractive they become” (IT: 8). Reiterating these sentiments, Steve adds, “a good friend of ours was [living] down in Liverpool and we went to Liverpool a couple of times to see him and we always went to see Tranmere. That says it all ye know. Maybe we just like supporting the underdog” (IT: 21). Inherent within this underdog status is a form of self-mocking whereby during general chat about Partick Thistle, a perceived personal hardship in remaining loyal to the club is implicitly referred to by all but one of the respondents. For example, Pat sums up his response to what it means to be a Partick Thistle supporter by stating, “I think we’ve covered it, I mean it’s torture that’s all haha” (IT: 8). Similarly, Ellen describes being a Partick Thistle supporter by stressing, “it’s usually a really fun experience if you didn’t have to watch what was on the park” (IT: 10), while Davie describes his first few matches as a child. “When I began going with my uncle I was going along to support them and that was me. I’ve suffered bravely for it” (IT: 2). These off the cuff remarks, albeit partly made in jest, demonstrate both an acceptance of being relatively unsuccessful — perhaps unglamorous — and a determination to maintain a front that involves self-mocking. It is these perceptions that combine to set Partick Thistle as a club and support apart — in the eyes of these Partick Thistle supporters - from the more successful Glasgow neighbours, Rangers and Celtic. This self-perceived notion of being the unglamorous underdog was subtly reinforced by Steve who describes his early school years as a Partick Thistle supporter, stressing, “I was at primary [school] and everybody was either Celtic or Rangers fans and I was the Thistle fan” (IT: 2: Original Emphasis).

Related to the self perception of being the underdog, all respondents alluded to the wider Partick Thistle supporter base as one which is able to laugh at itself, while two respondents expanded on this, stressing the primacy of ‘fun’, ‘good atmosphere’ and ‘good humour’ among the Partick Thistle supporters. Although acknowledging this self-mocking aspect of their club identity all respondents stressed that they do take their support seriously. Davie sums this position up best, commenting, “we poke fun but I don’t think we’re going to continually be the circus
act ... we’ll also be the first ones to stand up for our team” (IT: 3). Steve concurs, adding, “Thistle fans like to win, we don’t like to get beat” (IT: 5).

Scotland’s Sporting and Political Identity
The complex nature of political identity in Scotland was evident from responses. Steve and Ellen describe themselves as ‘Scottish not British’ and prefer ‘independence’ for Scotland. Davie also describes himself as ‘Scottish not British’ yet prefers ‘devolution’. Pat, the only respondent to describe himself as British (although ‘more Scottish than British’), originally stated ‘devolution’ as his preferred political preference but later adds, “I feel Scotland should go on their own, although I’m not an SNP supporter you know, I’m more socialist than anything” (IT: 7).

With regard to the Scotland national team all respondents support Scotland and actively attend a high percentage of home and away fixtures. All respondents highlighted the central role their local Partick Thistle supporters’ club plays in the Scotland arena, organising coach trips to a number of home and away fixtures, catering for non-Partick Thistle fans and Partick Thistle supporters alike. All respondents asserted that Partick Thistle have a disproportionately high percentage of supporters among the home and away Scotland support. Steve also suggests that the club has the highest percentage of Scotland supporters relative to their average club home attendance figures, adding that Firhill would “definitely” have fewer home supporters in attendance if Scotland played a home match that day or had played a midweek match in Europe.

Two possible reasons for this emerged from all respondents’ comments. First, the Scotland and Partick Thistle identities seem to be perceived as extraordinarily compatible and the Partick Thistle and Scotland match atmosphere are perceived to be similar. Ellen relates it to many Partick Thistle supporters attending Scotland games contributing to a ‘familiar’ (fun) atmosphere and being at least equally concerned with their own contribution to the spectacle as to the match outcome. She adds, “the atmosphere at a Scotland game is like the atmosphere at a Thistle game, it’s fun, it’s not particularly [about] enjoying what’s on the park. It’s always a nice atmosphere and a good laugh” (IT: 25). Furthermore, Davie claims that many Scotland supporters’ songs originate from Firhill and the Partick Thistle supporters,
while Pat notes the similarities between watching both teams in terms of match outcome, stressing, "I'm not someone who needs to see a winning team every week to enjoy myself" (IT: 13). Second, there is the perception – which is empirically supported by Giulianotti, (1994) and appears to still be the case** - that many smaller clubs have proportionally higher numbers of supporters among the Scotland fans. During the current interviews, this was explained to be due to the fact that their clubs are less likely to compete in European games**) The Scotland fixtures act as surrogate European matches. Pat notes, "I've been starved of success. I don't get the chance to see Thistle play in European football. That's why I go to see Scotland" (IT: 18). Steve sums this position up, noting, "Rangers and Celtic are playing in Europe and away and loads go away with them ... I think a lot of Thistle fans go to Scotland games because that is their European trip. We haven't played in Europe too often" (IT: 18). The supporters of smaller clubs, therefore, have little or no opportunity to express their 'Scottish' footballing identity other than in the Scotland team context. However, Pat confessed to supporting Celtic and attending some of their European home ties. He comments, "I still occasionally go to a European night at Parkhead. I will support them at a European night" (IT: 13). It is possible that in the absence of similar opportunities with Partick Thistle, Celtic become a focus of Pat's Scottishness, albeit with his previously stated family habitus in the background.

There was a general consensus that the majority of Scotland supporters, particularly the away contingent, are made up primarily of non-Old Firm clubs and that disproportionately, a high percentage originate from Fife, the Borders, the east coast and the Aberdeen area. Along with the previously stated lack of European trips for smaller clubs, a couple of reasons emerged for these claims. First, it was claimed that within the Scotland support itself, sections of fans actively engage in 'slagging off' the Old Firm and their supporters. In describing the Partick Thistle supporters' club that organises coach trips to Scotland matches, Pat admits, "aye there is Jonny who comes with us and he's a Rangers fan and he gets a bit of a slagging" (IT: 17). It is unclear if this is exclusively due to Jonny's support of Rangers or as a result of being a non-Partick Thistle supporter. However, in the context of the interview discussion at the time the comment was made, and in light of comments made by other supporters (of Partick Thistle and other clubs) in the course of this research, it
is possible to assume this was largely due to his support for Rangers per se. In
discussing the hypothetical display of (unspecified) club colours at Scotland
matches, Ellen immediately referred exclusively to the ‘Old Firm’, adding, “I think
if you turned up at a Scotland game with a Rangers or Celtic scarf, ye would get
lynched” (IT: 19). Ellen later highlighted that she has never sat next to a Rangers or
Celtic fan at a Scotland game despite having sat next to supporters of various
Scottish clubs in the past.

There is a stated belief among all but one respondent that Rangers (and to a lesser
extent, Celtic) used to have a far higher percentage of supporters attending Scotland
matches. Although Pat and Steve believed this to be primarily related to
instrumental reasons like number of club players in the current Scotland squad, and
availability of top class and European football, they also expressed similar reasons
to those which Ellen and Davie believed to be primary reasons. Ellen notes:

I think it’s more to do with the political and religious thing behind it when you go
to Parkhead and ye wave yer Irish flag and why then would you support Scotland? I
mean ye get it with Rangers supporters. Well if they sing Rule Britannia and God
Save the Queen and fly Union Jacks and then next week are going to Hampden to
support. I think it’s just trying to reconcile club football with international football.
It just doesn’t add up. Whereas every other team in Scotland, well fine, ok maybe
there’s Hearts and Hibs but not to the same extent ... And I just don’t think that it
stacks up (IT: 21).

This perception that Celtic and Rangers supporters have more difficulty
“reconciling club football with international football” was evident throughout all
respondents’ interviews. Moreover, Davie criticises both clubs for putting club
before country. “I just think the Old Firm fans think their team is more important
than their country, which you just cannot do and [yet] they do (IT: 8). However, Pat
diverges from this position, adding:

I think that (lack of European football with club) is why I try to see Scotland away
from home at every opportunity because I don’t get that chance with my club.
However, if we were suddenly to become successful and work our way up the
Premier League and get a UEFA cup place then I would spend my money going to
see Thistle at the expense of going to see Scotland. I’d rather see my club do well
than Scotland (IT: 18).

Steve diverges from both opposing positions, asserting both Scotland and Partick
Thistle are equally important. Therefore, out of the three respondents who expressed
a preference, Davie thinks Scotland are more important than Partick Thistle, while
Pat thinks Partick Thistle are more important than Scotland, and Steve believes both Partick Thistle and Scotland to be equally important.

Two respondents discussed the politicised nature of the tartan army, asserting primacy of class within a Scottish ‘national’ framework. Pat expresses a perception that the 1970s witnessed a rise in nationalism in the political and football sphere, noting, “I don’t know what way round it came right enough, if whether it was the Scottish football team that got SNP votes or if it was the other way round” (IT: 17). In response to whether or not the tartan army exhibits any obvious political symbolism, he adds, “well anti-Tory maybe, but not strong Labour. But anti-Tory I think aye ... The anti-Tory bit can also be anti-English I think as well ye know. It’s a bit of both” (IT: 17). This synonymousness was reiterated by Steve who adds, “the values of the Labour Party are the values of the Scottish people” (IT: 8). It appears that for these two respondents at least, aspects of Scottish national identity can be viewed as an extension of (old) Labour, to such an extent that the major ‘other’, England, is viewed in political terms as an extension of ‘Toryism’, Labour’s major ‘other’. Moreover, as evidenced in Pat’s response, this extension is manifested within the tartan army.

The ‘Other’
The concept of ‘the other’ proved to be highly situational, relying upon individual preferences, with a variety of ‘others’ mentioned depending upon contexts and situations. All respondents mentioned Clyde as a major other among the majority of the Partick Thistle support and all highlighted Rangers and Celtic as a combined ‘Old Firm’ ‘other’ that some fans like to view as the major one. Pat states, “ye get a lot of Thistle fans who would rather see the bigger clubs as rivals like Celtic or Rangers or Hearts” (IT: 3). Ellen concurs that the wider Partick Thistle fan base view either of the Old Firm clubs as the major other, adding, “I think people dislike them both as much as each other” (IT: 11). However, Davie disagrees, explaining Clyde are the main other to Partick Thistle. In response to being asked to name the major other, he expands, “for some reason Clyde ... Ye’ can’t say Rangers or Celtic” (IT: 11). Paradoxically, perhaps, despite this Davie then adds, “the team I like to beat most is Rangers followed closely by Celtic. And then it has got to be Clyde” (IT: 11).
When asked to expand on this, Davie adds:

Because I'm Protestant and because they (Rangers) are negative ... I don't have a bigoted bone in my body but when I go to Ibrox I'm a Fenian bastard ... I feel they are the most extreme out of the two. I just feel they are more bigoted than Celtic. I feel they expect me to support them (IT: 11 - 12).

Steve explains that he has no personal major other but that in his opinion, Clyde seem to hold this position for the majority of his fellow Partick Thistle supporters, while Pat's comments capture most clearly the complexities involved in defining the other. He accepts that Clyde are the club that most Partick Thistle supporters “hate the most” (IT: 3), adding:

There are other clubs like Kilmarnock, Ayr United and I can remember the old days against Hearts, running battles in the street which was awful. There wis' a real rivalry between Thistle and Hearts ... I don't know if it was the Glasgow Edinburgh thing but this was going back years ago. (IT: 2 - 3).

Ellen, Steve and Pat also noted that Kilmarnock have been a major other in recent years due to Partick Thistle beating them on consecutive occasions much to their supporters’ annoyance.

A distinctive class element emerged during the discussions on rugby union within Scotland. All but one of the respondents has attended both Scotland and club rugby union matches, and the same three currently watch Scotland and the regional team, Glasgow Warriors, on a regular basis. Steve has been a Glasgow season ticket holder for four years, while he, Pat and Davie recently travelled to Ireland to support Glasgow against Limerick. All respondents expressed a belief that rugby union fans in Scotland are mainly middle-class. Davie notes:

It's a posher crowd at the rugby. They don't necessarily behave any better cause they do some stupid things in the rugby club and get pished and make an arse of themselves. They just seem to think that their idea of fun is a wee bit beyond a lot of other people's idea of fun (IT: 13).

Pat adds, “the rugby is (pause) [a] public schoolboy thing really. Ye don't get that really at Firhill, ye know ye don't get public schoolboys going ‘uggy, uggy, uggy’, ye know” (IT: 21). Despite being a season ticket holder at Glasgow Warriors and regularly attending Scotland rugby union matches (including at least one match at Twickenham), Steve comments:
rugby is very much a public school sport still in Scotland ... it's a different crowd goes to rugby and a different crowd goes to football and there wouldn't be that many who go to both I would have thought (IT: 20).

Similarly, Ellen, who confesses to having little interest in rugby and not attending any rugby matches, adds:

I just always think that rugby supporters think they are a class above everybody else. I tend to get the impression that they are quite snobby cause they play rugby at private schools and whatever, and I just get the impression that they think they are better than everybody else and are a bit stuck up (IT: 22).

However, she then adds, "but the people that I know who do go to Scotland rugby games are fine, they are just like ... I just get that impression" (IT: 22).
6. DISCUSSION OF DATA

1. Introduction

This final chapter draws together the observations made in the previous chapter. The empirical data from the six clubs and two sports is discussed in detail and a selection of the most significant themes to emerge are analysed. The theoretical significance of these findings is illustrated at a primary level of analysis, utilising Bourdieu's (1984) explanatory model of "practice" and, at a secondary level, using Goffman's (1959) "dramaturgical model".

In keeping with the framework adopted in the discussion of data section, this chapter is broken down into the thematic sub-sections of 'club identity', 'the other' and 'Scottish identity'. Due to the overlapping nature of some of the themes, the sub-sections are merely intended to provide a malleable rather than hermetically sealed framework in order to analyse the data, allowing connections within and across thematic sub-sections to develop. As Bourdieu (1984) has shown, gaining a sociological understanding of social relationships requires knowledge and understanding of the values and practises specific to the group/s under study:

The relationships between the different groups and the different practices cannot be fully understood unless one takes account of the objective potentialities of the different institutionalised practices, that is, the social uses which these practices encourage, discourage or exclude both by their intrinsic logic and by their positional and distributional value (Bourdieu, p. 217).

It is these social relationships to which we now turn.

2. Club Identity and 'The Other'

Two major inter-related themes emerge from each of the rugby clubs. First, it appears that for rugby supporters it is important to identify with the players on a personal level and there is a perception that this personal identification is being eroded to the general detriment of the game.

   It was quite feasible to go down to Raeburn Place less than ten years ago and see nine or ten internationals on the pitch and then go upstairs into the bar and be standing shoulder to shoulder with them, with Rob Wainright, David Sole, Jim Renwick and maybe even they would buy you a beer but now (Aaron IT: 5).
And people who haven’t had the history that we have had of the club, which is so important and now it seems you don’t know team members like you used to. In the days of David Sole and Gavin Hastings, Sean Lineen were rugby players and they were stars and everybody knew them and it’s not like that at the moment in rugby. It’s not like that now, it’s changed a lot and I wonder how that will change Scotland’s [rugby] (Lesley IT: 28).

Second, there is a belief in and desire to maintain an ‘amateur’ ethos accompanied by a perception that this is being lost, endangering the future of club rugby in Scotland. This topic laced all of the rugby interviews and was discussed in most detail by Edinburgh Accies respondents as summed up in the following comments which broadly reflect the common position:

While people resented it (professionalism), the spectators say well, it’s not the way it used to be and there’s no doubt the numbers of spectators dropped at that point, and they didn’t drop to go and watch the pro game. They dropped because you know they were used to amateur rugby and enjoyed amateur rugby and then the whole situation changed (George, IT: 6).

Bourdieu’s (1984) observations on “the distinctive function” of sport appear to partially explain this “resentment” against professional rugby:

In an age when sporting activities were reserved for a few, the cult of ‘fair play’, the code of play of those who have self-control not to get so carried away by the game that they forget that it is ‘only a game’, was a logical development of the distinctive function of sport (p. 215).

Thus, the development of professional rugby endangers the self-control exerted by the distinguished fraction – those most able and willing to maintain the maxim that rugby is, and crucially should be, ‘only a game’. Accies respondent Vincent blames professionalism for the loss of financial backers and paying supporters:

It (professionalism) has impacted very, very dramatically ... And we as a club found out very quickly [that] a lot of our financial support disappeared like snow off a dyke because a lot of people took objection to the professionalisation ... It virtually devastated rugby in Scotland and Scottish rugby now is only making a recovery. I suppose if you go back to 97-98-99 there was something like fifteen thousand players playing rugby on a weekly basis during the season. That group has now moved down to around five to six thousand ... When I joined the club we were putting out seven teams. We dropped down to three struggling to get four. We are now putting out five teams ... And here we have a major Scottish club only putting out two teams ... We are probably doing as well as most clubs despite the fact that we are in the 2nd division. Even in Premier One the likes of the Ileriets and Boroughmuirs of this world are not getting crowds anything like what they were getting ten years ago. That whole base has disappeared like snow off a dyke and they haven’t moved across to the professional game ... And I think that is very sad that these people have gone ... They just disappeared (IT: 9 - 11).
Perhaps the antipathy towards professionalism was most evident during discussions about ‘the other’ revealing more subtle (class based) differences across the clubs. Edinburgh Accies respondents argued that all Edinburgh clubs dislike fellow Edinburgh club Heriots as a result of its efficient and professional type of approach. Additionally, in the Borders, Hawick respondents claim that other Borders clubs dislike Melrose for similar reasons as summed up in the following:

Melrose have been seen to be the best run club in the Borders through their Sevens ... They’ve been able to pay players and entice players to come and play for them and there were foreigners there which Hawick don’t have and Gala don’t have ... That team is there for knocking, ken. And it might be envy as much as anything ... My rugby has always been working-class. Cause I’m working-class and I’ve been involved and played and supported, and I think the majority of the people that go to Mansfield are just the ordinary working man ... I don’t think Hawick will be any different from any of the other Borders clubs, other than Melrose possibly. They’ve got a big kinda corporate type thing, middle-class. Melrose have always been ‘come on the rose’. It’s a posher area, ken it’s a satellite town and it’s just well-off people that live in Melrose and it’s no[1] just your ordinary Tom, Dick and Harries ... And their Sevens day, when they have their Sevens which is well known throughout the country, there will be more people go to corporate and go to Melrose Sevens that will never go to another rugby game the rest of the season. Simply through the business ... and it’s the place to be seen ... Everybody’s border rival, everybody wants to beat Melrose (Stephen IT: 18 - 23).

In understanding these clubs’ antipathy towards rivals and professionalism, one should analyse within the context of a working-class (Borders) and (upper) middle-class (Edinburgh) habitus, embodying class based differences in taste and “gains in distinction” exclusively associated within each “space of sport”. As Bourdieu (1984) explains, practice is infused with varying definitions of capital:

It is rare for the social homogeneity of the practitioners to be so great that the populations defined by the same activity do not function as fields in which the very definition of the legitimate practice is at stake. Conflicts over the legitimate way of doing it, or over the resources for doing it almost always retranslate social differences into the specific logic of the field (p. 211).

Retranslating the social differences into the specific logic of this field, one can see that the legitimate practices of Hawick And Edinburgh Accies differ according to subtle differences over resources and values between the Borders and city populations. Border clubs dislike Melrose for getting ‘above their station’ or ‘selling out’ (in a largely working-class space) while Edinburgh clubs dislike Heriots for ruining the cherished ‘amateur’ ethos (in an upper middle-class space) transforming the ‘aesthetic disposition’ into one of seriousness attached to “economic necessity”. This latter point is captured by Bourdieu’s (1984) discussion of the “distance from
necessity" and is linked to the aforementioned determination of some to maintain that rugby is “only a game”:

What is in fact affirmed in this relationship is the dependence of the aesthetic disposition on the past and present material conditions of existence which are the precondition of both its constitution and its application and also of the accumulation of a cultural capital which can only be acquired by means of a sort of withdrawal from economic necessity ... to be able to play the games of culture with the playful seriousness which Plato demanded, a seriousness without the ‘spirit of seriousness’, one has to belong to the ranks of those who have been able, not necessarily to make their whole existence a sort of children’s game, as artists do, but at least to maintain for a long time, sometimes a whole lifetime, a child’s relation to the world (pp. 53 - 54).

Perhaps the middle-class aversion to the professional ethos - to maintain a “seriousness” without the “spirit of seriousness” - is most sharply captured by Bourdieu’s (1984) following insights:

The meaning of a practice casts light on the class distribution of practices and this distribution casts light on the differential meaning of the practice ... This, far from escaping the logic of the field and its struggles, is most often the work of those who ... are required to ensure the imposition and inculcation of the schemes of perception and action which, in practice, organise the practices, and who are inclined to present the explanations they produce as grounded in reason or nature (p. 212).

Thus, sections of the upper middle-class fraction (Edinburgh Accies and Glasgow Hawks to a lesser extent) are disdainful towards aspects of the professional game. Their habitus forming “schemes of perception” and preferred “action organising the practice” present amateur rugby (the practice) as the ‘natural’ way. In this respect, aspects of the professional game subsequently endanger the aesthetic disposition and the dominant class fraction’s power within the field, for professionalism demands the inverse conditions associated with those lauded by that class fraction’s conditions for accumulating social / cultural capital – namely, it demands the complete embracing of, rather than withdrawal from, “economic necessity”.

This subtle difference in attitude towards capital accumulation across the class habitus is further revealed when one compares closely the Glasgow and Edinburgh clubs, both of which exist in a largely middle-class ‘field’.
Lesley from Edinburgh Accies replies to a question about who likes to beat Accies the most by responding:

Probably the Glaswegians. I think the rivalry is much more from them to Edinburgh than it is the other way round. It’s a little bit like the Scots English to me, watching it from the outside. You know Scotland always likes to beat England but England’s not really bothered if they beat Scotland cause it doesn’t really mean much to them. Whereas I think the Glaswegians are the same because they think Edinburgh people are a bit stuck up ye know (IT: 14).

Andrea from Glasgow Hawks touches upon these subtle class elements, adding:

you know my husband he always goes on about them in Edinburgh and I think it’s true what they say, in Edinburgh you will have had your tea, you know and Glasgow people will say would you like your tea or a cup of tea, while in Edinburgh you will have had your tea. I think that’s very true. I always remember he said he could count on one hand the number of times he’s been asked to people’s house in Edinburgh; people he knows fairly well. They are a different breed hahahahaha. Strange things (IT: 13).

Therefore, in presenting these class based differences, a major theoretical point is thus; the class fraction’s relationship to the practice is marked by that fraction’s “schemes of perception”. Furthermore, these “schemes of perception” are linked to the class fraction’s social trajectory in the space of sport – whether one is “veering towards the tastes of another class” (Wilkes, 1990: 126) and this may include being perceived to be too lower or upper-class for a particular class fraction. In other words, when of similar class, the rivalry usually derives from the perception of the ‘other’ being unworthy of their (shared) class and this (un)worthiness is specifically grounded in the class fraction’s ‘distance from necessity’, which, as Bourdieu (1984) argues, is tied to the trajectory that a class fraction inhabits. In rugby, therefore, the different class fractions’ attitudes towards professional rugby are instructive. The largely middle-class habitus (Glasgow and Edinburgh) have a shared disdain for the professional ethos based on the perceived eroding of a class based amateur ethos, though within this fraction itself, there is a second level of geographical distinction evident in the subtle machinations between the city clubs. Meanwhile, in the working-class ‘field’, Hawick respondents exhibit disdain towards Melrose for embracing professionalism too successfully and in so doing, ‘getting above their station’.

In order to fully develop these points, the corresponding data from the football supporters also reveals a class based distinction between the clubs. The class
distinction evidenced in the football clubs has two inter-related elements. On one level, this manifests itself between Glasgow and Edinburgh (along similar lines to the rugby supporters) and, as in the rugby interviews, Edinburgh is presented as the more ‘distinct’ city in class terms. Phrases like ‘soap dodgers’ and ‘slum dwellers’ are commonly utilised by Edinburgh clubs against their Glasgow counterparts in carving out the (perceived) class distinctions between the cities. In discussing city rivalry, Hibs respondent Fred remarks, “Ah’m no’ keen on Glasgow (IT: 11), while fellow Hibs supporter John confesses, “I’ve no time for the city” (IT: 19). On a second level, within Edinburgh itself, there is a perception (evidenced with both clubs) that Hearts view Hibs as slightly lower down the social scale, albeit within a particular ‘space of sport’ circumscribing their relationship, which also includes the intersecting of ethno-religious factors. Hibs supporter Kenny’s comments capture both these levels (Edinburgh / Glasgow and Hearts / Hibs), commenting:

Hearts, they are so arrogant, the Hearts fans. They really think they are something special and are a cut above Aberdeen you know, Hibs and Dundee United. They think they are a little bit bigger and better than us ... they think they are something they are not ... And it’s linked in a bit with they are always kinda seen as the establishment team in Edinburgh ... It’s an attitude that annoys me with Edinburgh folk that take the moral high ground. I mean it’s ok for them to sing ‘in yer Glasgow slums’ and to slag folk for being poor ye know but then they’ll say ‘they’re disgusting bigots’, ye know. We’re ok, we’re allowed to make fun of social deprivation ... it’s a real hoity attitude, it really annoys me about Edinburgh football fans and a lot of Edinburgh people in general (IT: 18 - 22).

Meanwhile, the specific intra-Edinburgh rivalry is reiterated by Hearts supporter Fred explaining his ‘Hearts identity’ in subtle class terms:

It’s the biggest club in Edinburgh. It’s the poshest, it’s the club in Edinburgh that has got a bit of class. I suppose there might be a wee bit of snobbery involved ... but if you had to pick one of the two teams and say which one was the working class team you would probably say Hibs and I dunno, we just felt, ye always felt ye were a wee bit better than them, I dunno why (IT: 3).
working-class 'field' are seen to be accumulating gains in distinction by promoting their perceived middle-class or upper working-class credentials (as evidenced by Hearts disparaging Hibs and both Edinburgh clubs disparaging Glasgow clubs for being 'lower' working-class). While, Rugby supporters, within a largely middle-class 'field', on the other hand accumulate gains in distinction by eschewing explicit associations to middle-class identifiers (as evidenced by Hawks wishing to remain lower than the upper middle-class 'snobs' associated with Edinburgh Accies, and with Hawick being disdainful towards Melrose for 'getting above their station').

Whilst it is true that there are likely to be genuine class based differences between rugby clubs Edinburgh Accies and Hawick, inevitably raising certain questions, Bourdieu (1992) can help clarify this apparent conundrum. Cited in Kay and Laberge (2002), Bourdieu stresses:

positions in a field are determined by the unequal distribution of relevant capitals rather than by the personal attributes of their occupants (Bourdieu, 1993) ... the structure of a field is a state of the power relations among the agents or institutions engaged in the struggle; it is the result of previous struggles and is itself always at stake and likely to be transformed. [Therefore] according to Bourdieu, depending on agents' trajectories and positions in the field, agents will orient themselves differently toward the distribution of the field's specific capitals (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, p. 109) (p. 27).

The class of individual Hawick supporters, therefore, is less central to their collective group position than is the cumulative historical development of the club and its power relationships within the largely middle-class field of Scottish rugby union. These data suggest, then, that different sports and clubs within sports inhabit different positions and trajectories, and subsequently, orient themselves accordingly in order to distinguish their class credentials by raising or lowering their class status to reflect their preferred position on the scale. Returning to the rugby clubs, these subtle class fraction variations between the city rugby clubs and the Borders rugby club are further illustrated by the linkages the city clubs have to fee-paying schools which is not evident in the Borders. It appears that for the city rugby clubs, their 'localised' identity is more closely linked to 'the schools' than to the city (of Glasgow or Edinburgh\textsuperscript{XIV}), whereas for Hawick supporters, the club identity is closely tied to the wider town of Hawick itself. Edinburgh Accies respondent Lesley makes this explicit, noting, "I wouldn't have said it (club identity) is to do with the city because there are so many clubs in the city. I wouldn't have said it's got anything to do with the city. If it's got any tie, it's to do with the school" (IT: 5).
Reinforcing this further, Connor from Edinburgh Accies responds to a question about the importance of Edinburgh to the club identity, adding, "first of all there is the connection with the school and to me it's very important that we have the school connection. Apart from that (school connection), it's (Edinburgh) not so relevant I don't think" (IT: 7). Although a Hawick respondent, Stephen agrees with many of the sentiments expressed by supporters of city rugby clubs, while also expressing the geographical importance of his Hawick identity:

Their (city clubs) fans are different from ours completely because Hawick have, it's a town (emphasis) and it's all geared to that whereas Edinburgh Accies, they could win the cup final, they've no identity, they've no[t] got a town that will come out and support them. The Hawks are the same. They won the cup a few years ago and they went back to their clubrooms and that was it. We won the cup and had an open deck bus along the High Street ken, because it's all Hawick, it's a town. It's a whole town and community. Everything is geared to Hawick things doing well (IT: 25).

This becomes analytically significant when contrasted with the football clubs which all showed significant attachment to geographical location. In all football cases, both the city and specific areas within the city were highlighted as important to the respective club identity. Moreover, across both sports those clubs exhibiting strong linkages to geographical elements (Hawick, Hibs, Hearts, Partick Thistle) were the same clubs expressing strong levels of preference for their local (club) sporting identity over their national (Scotland) sporting identity. This suggests that where geographical habitus attachments are strong this results in 'localised' identity superseding national identity.

In analysing the significance of the local identity superseding any national identity, a further point of interest arises and is closely tied to the main themes to emerge from the football clubs. We can see from both sports that out of the four clubs expressing a stronger localised identity as opposed to national identity, those expressing these sentiments most strongly, (Hawick, Hibs and Hearts) were also the main clubs to exhibit the strongest elements of support for their main 'other' when in opposition to another inter-town / city rival. In other words, it appears that when a strong localised identity exists, not only does it supersede any national identification it also supersedes any local rivalry with major 'others', resulting in club supporters actively wishing their main rival to beat another less 'local' rival.
Although there is evidence of a strong geographical identification for the two Edinburgh football clubs at both a city and more localised level – Edinburgh, Gorgie, Leith, Cowgate - equally significant factors emerged in relation to their club identity and the notion of 'the other' and inform our understanding of the nuances surrounding sporting national identification in Scotland. The main two interlinked factors to transpire from the football clubs in terms of 'club identity' involved first, the supporters' expression of an identity which is situational and highly dependent upon the opposition and its perceived identity and second, a common disdain towards the Old Firm. Therefore, Hibs supporters exaggerate their Irishness against the unionist 'others' of Rangers and Hearts, and exaggerate their Scottishness against the Irish ‘other’ Celtic, while Hearts supporters exaggerate their Scottishness against Rangers and their Britishness against Celtic.

Hibs were named the major other by three out of four Hearts interviewees (the odd one out naming Celtic as his major other), while for Hibs respondents, Hearts were the main other for five out of six respondents, with the remaining respondent naming Rangers and Celtic equally. However, evidence emerged of an increasing resentment towards Celtic and Rangers. Such is the antipathy shown towards the Old Firm, that some prefer their admitted major rival (Hibs or Hearts) to beat either of the Glasgow clubs. Despite a lingering perception in some quarters of Hibs and Hearts being a ‘mini Old Firm’ and despite there being evidence of ethno-religious aspects attached to their respective habitus formation, supporters of both Hibs and Hearts appear to increasingly dislike (Irish) Celtic and (British) Rangers in equal measure. Hearts supporter Fred reflects some of the wider Hearts / Hibs opinions regarding Celtic and Rangers as hated equals, noting, “there’s more and more Hearts fans I would say now hate both of them just as much as the other” (IT: 16 -17).

Although sections of the supporters attached to Hearts and Hibs indulge in “managing a front” according to audience segregation – becoming more or less British / Irish or Scottish depending upon the opposition - it appears that for both clubs a Scottish identity is emerging as the primary national identification among their respective supporters. This is not to deny that within the “space of sport” occupied by Hibs and Hearts in Leith, Gorgie, Edinburgh and Midlothian there are
pockets of British unionist supporters among Hearts and that for some, a form of Irishness has been re-awakened at Hibs. However, when this east “space of sport” interacts with the west (Glasgow) “space of sport” the apparent overriding concern for supporters of both clubs seems to be to distance themselves from the ‘sectarianised Old Firm’ whilst reinforcing a Scottish identity. It is at this juncture that analysing the football respondents’ opinions on the Scotland national team becomes instructive, for evidence of Hibs, Hearts and Partick Thistle embodying a Scottish identity in direct opposition to Rangers and Celtic becomes even more apparent.

3. Scotland’s Sporting Identity

In common with the Edinburgh clubs, a central element of the Partick Thistle identity appeared to involve distancing self from (Irish) Celtic and (British) Rangers and central to this distancing process is an alignment with the Scotland team. The Partick Thistle club identity is perceived by supporters to go hand in hand with Scottishness. The Partick Thistle respondents were also the most likely to describe themselves as “Scottish not British” and to desire independence. Additionally, throughout the interviews, it was implied that the travelling Scotland support (tartan army) has an extraordinary high percentage of Partick Thistle supporters relative to most other clubs – this is supported by Giulianotti (1994). Throughout the Hibs and Hearts interviews, it was also apparent that their supporters perceived the Scotland support to be made up of large numbers of both their own supporters and Partick Thistle supporters more generally. Furthermore, respondents from all football clubs (and Hawks) actually expressed the belief that few Celtic or Rangers supporters attend Scotland football fixtures.

Throughout the football interviews, England was named as the major other, although some respondents expressed support for England when playing less local opposition. Additionally, no respondent expressed anti-English sentiment as some may have expected. It appears therefore, that post-99 with increased political autonomy, the nature of the tartan army may be becoming less anti-English and
more anti-'Old Firm'. That is, in tandem with a perceived reduction in the number of Celtic and Rangers supporters at Scotland matches, and the apparent increase in supporters from other clubs viewing them both as 'sectarian' folk devils, the 'not Old Firm' tag becomes a newly emergent and post-99 position against which, both at club level and national level, the tartan army now defines itself. As Giulianotti (1991) astutely predicted:

Should Scotland gain greater political and economic autonomy from England ... then the significant 'cultural dislike' of England will be less routinely reproduced than is currently the case. Given such a scenario, the net effect would be that the Scottish team [supporters] would be required to find a way of positively presenting themselves, rather than simply irradiating an ossified typology of Englishness, and negatively defining themselves against it (p. 522).

At club level there is evidence of "gains in distinction" in 'not being Old Firm' according to the data. It would be a natural extension to assume this could carry over to the international team too. Indeed, this appears to be partly evidenced. A number of respondents suggested that Rangers and Celtic supporters would be 'slagged off' if known to be supporters of either club during Scotland trips. Part of the enjoyment for Scotland supporters is that the Scotland international arena is freed of club rivalries. Pat explains the club-free Scotland experience, ironically, noting the appearance of a Partick Thistle top, which in itself may be representative of a more subtle 'Scottish' signifier:

I can only ever remember once seeing that (club colours at Scotland match) and it was Partick Thistle ... and I couldn't understand why he was wearing it. I mean ye are no[tt] there to support yer club, ye are there to support yer country. And for me he shouldnae be wearing club colours in any form (IT: 10).

The following transcript from Partick Thistle respondent, Ellen, reveals these subtle themes further. She is questioned about the differences between those England supporters who explicitly display club colours (usually flags rather than shirts) and the Scotland supporters who don't:

JK You see that with England fans don't you? Do you know why that is?

E Probably because in England they support their national team. I think if you turned up at a Scotland game with a Rangers or Celtic scarf ye would get lynched.

JK Or what about a Partick Thistle top or scarf?

E Ha, yeah we would get clapped and get a seat down the front. No I think everybody's there to support the national team and it doesn't matter what
Despite being made in a half joking manner, these comments reveal two underlying elements running through most of the football interviews. First, by comparing England – where “they support their national team” – Ellen insinuates that there are club supporters in Scotland who do not support the national team. Moreover, these supporters are explicitly outed without prior prompting by exclusive reference to “Celtic and Rangers scarf” wearers getting “lynched”. In other words, Celtic and Rangers signify non-Scottish symbolism and consequently are viewed as oppositional to Scotland. Second, unlike the non-Scottish ‘Old Firm’, Partick Thistle are perceived as inherently ‘Scottish’, as shown by the “we would get seats down the front” joke.

In discussing aspects of national identity in Scottish sport and society, it was revealed that the relationship is complex and unpredictable in parts. Hawks respondents were the most uniform, all expressing their national identity as ‘more Scottish than British’ and three desiring devolution, with one preferring independence. There was little pattern across or within the sports and within the other clubs. For example, even within the second most uniform group, the Partick Thistle supporters, three respondents describe themselves as ‘Scottish not British’ and one states ‘more Scottish than British’. However, one of those (Davie) stating ‘Scottish not British’ did not prefer independence but rather devolution, while one (Pat) described himself as ‘more Scottish than British’ and expressed, at different times, a desire for both independence and devolution.

Paterson at al (2001) remind us that “national identity does not in and of itself explain constitutional and political attitudes” (p. 102) and add, “the fact that party choice, national identity and constitutional preference do not overlap in any neat way suggests that there are different ways of ‘being Scottish’” (p. 115). Bond and Rosie (2002) conclude, “once again we have discovered that national identity does not map on to the political perspective as neatly as we might suppose” (p.52). These points perhaps become clearest when analysing the constitutional identities expressed by the Hearts supporters. Fred and Jack describe themselves as ‘more
Scottish than British’, with Fred preferring a Westminster government and Jack deviation. Andy describes himself as ‘Scottish not British’ and desires independence for Scotland. Diane, who despite describing herself as ‘equally Scottish and British’, shares Andy’s preference for Scottish independence thereby demonstrating the possible paradoxes inherent in political and national identity construction. These paradoxes are further reinforced when Diane and Fred both admit to supporting England at football and cricket respectively.

Diane and Andy, both born in the mid-1980s were the youngest respondents from Hearts. This may help to explain their preference for independence, as McCrone and Paterson (2002) highlight that the desire for independence rose from 7% in 1979 to 25% in 1992. Additionally, Bond and Rosie (2002) found that since 1992 national identity superseded class identity, with more Scots feeling they have more in common with Scots of a different class than with English people of the same class. Reinforcing this claim, Paterson et al (2001) found that in 1992 43% of Scots identified more with nation compared to the 24% identifying more with class and this contrasts with figures of 38% and 44% respectively in 1979. In addition to considering these wider findings, fifty two year old Fred’s response suggests that a youthful ideological outlook contributed to his previous political desire for Scottish independence:

I think everybody dabbles with nationalism and the SNP, although it was before I was old enough to vote ... I think as ye grow up ye sort of ... ye start to look at things from a broader perspective rather than just this sort of insular sort of nationalism and the shortbread tins sort of thing (IT: 25).

As stated in the previous chapter, it becomes clear that more than mere national identity is informing his constitutional preferences. As previously shown, Fred describes his political journey, demonstrating that his class habitus overrides his national identity habitus. “Ye realise they are no any different from what you are. Ok they have a different accent but their outlook on life tends to be the same (IT: 26). This may be linked to the aforementioned findings by Bond and Rosie (2002) and Paterson et al. (2001), with 1950s-born Fred remaining closer to his class identity than his national identity.
Partick Thistle respondents Pat and Steve also associate sporting nationalism with political nationalism and extend the perceived link between England and 'Toryism'. Pat suggests that the tartan army may be politically inclined to be “anti-Tory [because] the anti-Tory bit can also be anti-English” (IT: 17), while Steve asserts, “the values of the Labour Party are the values of the Scottish people” (IT: 8).

These responses indicate that the relationship between national identity and political preference is often complex, as demonstrated by Fred's desire for a UK identity grounded in internationalism (and socialism) rather than any 'unionist' or nationalist doctrine and Pat and Steve inter-linking England with (political) Conservativism, and Scotland with (old Labour) socialism.

In terms of sporting linkages to Scottish national identity, one of the major points to emerge across both sports was a perception that both sports' national teams have gained 'new' fans in recent years and, again, the differences between the two sports in terms of maintaining distinction becomes apparent. In rugby these themes are partially supported by respondents from all clubs, revealing the perception of increasing numbers of 'non-traditional' rugby supporters – likened by some respondents to 'football fans' – attending regional and international fixtures in Scotland. In describing these 'new' supporters, Hawick respondent Meg labels them "kilted warriors" (IT: 32), and she asserts that in the last ten years increasing numbers of Scotland rugby supporters wear kilts and sing nationalistic songs:

There are now vast numbers of folk who go to rugby and some of them I think huvnie a clue about what rugby's about ...It used to be that the crowd was very well mannered. You know if there was a player taking a penalty or conversion then the crowd was quiet but now there's the element coming in where very, very few players are given silence for their kick and it's come in right through [all levels of rugby] ... I would say there's been a decline in manners among the crowd ... There are a lot more fans wearing kilts now than there ever used to be (IT: 13).

The extent to which the antipathy shown towards the newly emerging "kilted warriors" is class based remains unclear. It may simply be the manner in which the newcomers support the team, or it may be the increasingly obvious display of nationalist dress and behaviour which offends the traditional fans. Accies respondent Aaron adds:

There are certainly different people [who] come to the internationals now than perhaps ten years ago. You wouldn't have seen them at Murrayfield. You sit next to
them, you listen to them, you hear the language and you go, ‘these aren’t the people that we used to have here ten years ago’ (IT: 15).

Bourdieu’s (1984) insights help us understand these expressions. In discussing the attitudes to practices in light of their increasing popularity, he shows that the ranking of values in one class fraction finds its inverse in another class fraction:

Explicit aesthetic choices are in fact often constituted in opposition to the choices of the groups closet in social space, with whom the competition is most direct and most immediate ... the more strongly a singer is preferred by the less cultivated, the more he or she is refused by the most cultivated – whose tastes in this area are almost exclusively expressed in rejections. These refusals, almost always expressed in the mode of distaste, are often accompanied by pitying or indignant remarks about the corresponding tastes ('I can’t understand how anyone can like that!'). Similarly, one finds that the declining petite bourgeoisie systematically rejects the virtues that the new petite bourgeoisie most readily claims for itself (pp. 60 - 61).

Explicating this further, and allowing us additional insight, Bourdieu adds:

Their very accessibility and all that this entails, such as undesirable contacts, tend to discredit them in the eyes of the dominant class. And indeed, the most typically popular sports ... which ... in their early days were the delight of aristocrats, but which, in becoming popular, have ceased to be what they were, combine all the features which repel the dominant class (p. 214).

Thus, in rugby we are reminded of Accies respondent Aaron, lamenting:

there are lots coming to watch us and filling the stadium ... there is a broader Scottish kinda support and it’s almost like a Scottish uniform is starting to appear now of a Scotland rugby shirt, a jersey, a pair of Timberland boots with socks down below the knees ... I used to wear a kilt [to matches] but now I wouldn’t be seen dead in it. I don’t want to be associated with that sort of em, almost false patriotism that seems to be walking around. I’m almost trying to disassociate myself from that now. I see those guys going around Paris and Dublin and all the rest of the internationals. They can go that way (he points to opposite corner) and I’m going to go this way thank you very much. You know I’m still supporting my country but I’m not going to be associated with that (IT: 16).

Therefore, with increasing numbers of new fans (outsiders), certain aspects of supporting the Scotland team appear to have taken on a different meaning resulting in Aaron adapting his behaviour in order to maintain the impression he desires. This ‘broader’ support, which engages in practices and behaviour which seem incompatible with the “front” being maintained by Aaron illuminate the subtle class tensions implicit within the Scotland rugby support and in the ways in which they express their Scottishness. These become visible by the competing ways they acquire gains in distinction. On one level there appears to be the ‘new’ fan, the “parvenus” (Bourdieu, 1984) whose tastes are veering towards those of another
class (Wilkes, 1990), and whose very presence simultaneously contributes to these pre-existing dominant class tastes being transformed into negative symbols for the dominant class. That is, the "outsider" 'football' type patriot fan is perceived by the established traditional fans to be bringing increasing levels of nationalism and boorishness to rugby. Consequently, on another level, these previously accepted practices are suddenly being avoided rather than embraced by that dominant class and, the existing dominant class fraction – illustrated by Aaron in this case – maintain their distinction by shifting their preferences in order to maintain their distinction.

This maintainance of distinction evident in rugby within the context of increasing popularisation of the sport also finds its equivalent manifestation in football and is most clearly expressed by Hibs respondent John who comments:

There's nae beating aboot it, there's some kilted clowns that really just go to dress up and say 'here I am, I'm Scottish' and they actually go abroad and they celebrate the fact - that look how bad we are but we don't care, we'll just get bevvied and have a party anyway and it'll be wonderful. And I'm afraid that attitude completely does ma head in and it's even becoming more and more prevalent as ye follow Scotland ... Ye used to see the odd kilt if ye were abroad with Scotland but very, very few ... Now ... it's like the mafia where if yer no[t] properly dressed for the Scotland game ye know ye are almost excommunicated if you've no[t] got the right tartan on and yev no[t] got the right boots on or yev no[t] got the silly Loch Ness hat on yer head or something. Ye know, the stupider ye dress up ... As I say, they seem to revel in the fact they don't care if they get beat ten nil, ye know, we're Scottish and we're having a laugh, we're just here for the drink and everything ... We've turned into caricatures of ourselves ... It's just become totally embarrassing now to be honest with ye and it annoys me (IT: 23 - 25).

To understand this further, MacCannell's concept of "staged authenticity" proves helpful. McCrone et al. (1995) draw upon this and Urry's (1990) "tourist gaze" highlighting, that for Urry, modern tourists:

are to be treated as semioticians reading the landscape for certain pre-established notions or signs ... a new breed has been formed, the 'post-tourist'. Post-tourists ... know that there is no authentic tourist experience, merely a series of games and texts that can be played (p. 35).

Thus sections of the tartan army, particularly perhaps the more recent members, read the landscape playing a series of games and texts to confirm their pre-established notion of how to be an authentic 'foot soldier', becoming 'post-fans'.
McCrone et al. reflect some of Debord’s (1994) claims, noting:

We examined the arguments for heritage as a form of ‘staged authenticity’ in which image has replaced reality and simulacra masquerade as heritage as a form of history that never really existed. Places become centres of spectacle and display, and the nostalgia associated with heritage is a powerful emotion ... Spectacle has replaced meaning, and sensation overpowers value (p. 207).

The spectacle of the “kilted clowns” (simulacra) is, therefore, a “staged authenticity” in which the performers actively play their role amid “the centres of spectacle”, which for the tartan army include various exotic locations from Estonia to Stockholm. Not only then are there increasing numbers of vulgar newcomers bereft of competence, in the eyes of the established group at least, they have become caricatures less interested in the result and more interested in “the drink and everything”, resulting in reduced gains in distinction for the established members within the group. Bourdieu (1984) helps us understand this further:

In an age when participation is not always a sufficient guarantee of the rarity of the participants, those who seek to prove their excellence must affirm their disinterestedness by remaining aloof from practices devalued by the appearances of sheep-like conformism which they acquired by becoming more common. To distance themselves from common amusements, the privileged once again need only let themselves be guided by the horror of vulgar crowds which always leads them elsewhere, higher, further, to new experiences and virgin spaces, exclusively or firstly theirs, and also by the sense of the legitimacy of their practices, which is a function of their distributional value, of course, but also of the degree to which they lend themselves to aestheticisation, in practice or discourse (p. 215).

John clearly illustrates the belief in the legitimacy of his – and illegitimacy of others’ - behaviour in distancing self from vulgar crowds and being first to find “virgin space” as an established tartan army member rather than a “kilted clown” outsider:

I used to laugh when I would see it in the papers that ‘oh Scotland have been drawn against some team fae wherever it wis in Eastern Europe and the tartan army won’t like this’ (emphasises this in the guise and style of a reporter). Well they were fuckin wrong. This is everything the tartan army wanted, some obscure part of the world where nobody had been to before, ye know when Russia started breaking up and it was brilliant (emphasised) and ye would go to Estonia the first time and it was a different world, two to three thousand people there and it was brilliant but now if ye played in Estonia next week there’d be five thousand Scots fans there and it wouldnae be the same. But maybe that’s a wee bit elitist and maybe that’s part of it. Oh everybody does it now so it’s not quite got the same buzz to it. But that was part of it (IT: 25).

Thus, when participation is increasing – with the arrival of ‘new’ (post-fans) fans – rarity cannot be guaranteed by participation alone. Therefore, for Aaron and John at
least, avoiding the devalued "sheep-like" conformity maintains their distinction. It appears then that the dominant class within the "sport space" does not have to be classified along class lines but may, depending upon the context and "space of sport", be better classified as established and outsider (newcomer). For example, Hibs respondent John is probably of a similar social class as the "kilted clown" newcomers, yet he increasingly dislikes the Scotland matches now that they have become so popularised and mainstream. As Elias and Scotson (1994) show, "contact with outsiders threatens an "insider" with the lowering of their own status within the established group" and leads to the established group members sharing a "fear of pollution" from newcomers (p. xxiv). The corresponding rugby example evidenced in Aaron's increasing refusal to wear the kilt at Scotland rugby matches may be more related to a social class distinction process whereby he is distancing himself from the newcomer 'football types' and non-traditional supporters, which can be translated into working class football fans. The extent to which Aaron's resentment is similar in origin to John's - that is, grounded in established and outsider relations per se - requires further research, as it seems plausible that this could apply in Aaron's case also. These comments may be more fully explained if one considers the possibility that the 'traditional' habitus of the rugby fan in Scotland has been linked to a club and is often perceived to be middle-class or public school influenced. This should be juxtaposed with Scotland fans at recent rugby matches behaving increasingly more like the football type of fan - as a result, perhaps, of both football fans crossing over codes and also with more traditional rugby fans embodying a football type habitus. Additionally, there may also be a "sporting" habitus which exhibits no technical or physical expertise or capital for its possessors, but is linked more to merely enjoying watching sport.

A major point that emerged in relation to national identity focused on the singing of national anthems, revealing a determination among the Scotland rugby supporters to protect the "fostered impression" (Goffman, 1959) of their Scottish sporting identity.
In contextualising this, the following quote from respected Scottish rugby commentator Bill McLaren's (1992) autobiography documents the build up to the 1990 Calcutta Cup match between Scotland and England at Murrayfield.

... and then came the moment that Scots will never forget – the sight of Scotland’s fifteen joining with the fifty-three thousand-strong crowd in the most inspiring rendering of ‘Flower of Scotland’ that one ever could imagine. It was quite overwhelming ... I have to admit to a feeling of high emotion and intense national pride ... It seemed as if the whole of Scotland was united in anthem behind the national side ... It certainly stirred the blood of every Scot (p. 210).

Discussing this event, Jarvie (1993) suggests:

The adoption by such a conservative Scottish institution as the Scottish Rugby Union of the populist national anthem ‘Flower of Scotland’ at one level might be seen as insignificant and yet at another level it was a profound gesture of sentimentality which in part encapsulated the mood of the Scottish people at a particular point in time (p. 58).

Although the adoption of such a nationalist anthem by a ‘conservative’ institution like the SRU may indeed be profound and representative of sections of “the Scottish people” or “many Scots”xlvii, particularly considering that it eventually replaced the UK anthem God Save the Queen, there is a third level of significance attached to this which Jarvie has overlooked and which became evident in analysing the interview data. Bairner’s (2001) insightful remark that the adoption of the Flower of Scotland “appears to have tapped into the patriotic sentiment and as a result to have won support from every section of Scottish society” (p. 63; emphasis added) is partially correct. It probably did tap into patriotic sentiment and it probably did win support from most if not all sections of Scottish society. However, the evidence suggests that it did not win universal support because of its Scottish nationalist sentiment. As Bairner himself highlights in the same passage, “this would hardly explain why the Princess Royal, in her capacity as Patron of the SRU, was willing to sing the song so lustily” (p.63). Rather, it appears that it garnered the support, at least of the conservative SRU and a large proportion of its conservative members, for the very opposite reason. The SRU’s use of Flower of Scotland prevented embarrassment from the increasing levels of booing and disdain shown towards the UK anthem by the Murrayfield supporters.
Accies respondent Connor and Hawks respondent Derek are representative of a number of comments made:

I think it’s a dirge and I don’t really like it but I will sing it as heartily if we are at Murrayfield or wherever ... the move was made very simply because people were booing God Save the Queen (Connor IT: 19).

It was suitable at the time to adopt something as an anthem because the, because of the poor performance of the singing of the UK national anthem, which used to take place before all home internationals. That left a lot to be desired ... I mean I and others recognise that it’s not the answer but there is no obvious answer at present so it will do meantime (Derek IT: 16).

To understand this, Goffman (1959) proves insightful. He states, “It would seem that while a team-performance is in progress, any member of the team has the power to give the show away or to disrupt it by inappropriate conduct (p. 88). Performers have an “expressive responsibility” (p. 203) to act in a way that will not endanger the impression management being sustained. If one abandons this responsibility, giving the show away by disrupting it, ‘hubris’ and shame potentially result. Therefore, in alleviating this problem at their ‘show’, the SRU adopt the Flower of Scotland. A further crucial element comes into play at this point, and is explained by Goffman (1959):

There are colleague groupings of a more corporate character, whose members are so closely identified in the eyes of other people that the good reputation of one practitioner depends on the good conduct of the others. If one member is exposed and causes a scandal, then all lose some public repute (p. 164).

This “scandal” avoidance provides perhaps part of the explanation for the replacement of God Save The Queen by The Flower of Scotland. Another part of the explanation can be demonstrated by realising that conversely, there are some members of colleague groupings whose membership is so closely identified as representative of the wider group that their positive behaviour can be legitimately viewed as representative of that group. Hence, when the Princess Royal lustily and publicly sings Flower of Scotland one could argue its potential nationalistic message is neutered rather than nourished transforming it from nationalist anthem to establishment folk tune and serving as a signifier of a dual Scottish cultural patriotism and British civic nationalism. In this respect, many of Scotland’s “conservative” fans and administrators would adopt the anthem as a national symbol. Andrews (1996) makes a similar point regarding the Welsh Rugby Union.
actively seeking to reinforce and cement a British imperial state identity co-existing alongside a Welsh identity by, among other things, incorporating the three-feathers insignia of the Prince of Wales on the scarlet jersey of the Welsh rugby union team. Andrews writes:

Welsh developments and successes were thrust on the world stage, and their profile was heightened by articulating them as constituent components of the British empire... Rugby played a major role in reinforcing the British imperial identity of Wales (pp. 63 - 64).

In this way, the patriotism of the Welsh – their love of their Welsh nation – was fused and actually reinforced by their civic nationalism to the United Kingdom and appears to have a Celtic counterpart in Scotland. The SRU undeniably adopted Flower of Scotland during a period of increasing Scottish nationalism and during a period when God Save the Queen was increasingly being publicly rejected. Irrespective of their intentions, the result would appear to suggest that the adoption of the nationalistic anthem may have had less to do with forging a Scottish nationalistic voice and more to do with articulating a dual and complementary British nationalist and Scottish patriotic identity.
8. Conclusion

This concluding chapter summarises the thesis. The opening section provides a statement of limitations before proceeding to chart the main findings in order to provide a more sociologically informed understanding of Scottish sporting identities. The thesis is then situated in its wider context within the existing literature and provides future recommendations for building upon its findings contributing further knowledge in the field.

The study primarily relies on empirical data gathered from a small sample of rugby union and football supporters specially selected to participate. In this respect, the sample remains too small and homogeneous to make grandiose claims regarding "the Scottish sporting public". As Bairner (2001) correctly cautions, the place of women in Scottish sport requires further analysis and, despite promising avenues relating to female involvement in the empirical data, the present study was unable to deal with these in even a cursory manner. It is acknowledged that ideally more women and ethnic minority interviewees would have been desirable as both remain under-developed areas in the literature and promise rich sociological rewards when finally accorded the analytical treatment they deserve. Additionally, it appears the case that the majority of interviewees were of Christian background (practising and non-practising) and future research would benefit from a wider ethno-religious sample.

Given that the thesis has been informed by a realist and constructivist approach, it makes no claim to provide the only truth. Rather, a truth based on the empirical data gathered within a clearly set-out methodological framework has been provided. This truth has been presented by recourse to two complementary theorists which facilitates a primary and secondary level of synthesis. The findings generated make an original contribution to the existing literature on sport and national identity in Scotland at a primary level and sport and national identity at a secondary level.

The claims made in the study represent the interpretation of interviewees' practises, values, opinions, and attitudes. However, it is suggested that these findings can be viewed as generalisable and, perhaps, specifically pertinent to the present study, this
generalisability relates more to theoretical inferences rather than statistical representations. In this respect, although a small sample was used, the methodological procedure adopted allows the individual responses from interviewees to be regarded (with caution) as potentially representative of the respective wider supporter group. The interview samples sought were intended to generate sociologically driven exploratory information which could be used in conjunction with the information from previously reviewed literature.

There are a number of key themes which build upon existing research and which provide a timely reminder of the importance of getting out into the ‘field’ and discovering the social realities as they exist for the subjects under study. Perhaps the clearest finding is that despite its apparent inconspicuousness, the position of class in studies of national identity and sport in Scotland is still of primary importance. While it is true that class conceptions have changed and shifted in post-industrial Scotland (in tandem with other countries), this necessitates more subtle class-based analyses, rather than a premature acceptance of its demise as an important classificatory concept. In attempting such a nuanced analysis, class remained a central feature of the other major finding of the study, namely that of spacial attachment. Even where a civic, regional / town identity was acknowledged as a primary identifier, subtle class elements were revealed lurking within the geographical embodiment of habitus.

There were no observable patterns across clubs or sports regarding constitutional or political identity and perhaps this is partly due to the small sample numbers. It may also be illustrative of the complex nature of political, constitutional and sporting identification within Scotland in the twenty first century with a Scottish Parliament and increasing Europeanisation processes. Although there were examples of sporting nationalism – both Scottish and British - and patriotism being expressed, the findings remain equivocal in terms of identifying sport or club specific differences. Further research is desirable here in order to make more significant claims in this regard.

The thesis has discovered a number of factors influencing the relationship in Scotland between national identity and sport and has found a variety of Scottish
sporting identities existing within and across clubs. Rugby union supporters share a stronger personal bond with players and highly value the fading amateur ethos, which along with increasing professionalism, is believed to be eroding the fabric of the game in Scotland. At a deeper level, the subtle class machinations between the Borders and city rugby clubs reveals differences in their respective approaches to making gains in distinction and are clearly manifested in their relationships with major rivals. Subtle class differences are also evident within the football clubs and, revealingly, by contrasting the two sports we illuminate what appear to be significant differences between both sports in relation to class position and trajectory in the pursuit of accumulating gains in distinction.

Across both sports, distinction is accumulated according to differing class trajectories and habitus. In rugby union, therefore, the middle-class city clubs express an antipathy towards Heriots for being “too professional” and “mercenary” in their approach, while the Borders (and more working-class) club Hawick dislike Melrose for “getting above their station”. At a superficial level this points towards a shared disdain for the eroding of the amateur ideal. At a deeper level, however, the joint antipathy towards professionalism by both types of club (middle-class and working-class) reveals a joint aversion to rugby union being tied to “economic necessity” (Bourdieu, 1984). Moreover, one can see clearly therefore, that rugby union supporters accumulate gains in distinction by avoiding explicit associations to middle-class identifiers – the upper middle-class Accies avoiding the rather crude professionalism of Heriots, and the largely working-class Hawick avoiding the ‘delusions of grandeur’ associated with Melrose. This is in sharp contrast to the football supporters and the way they accumulate gains in distinction. The football supporters accumulate gains in distinction by promoting their perceived middle-class or upper working-class positions and simultaneously exaggerating the lower class status of their rivals. This became evident at both local and regional levels. First, within Edinburgh, Hearts and Hibs supporters believe that Hearts perceive their club to be of higher class distinction. At a regional level all football clubs expressed the view that Edinburgh supporters perceive the city to be of higher class status than Glasgow. It should be highlighted that on both these levels, ethno-religious factors are closely tied to the class elements of status accorded Hibs, Hearts, Edinburgh and Celtic, Rangers and Glasgow.
Additionally, the more working-class ‘fields’ of the football clubs and the Borders rugby club demonstrate a stronger local identity based on various socio-geographical factors which remain absent from the city rugby clubs. It appears that where a local identity is strong this supersedes any national sporting identification. Therefore, the supporters of the three football clubs and Hawick have a higher degree of spacial identification to their locality. In this respect, they are more likely to exhibit a stronger local identity than national identity, to such an extent that they even support their major rivals in preference to less local opponents. The only tangible local identification for the city rugby clubs appears to be more related to ‘the schools’ and does not appear to lead to any local identity superseding national identity. These findings suggest that there is a degree of diversity in terms of socio-cultural representation between fans across the rugby clubs (as evidenced in the city / Borders distinction) and across both sports (as evidenced by the different approaches to accruing gains in distinction by either embracing or eschewing middle class credentials). Clearly, this requires further research in order to make more substantiated claims. Ideally, additional city and Borders clubs would be analysed and a more diverse sample, in terms of the previously mentioned ethno-religious backgrounds, would be sought.

In terms of football club identity, a high degree of situational ‘front’ was apparent, with supporters engaging in “audience segregation” (Goffman, 1959) emphasising and reducing particular aspects of their collective identity based on the perceived “front” presented by the opposition supporters. One common theme to emerge from all clubs was a strong antipathy towards Rangers and Celtic (clubs and supporters), with a ‘folk devil’ ascription given to the two Glasgow clubs. It is clear that for many Hibs, Hearts and Partick Thistle supporters, disassociating themselves from the ‘sectarianised’ Rangers and Celtic is a major contributor to accumulating symbolic capital. The significance of class here should also be considered, particularly in relation to the aforementioned class distinctions apparent within Edinburgh and Glasgow. Although further research in this area is desirable, it seems fair to acknowledge that class and, for the Edinburgh-based supporters, space are contributory factors towards this antipathy towards Glasgow’s Old Firm.
There is evidence to suggest that the clubs in the study (re)present their own club identity in relation, that is, in direct opposition, to the British / English / Loyalist Rangers and the Irish / Republican Celtic resulting in increasing levels of 'Scottishness' among the studied clubs. This 'Scottishness' appears to be replicated at international level also, with a perception that Celtic and Rangers have few Scotland supporters and that a selection of other provincial Scottish clubs are over-represented. It appears that Giulianotti (1991) was correct and that a central feature of post-99 Scottish football identity involves abandoning the traditional “cultural dislike” (p. 522) of the English. This is not to deny of course that England still represent the major sporting ‘other’, it merely accords with Giulianotti’s assertion that the tartan army is indeed intent on performing the role of “instrumental ambassadors”, fostering “ambassadorial bonhomie” in opposition to ‘English’ hooliganism. Giulianotti’s prediction captures only half the story, however. In addition to maintaining a (changing) rivalry with England, a central feature of this post-99 Scottish football identity involves strong anti-Old Firm elements at both club and national level. With the Old Firm increasingly being viewed as ‘un-Scottish’ or even ‘anti-Scottish’, by large sections of Scotland’s football public, the construction of the imagined ‘Scottish’ football identity is bolstered by being anti-Old Firm. Indeed, if there was one single ‘national’ factor common across the football clubs it is the stated desire to demonstrate and bolster a Scottish sporting identity by being anti-Old Firm.

In both sports significant numbers of respondents expressed a belief in ‘new’ fans appearing at international fixtures within the last ten years, and again, with analysis, the extent to which popular representations of Scottish national identity are either exhibited or eschewed by existing fans reveals subtle tensions in relation to class and national identity. In football, there is a perceived increase in ‘tourist’ fans and a reduction in Old Firm fans attending Scotland fixtures, while rugby has apparently experienced an increase in football type boorishness and nationalism at fixtures. This is partially evidenced by claims of a rapid increase in the public display of tartan and national dress in recent years (in both sports) as well as a perceived drop in manners and decency at Scotland rugby matches. It is possible to posit that there may well be a cross over of football fans now attending rugby fixtures and that with the decreasing levels of anti-Englishness at Scotland football matches, that rugby
provides fresh territory for the expression of a 'more traditional' type of nationalism on the sporting stage. In tandem with the appearance of these new fans and changing behaviours, sections within the established groups of supporters, across both sports, are increasingly avoiding associating with the visible signifiers that represent the popular Scottish sporting identity. Again, further research is required here, as although this theme arose across both sports, the only conclusive common characteristic of those expressing the view was that they were part of the established group.

The adoption of Flower of Scotland by the SRU is perhaps metaphorically applicable in understanding Scottish sporting identities post-99. If Jarvie (1993) and Jarvie and Walker (1994) are correct and the adoption of Flower of Scotland by the conservative SRU did indeed tap into “the mood” of the “Scottish people”, one is obliged to ask into what mood and which people? It appears that although it probably is true to assert the Flower of Scotland tapped into patriotic sentiment and did win popular support among sections of the ‘Scottish people’, these two assertions are not necessarily or inevitably coterminous. One is equally obliged to assert that for other sections of ‘the Scottish people’ their ‘mood’ was either not captured by the Flower of Scotland or was, but paradoxically as a result of reinforcing a dual and complimentary Scottish patriotic and British nationalistic identity. McCrone et al. (1995) drew attention to the “increasing difficulty” experienced in separating cultural nationalism from political nationalism. Perhaps the time has come to move beyond this rather narrow framework and to broaden the question further. It seems more pertinent to ask not simply whether one’s nationalism is cultural or political (or both), but crucially, to ask whether the ‘nationalism’ is indeed nationalism or if it is more accurately defined as patriotism? Additionally, one would be wise to ascertain exactly which nation or nation-state is being invoked, for the sport and national identity nexus is more malleable than often assumed.

It appears fair to assert that it remains a step too far to claim a Scottish sporting identity exists in anything other than the imagined consciousness of a small minority. It is more appropriate to remind ourselves that a variety of Scottish national sporting identities exist, some multi-faceted and some complimentary,
some nationalistic and some patriotic. This thesis has provided a sociologically driven explanation of why this is the case. For example, class and spacial factors remain significant in the contraction of Scottish sporting identities, and it is possible to be either a Scottish cultural patriot or a British civic nationalist – or both. Jarvie and Walker's (1994) reminder that Scottish sport "has contributed to a sense of nation, class and even community" (p. 3) remains pertinent today. Perhaps the overlapping nature of these three elements has been prematurely overlooked and that rather than treat them as hermetically sealed entities, one should equally consider their compounding possibilities in the construction of national identities. In other words, class, community and national identities intersect with and contribute to both complimentary and contradictory "senses of nation".

Despite clear differences between the rugby and football supporters regarding elements of spatial and class identifiers, it remains too early to meaningfully pinpoint significant differences across both sports in relation to the national identities. Moreover, it seems incontrovertible to assume that in addition to rugby union and football national identities existing in Scotland, other equally meaningful sporting identities remain partially or completely undiscovered by the academic gaze. Wha's like us? – This depends as much, it seems, on class and spaciality factors as much as it does on any national factor.
NOTES

1 The victors would win the Calcutta Cup, the Championship, the Triple Crown and the Grand Slam.
2 Lord Rosebery was appointed Undersecretary of State at the Home Office with special responsibility for Scottish affairs in 1881. He later became Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister.
3 Large sections of both clubs’ supporters chanted this to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher throughout the match, while holding aloft red cards which had been widely distributed around the stadium vicinity before the match began.
4 A more accurate term would be “Scotland supporters” as not all supporters of Scotland are necessarily ‘Scottish’.
5 Also see Bourdieu (1990).
6 As shown in this sub-section, there are other examples where Bourdieu has provided explanatory definitions of habitus. Also, see Distinction (1984: 170).
7 This is where Goffman’s symbolic interactionism approach informs the research at a secondary level.
8 This theoretical application compliments the ‘realist’ epistemological position adopted in the current research.
9 In addition to encompassing some of Goffman’s ‘dramaturgical model’, Bourdieu’s generative concept “schemes of perception” appears similar to Goffman’s concept of “vocabulary of fronts” (Goffman, 1959:36).
10 Although Bourdieu’s example here refers to ‘national’ ‘spaces of sport’ (fields), they can refer to more localised spaces within the same nation-state or ‘nation’.
11 In addition to the aforementioned similarities in some of their concepts, Bourdieu published a tribute to Goffman after his death. See “Erving Goffman, Discoverer of the Infinitely Small”. In Theory, Culture and Society, (1983) 2 112-113.
12 This is a new web-based initiative from the SRU, which facilitates the selling of international match day tickets.
13 In the absence of official club figures, personal communication with the club secretary revealed that Hawick, in common with some other rugby union clubs, do not record exact attendance figures. Therefore, the 600 figure used represents an estimate.
14 The ‘sevens’ tournaments are an annual gala day event in which teams of seven players compete on one day for the sevens trophy. A number of clubs organise their own sevens tournaments.
15 Figures taken from 2001 census (http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/census/censushm/index.html). Additionally, in the absence of figures relating to Hawick specifically, the density of people per hectare can be compared by regions, with Greater Glasgow having 15.62 people per hectare, Midlothian having 4.42 people per hectare and the Borders having 0.23 people per hectare.
16 In March 2007, the SRU announced that from the following season onwards there would no longer be a Borders Reivers team due to financial constraints.
17 Sometimes the club are referred to as Edinburgh Academicals. Accies is often used for shorthand.
18 Figure taken from the 2001 census.
19 This derby match took place the following week after the transmission of the Panorama programme on 27/2/05.
20 Alexander (2003) claims “Heart of Midlothian’s grasp of its own history leaves much to be desired” (p. 311).
21 Most recently, on October, 2006, 17 rival supporters were arrested for disturbances following a Hibs v Hearts derby (see Sabadus, 2006). Additionally, on November 4th 2006, in the immediate aftermath of a Celtic v Hearts fixture, the official Hearts website referred to Celtic’s support as “gypsies”. The person responsible – Iain Gibson, a Conservative party press officer – later apologised.
22 There seems to be some confusion surrounding the official name of this organisation. Mackay (1986) states that it was the Young Men’s Catholic Association, (YMCA).
23 This was confirmed during personal communication with Hibs historian Tom Wright. With regard to the proposed name and colours change, Wright concedes although “there is no tangible evidence”, he highlights a taped interview in his possession involving Docherty and Thompson, co-writers of A Hundred Years of Hibs, in which it is “categorically” stated that discussions definitely
took place probably around the 1940s, with red and white being the preferred colours of the new strip.

xxiv 'Hawick' player in this sense representing an ex-Hawick player.

xxv 'Aye' in Hawick local dialect translates in this context to 'always', making 'aye been' mean the same as 'always been'.

xxvi Supporting the Lions may not be synonymous with Britishness for some, given the (North and Republic) 'Irish' inclusion.

xxvii 'Footballisation' is used in present context to refer to the traditional tartan army type of carnivalesque behaviour outlined by Giulianotti (1991). Such behaviour includes wearing kilts with rolled down socks and Timberland (or similar) boots, singing humorous and ironic songs, and generally showing an awareness of one's own 'active' position within the actual event.

xxviii Bourdieu describes this practice as "most evident in rural areas" (p. 832). However, the conceptual example can usefully be applied to non - rural areas also.

xxix As shown in the football related interview data generated in the course of this research.

xxx Stewart's Melville are not a rival of Accies. They were merely used as an instructive example of old school rivalries impacting on a newly formed club.

xxxi He was a senior committee member of one of the clubs and instrumental in the process of amalgamating the two clubs.

xxxii Clearly more probing is required here to be certain. Fishing and golf are obviously practised by people who would describe themselves as working-class. Additionally, many local authority golf courses are available for use (at prices more affordable to working-class members) across the central belt, reducing the 'exclusive' nature of golf for some. However, considering the specific context, and utilising a Bourdieu-an reading – linking it to its historical development within a field and habitus relationship - it is probable that in this instance golf and fishing embody a middle-class habitus often associated with these sports.

xxxiii Supporting the Lions may not be synonymous with Britishness for some, given the 'Irish' inclusion. It is argued in this case – considering the wider context – that it is (at least) symbolically synonymous with Britishness for these respondents.

xxxiv 'Gordon' is Gordon Bulloch the Scotland captain. Chris Cusiter is a Scotland player too.

xxxv These buses were owned and operated by Scottish company SMT who ran services across the central belt of Scotland.

xxxvi 'Irishness' in the present form is representative of what is commonly understood in the given circumstance to be 'Catholic-Irish'.

xxxvii Save The Jags is the name that was adopted by the supporter-led campaign to raise funds for Partick Thistle when it was close to going bankrupt in the mid-nineties.

xxxviii As shown in the interview data across three football clubs generated in the course of this research.

xxix This is also linked to the belief in fans of smaller clubs being more willing to watch unsuccessful teams than fans of bigger, more successful clubs.

x The difficulty in ascribing individuals 'supporter' status is illuminated in Pat's interview transcript at this point. Despite paying to watch Glasgow on a number of occasions and having travelled to Ireland to watch them, missing a Partick Thistle match to do so, he states, "I wouldn't call myself a proper supporter" (IT: 20).

xi The 'most significant' themes have been deemed those which appear to have connections with either all the clubs (across the same sport) or some clubs (from the other sport). For example, although two rugby clubs (Hawick and Hawks) exhibited a potentially valuable set of data relating to highly gendered role play within the respective clubs, neither the third rugby club (Edinburgh Accies) nor any of the football clubs displayed this potential. Therefore, despite recognising the potentially valuable insight such discussion could provide, the 'discussion of data' section has overlooked this particular analysis.

xii On one level this may seem paradoxical given the 'professional' nature of the amalgamated Glasgow Hawks in attempting to re-structure the member clubs to compete against top clubs. However, given the level of disdain towards 'professionalism' by respondents – sometimes personally felt, sometimes ascribed to wider sections of their own support base – interview evidence supports this claim.

xiii In both sports, the perceived city rivalry was more obvious from the Edinburgh clubs' respondents than the Glasgow clubs' respondents.
A common song referred to by all Hibs and Hearts respondents and sung by them towards Rangers and Celtic supporters is, ‘In Yer Glasgow Slums’, which represents a disparaging chant based on social class perceptions.

It should be stated that in both city clubs’ cases, there is a degree of localised geographical attachment – to the West End (Glasgow) and Stockbridge and New Town (Edinburgh) – However, during interviews, it became clear that these geographical attachments were closely associated with the fee-paying schools which have historical ties with the clubs rather than any significant identification with the area or town in the same ways evidenced in the responses from those associated to Hawick and the three football clubs.

This even became apparent at Hawks when they produced a club leaflet distancing themselves – albeit in joking fashion - from Rangers and Celtic who had, a week previously, been subject to a BBC Panorama expose alleging ‘sectarian’ practices among their supporters.

In a later paper (Jarvie and Walker, 1994) “Scottish people” is replaced by “many Scots”.
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Appendix 1

The Moreno Scale

Which, if any, of the following best describes how you see yourself?

Scottish, not British

More Scottish than British

Equally Scottish and British

More British than Scottish

British, not Scottish

None of these
26 July 2007

Dear sir/madam

I am a research student in the School of Sport and Exercise Sciences at Loughborough University and am currently conducting doctoral research into rugby union and national identity in Scotland. This study is being supervised by Dr. Alan Bairner, a senior academic within the School and a respected expert in the field. As part of my thesis I am investigating the self perceptions of Scottish club supporters with reference to wider notions of Scottish national identity, particularly within the context of the re-opening of the Scottish Parliament.

In order to do this effectively, I require the help of certain prominent and established clubs, particularly those who would be willing to encourage a small number of individuals to speak with me about their own views and opinions on Scottish national identity. It is my belief that this research into the relationship between national identity and rugby union in Scotland represents the first systematic study of this kind and I am convinced that the project will represent a valuable and original contribution to existing studies. There is an urgent need to analyse and understand the valuable position that rugby union holds for the people of Scotland, and to finally recognise its contribution to notions of Scottish national identity. Present contributions are almost exclusively based upon football. It is envisaged that this project will begin to redress the balance. I would, therefore, like to enquire whether your club would be appropriate and willing to contribute to the project.

The data collection is of a qualitative nature and would entail no more than simply myself talking and chatting, on the odd match day, club function or pre-arranged time, to small numbers of your members. If this falls outside of your personal remit, can you advise me of the appropriate person to address this request to? I appreciate your consideration in this matter and hope that you are able to assist me in some way. If you require clarification or further information please do not hesitate to contact either myself or my supervisor at the stated address.

Yours sincerely

John Kelly
Dear Sir or Madam

I am a research student in the School of Sport and Exercise Sciences at Loughborough University and am currently conducting doctoral research into football and rugby union and national identity in Scotland. This study is being supervised by Dr. Alan Bairner, a senior academic within the School and a respected expert in the field.

As part of my thesis I am researching a select group of Scottish club supporters, analysing their self-perceptions of sporting identity with reference to wider notions of Scottish national identity, particularly within the context of the re-opening of the Scottish Parliament.

In order to do this effectively, I require the help of certain supporters groups, particularly ones who would be willing to encourage a small number of individuals to speak with me about their own views and opinions on Scottish national identity. I am particularly interested in those clubs which have often been overlooked in previous studies at the expense of the Old Firm and I believe that my research will represent a valuable and original contribution to existing studies. I would like to enquire whether your club would be appropriate and willing to contribute to the project.

The data collection is of a qualitative nature and would entail no more than myself simply talking and chatting, on the odd match day, club function or pre-arranged time, to small numbers of your members. If you are not in a position to answer this, can you advise me of the appropriate person to address this request to?

I appreciate your consideration in this matter and hope that you are able to assist me in some way. If you require clarification or further information please do not hesitate to contact either myself or my supervisor at the above address.

Yours sincerely

John Kelly
Appendix 4

Thematic Coding Explanation

1. Transcribe interviews
   a. Make observational comments as transcript is typed (these appear in bold on the typed transcript sheet). This may include initial thoughts, potential links with other interviewees – both within club and across clubs / sports, theoretical possibilities and methodological information.
   b. Select and highlight potential key themes in bold underlined.

2. Write shorthand comments in pencil on interview sheet margin to record every meaningful statement made by interviewee.

3. Type out second round of notes from each interview – these consist of a bullet point summary of every recorded meaningful statement from step 2, along with the page number from which they appear on the original interview transcript sheets.

4. Highlight major and minor themes and present in spreadsheet form in order for each club to be compared and contrasted.

5. Compare and contrast each box of themes with other clubs / sports.
Appendix 5

Record of Interviews Conducted

Football

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club / Interviewee</th>
<th>Date Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portobello Hearts Supporters Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>23/1/05 1.45 pm</td>
<td>Hotel tea room on Princes Street, Edinburgh city centre</td>
<td>1 hour 8 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>23/1/05 7.30 pm</td>
<td>Cairnie public house, Arbroath</td>
<td>1 hour 49 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane</td>
<td>24/1/05 12 noon</td>
<td>Office in Livingstone retail park</td>
<td>35 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>24/1/05 3.30 pm</td>
<td>Edinburgh city centre public house</td>
<td>1 hour 2 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Hibernian Supporters Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi and Vera</td>
<td>12/2/05 3.15 pm</td>
<td>Bell and Moon restaurant Edinburgh city centre</td>
<td>1 hour 25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td>13/2/05 1 pm</td>
<td>The Four in Hand public house, Easter Road, Edinburgh</td>
<td>1 hour 6 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>13/2/05 3.30 pm</td>
<td>The Four in Hand public house, Easter Road, Edinburgh</td>
<td>1 hour 33 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>14/2/05 2.15 pm</td>
<td>Starbucks coffee shop, Princes Street Edinburgh</td>
<td>1 hour 31 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablos Partick Thistle Supporters Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davie</td>
<td>19/4/05 6 pm</td>
<td>Pablos Public House, Jordanhill, Glasgow</td>
<td>1 hour 5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>19/4/05 7.30 pm</td>
<td>Pablos Public House, Jordanhill, Glasgow</td>
<td>1 hour 11 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>19/4/05 9 pm</td>
<td>Pablos Public House, Jordanhill, Glasgow</td>
<td>1 hour 24 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>20/4/05 6 pm</td>
<td>Pablos Public House, Jordanhill, Glasgow</td>
<td>1 hour 3 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club / Interviewee</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporters of Hawick RFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan</td>
<td>1/4/05</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td>Mansfield Park office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg</td>
<td>1/4/05</td>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>Mansfield Park lounge area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>3/4/05</td>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>Stephen’s living room in Hawick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>16/4/05</td>
<td>2pm</td>
<td>Jake’s living room in Hawick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporters of Glasgow Hawks RFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>24/6/05</td>
<td>11.35am</td>
<td>Clubhouse at Anniesland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>24/6/05</td>
<td>1.45pm</td>
<td>Clubhouse at Anniesland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>2/7/05</td>
<td>3.35pm</td>
<td>Clubhouse at Anniesland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>5/7/05</td>
<td>12.30pm</td>
<td>Glasgow city centre solicitors’ office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporters of Edinburgh Accies RFC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>10/7/05</td>
<td>12.50pm</td>
<td>Lesley’s living room, Morningside Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>10/7/05</td>
<td>2.50pm</td>
<td>Aaron’s living room, Morningside Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie and George</td>
<td>10/7/05</td>
<td>4.40pm</td>
<td>Angie and George’s living room, Morningside Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>11/7/05</td>
<td>10.30am</td>
<td>Connor’s office in Morningside Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Interview Transcript
Edinburgh Accies Rugby Club

Name: Aaron S.
Location: Aaron's living room in Morningside Edinburgh
Time: 2.50 pm
Duration: 1 hour 2 minutes

Key:

Underlined and bold equals coded themes emerging.

/ equals someone coming in to speak, cutting into the conversation before the speaker is finished speaking

... equals pause of 3 seconds or more

JK Can you tell me a little bit about yourself?

AS I'm 46 years old, I'm a business manager, I'm married with 2 children, a fourteen year old and a ten year old. The 10 year old is an active rugby player and I'm a rugby coach and mini rugby junior referee, so I'm pretty active with that. I love sport. I played a lot of rugby myself as a school kid and then club rugby, em Edinburgh Accies to begin with and then I went to university in Newcastle and I played for Newcastle Northern and that's where I played my first team rugby and that was against (inaudible) and all that sort of crowd. And then I went to London to work in London and played a bit of social rugby in London. I didn't want to play full time rugby and it was quite engrossed in my work. I played for Hampstead and then I came back to Edinburgh and went to Edinburgh Accies and was very much at the
epicentre of their golden oldies team who never lost a game. We wanted to play good rugby but didn't want to play serious rugby. I was working for Glenmorange and I was singularly responsible for bringing sponsorship from Glenmorange to the Accies. It was just at the time when the Accies were challenging to win the Premier division and so it was about a hundred and forty thousand pounds which was actually a lot by rugby standards in Scotland. So I did that, I was responsible for that. So that's my background, so I played up until I was forty with the sociable side. But in terms of the rugby club, Vincent is a good guy to speak to. I 've travelled abroad with work a lot so I'm not on committee but if a helping hand is needed I've always been there. I am a passionate, I'm passionate about my rugby. I just bought debentures at Murrayfield the other day. They were cheap and available and I thought they can't get any worse you know but actually, they have managed haha.

JK Ok, can I just ask you a little bit more about your association to the Accies /

AS Yeah, yeah /

JK Were you a /

AS I didn't go to the school (not a Schooled Accie but note he is public school product and so the educational/cultural/symbolic capital crosses over to him irrespective of not being an Accie – class habitus more important than historical linkages to school) I went to another school in Perthshire which didn't have another rugby boys' team affiliation. So when I moved to Edinburgh where could you go? This would be 1976-77. There weren't that many good open clubs. Edinburgh Wanderers, Heriots, quasi-open, ye know, Accies had gone open because they were desperate for players. (his wife comes in and they have a chat) SO that's how I went into the Accies. They also had a very good reputation for being very sociable. A lot of people from my school had gone there that I knew, and at that point they were second or
third division. And we would get a good game of rugby. We would win more than we would lose.

JK So when you joined them, you joined them initially as a player?

AS Oh yeah, as a player, very much so.

JK And although on one level you were joining as an outsider, you were very much at home because you had friends and had ex-school friends and stuff there /

AS Yeah, I had ex school friends there and of course Accies were seen as a good open and sociable club. I guess with like-minded people, with similar backgrounds to myself and all the rest of it (his wife shouts over, ‘good discos’) good discos, yeah seriously if you wanted to pick up a girl (we smile a little). The Accies hd the best discos. They were the days before the licensing laws were extended across Edinburgh and Scotland. The only place you could get a drink was in the clubs and of course Edinburgh Accies very central, so one or two in the morning they had a late licence to drink.

JK Ok, Edinburgh Accies Identity, I wanted to ask you your opinion on what that means to you, if indeed anything. If I was to say to you is there such a thing as an Edinburgh Accies identity? And if so what is it?

AS Well there is an awful lot of tradition with this place, Raeburn Place and all the rest of it. The first place of an international, Scotland England, and I guess there is that great tradition aspect to it. But I guess probably the identity I link to it, again my own opinion was it was very sociable and yes, there were a lot of like-minded individuals and all the rest of it (Bourdieu’s Capital). The social side of it was always at least equally if not more important than the rugby side. It just so happened that because of the background and the schools that most people went to at the club we all knew how to play a good game of rugby (I wonder if ‘playing a good game of
rugby’ is a metaphor for being ‘of the right sort’?) It didn’t matter if it was the first fifteen down to the sixth fifteen, everyone knew the basics of the game and we could also look after ourselves on the pitch at any level. So there was that tradition and that to me was probably more of the tradition that I was akin to. Everybody was like-minded, we weren’t a bunch of prima-donas, yet also at the same time we could go and play Hawick and as far as they were concerned they were the tough boys and they would be playing the Edinburgh snobs and as far as they were concerned they would be giving us a good shooing and it never happened. I mean if there was a good shooing they nearly always came off second best. Just because you have a (inaudible) name and a posh accent by Scottish standards doesn’t mean you can’t look after yourself. So we always looked after ourselves in a rugby sense and at the same time a bit of balance to it all and at 6 o’clock in the afternoon it would be home to family or whatever else we were doing. It wasn’t the be-all and the end all. So there was a mix of the history and the reality and good competent rugby and social, a good sociable area.

JK Clearly from your own perspective you’ve been heavily involved as a player. Now it’s increasingly, as someone who is an outsider regarding Scottish rugby, it is increasingly, it strikes me as being the case, certainly for Edinburgh Accies, the supporters, certainly thr male supporters tend to be made up of either ex-school boys or ex-players and possibly both, in your case not, just as a player. I wondered to what extent that is still the case today?

AS I would say it’s probably even more so now. I think there was a period possibly in the late 80s mid 90s when Accies were in the premier division, playing very good attractive rugby when all of a sudden people wanted to go and watch Edinburgh Accies’ backs playing, to watch David Soul and others, we got outsiders coming. Now ... yeah it’s the same old faces ye see all the time going to watch, so they are actually ex-school, ex-(inaudible), or ex-players for the most part. And I would say there are not very many over there who haven’t got some form of ex-affiliation, being the old school tie or
club. I would say somebody who just likes rugby aint going to come to
Raeburn Place to watch Edinburgh Accies.

JK Where in your opinion would those sorts of people go?

AS Some will go to the Edinburgh Regional team, the Gunners. I will, I will go
to watch the Gunners more now than I will to watch Edinburgh Accies. I just
don't think the standard is good enough. Me and my son would much rather
go and watch the internationals playing. Or he might go to Heriots,
Borrughmuir, Heriots Burroughmuir, Stewerts Melville, ye know the
Edinburgh clubs that will be feeding the Edinburgh Gunners and potential
internationals. So if Heriots are going to play Hawick and there's nothing
else on, Edinburgh Gunners aren't playing, I might go and see that. I always
like going to see that, purely because that's the next rung beneath Edinburgh
Gunners. I don't think many people will be going to watch Edinburgh
Accies play ... Ayr.

JK Yeah. It's interesting because this is certainly hinting at a theme that I've not
come across with football supporters. He theme, you said earlier that you're
a big sports fan and a big rugby fan. I just wondered to what extent with
rugby in particular, that people are first and foremost perhaps fans of the
sport and perhaps a close second, but certainly second, are fans of a
particular club. ...

AS I can only speak personally, but I am more a fan of the sport. Now if I get
the choice of watching Lecicester, we've got Wasps coming up to play the
Edinburgh Gunners in the Heniekin Cup. Now if Edinburgh Accies were
playing Western Scotland in a be all and end all match at the same time and
that was going to win them promotion to the first division, I'm going to be
watching Edinburgh Gunners playing Wasps (even though Accies match
IS very meaningful) Now Vincent O'Donoghue will say to me 'how can
you do that? What about the loyalty to your club?' I've got loyalty to my
club but the loyalty isn't, but the club is, is (inaudible) so much now, that as
far as I’m concerned my loyalty is more to / my son wants to go and watch
the Wasps, he wants to go and see Lawrence Delalio playing, he doesn’t
want to go and see some person playing what I think is a standard less than.
I mean when I played a few years ago in the thirds the standard was about
the same as the first fifteen today, so you know. But that is my own view.
There are some diehards in Edinburgh Accies where club comes first. I want
the club to do well. And in the old days when we had 5 internationals
playing for the Accies I would always be there seeing the Accies play but
then at the same time they might have been playing Hawick who would have
had 3 or 4 internationals playing. So it was quite feasible to go down to
Raeburn Place less than 10 years ago and see 9 or 10 internationals on the
pitch and then go upstairs into the bar and be standing shoulder to shoulder
with them, with Rob Wainright, David Soul, Jim Renwick and maybe even
they would buy you a beer but now. You want to go where the best quality
is.

JK   Ok, still on the theme of the Accies identity, again for want of a better
phrase. Can I ask you about the city of Edinburgh? Can I ask if that’s
important to you, in terms of your Edinburgh Accies identity, or if you think
it’s important to the wider Accies fans?

AS   It’s important to me because I support Edinburgh Gunners except it doesn’t
really / there are a lot of people that aren’t that bothered about the Gunners,
they actually feel that it’s actually dissipated the certain clubs. Edinburgh is,
I mean Edinburgh is almost like southside and northside and we happen to
be a northside club. … /

JK   The reason I’m asking is that with some of my clubs, both codes of football,
some of my clubs have expressed a very strong identification with their city
or their town, Hawick being a great example of course. But even in the city of
Edinburgh I found that fairly surprising but certainly noticeable, was that the
football clubs, the supporters I spoke to expressed, for different reasons, but
a very strong pride in Edinburgh and they both told me that their clubs were
the Edinburgh clubs. And I wondered with there being quite a few Edinburgh rugby clubs and obviously Edinburgh Academical being the traditional club, I wondered if that was to any extent true for you or the wider Accies supporters?

AS I haven't even thought about it before but yeah there is. I mean there's Edinburgh clubs, there's Glasgow clubs and there's the Borders, and I think there was a perception that the Borders clubs love to beat up the Edinburgh clubs but then it got easy and it's actually the Hawks now cause they've really come on. You know, let's go and duff up these posh Edinburgh boys, We're the Borders and we quite like to take you on. But I mean personally I see that actually there is quite a lot of rivalry between the clubs in Edinburgh alone. You know there used to be a thing why do you call Heriots your toenail? Why do they call you the toenail? It was because they were the lowest of the low, a toenail and that's a Herioter. And it's a standing joke. But you know when we were playing Heriots and they were one mile down the road from us, ohh it was a niggle game. We had more niggle with the Heriots and Accies games than you did with Accies versus Hawick so actually there's as much internal strife here as anything with overtly Edinburgh versus the Borders versus Glasgow (Edinburgh rivalries stronger than 'other's rivalries) but again, that's my own personal view. And again to be fair the level I was playing rugby at Edinburgh Accies we couldn't be bothered driving through to Glasgow ye know most of our games were played in Edinburgh, there was enough clubs in Edinburgh. In the good old days. So we had plenty of teams to play with locally without having to travel all over the country.

JK can I just ask you since you've just touched on it. I would like to ask you about the notion of the other, your big rivals. Who do you think likes to see you as their big rivals?

AS Well it depend if we're in the second or third division /
JK Yeah, it changes with context /

AS So, in that respect it does change. People like Mussleborough and things like that, Portobello. To me, my rivals as the Edinburgh Accies rivals, and they probably still are even thought they would take 50 points off us every time, are Borrughmuir, Heriots, Stewerts Melville, Watsonians. But it's almost like saying when at football when Partick Thistle or Livingstone were top of the premier division and now they're down in the second division and we couldn't go up and play some of these teams now. They would take at least 40 points, that's the gulf that exists. But it will still be a great game for us to play them. They'll still like us (as in 'respect' I think, considering he has just told me that they are all still local rivals) because we're Edinburgh Accies and they are still Stewerts Melville and they will still be able to have a good beer after the match because again, I suppose of the private school background and etc, etc, etc, but so it probably has moved on. Your more direct ones probably are your Portobellos (non-public school?) or the Mussleboroughs who are toughly in the same divisions as us. But then we have the Ayrs, the West of Scotland, the Biggars who are now playing, and they are probably now the ones who want to beat us in terms of staying in the same division. But our rivals and traditional rivals I would suggest are the other school-orientated clubs. (Bourdieu's 'capital')

JK Can I ask you if you think that there is a rivalry either on your part or their part between Edinburgh and Glasgow, any of the Edinburgh and Glasgow teams?

AS Yeah, definitely. Mmm, the Glasgow Accies of this world, the West of Scotland, Glasgow High School, GHK and the Hawks yeah the rivalry is there but again it has changed since we moved into the second quasi third division. It's no longer the same for us, ye know Ayr is probably a bigger one for us now because we play them. Edinburgh versus Glasgow I mean a lot of it will go back to school rivalries ye know, again when I used to play, we used to go, Edinburgh Accies versus Glasgow Accies, there were people
who I'd recognise at Glasgow Accies, and this was me at 37, that I played and was playing against as a 15 year old (*maintaining cultural/symbolic habitus*) in the games at Lochamond (his private school in Perthshire) and I used to play against them at Glasgow Academy. It's funny and 15-20 years on ye would still see them going about, now with their kids and their sons will be playing so ... it's actually quite a nice rivalry because we've grown up together but yeah, we'll still want to beat Glasgow Accies, but now I'm not sure if that's a Glasgow rivalry or is it just an old schoolboy rivalry? Again that's a personal thing (observation) for me. I had no real affiliation with the West of Scotland (unsure if this is what was said) or the areas with the squad and teams like that. I had nothing to do with, to me they were just teams to beat.

**JK** Ok, is it important to you to have local coaches?

**AS** Mmm, /

**JK** And local players I should add. And or?

**AS** Are we talking about Edinburgh Accies here?

**JK** Yeah, I will ask you in a Scotland context as well a bit later if I may.

**AS** In an ideal world yes, but I think there is a realisation that if you really want to succeed then you have to bring in some outside help. So, yeah, I'm actually fairly ambivalent about it. I want the best but I also want to see ye know, my son goes to Edinburgh Academy and I would like to see Edinburgh Academy boys come through the system. The only thing that slightly upsets me now is that a really good Edinburgh Academy boy could go into the Academicals do very well there and if he's really good, within half a season he'll be virtually told to go to Borrughmuir or Heriots or one of the feeders so the Accies themselves will lose that. So in that respect I don't
like that. And then they are replaced by people that are less able. I want to see good players. I don’t care where they come from.

JK Talking about professionalisation. Can you tell me how that has affected the Accies?

AS Bankrupted it. (we both laugh a little at this deadpan response) It’s done it no favours whatsoever. They were slow to react to it and when it actually happened, the Accies stood there and watched what happened. I’d say for that matter, so did Heriots and so did Borrughmuir and all the rest of it. And before they could see what was happening, Edinburgh Gunners had been created and they were lured away by the Jim Telfers the Ian McGeechans of this world when actually if they would have had their brains on they would have said, ‘well actually does there have to be an Edinburgh team here?’

What should (emphasis) have happened was Muir, Heriots, Accies, Stewarts Melville, Watsonians actually almost emerged into one and created the Edinburgh Gunners club as is already there at the moment. (he seems to be saying the existing clubs should have created their own little Edinburgh top tier – sounds like and Edinburgh version of the Hawks is what he would have preferred) Instead it was a club that was created as an entity from nothing, created by 2 or 3 guys from the SRU, therefore it was undervalued, under supported, gets no real inherent support from the clubs which I think is a great shame. Vincent hates the Gunners. We’ve had arguments in the pub over this. He’ll ask me how I can go and watch them and I’ll say because I like to watch good rugby. I think it has disaterised the club. I mean the Accies are lucky in that they are able to field four 15s but there are a lot of other clubs now that are struggling to get 2 teams together. And professionalism has contributed to that. We the clubs just didn’t really appreciate what was happening. And we allowed the SRU to run over us.

JK Can I ask you specifically now, and I realise a lot os going on at club level and supporter level. But specifically on supporter level at the moment, to what extent do you think professionalisation has impacted upon the
supporters in terms of like you just mentioned, yourself and Vince having a
debate about you supporting the regional team and Vince not. I wonder to
what extent there is a conflict or /

AS  Total tension. There is total tension as far as I’m concerned and again, it’s
not benefiting anyone. It’s not benefiting the professional team or the clubs.
The clubs don’t want to give as much support, Ian Barnes and Jim Renwick
are the coaches of Edinburgh Accies and they sort eh, och they don’t want to
feed, they don’t have this burning desire to feed into the Edinburgh Gunners.
I mean Hawick Trades and the feeder clubs used to feed into Hawick and
that was their primary role (I wonder if they would see it like that?) and it
was (inaudible) and one of their players would move into the top team and
there was a pride. That doesn’t happen. And so that whole integration has
sort of been lost. Now you used to go play for the Edinburgh districts and
the Edinburgh districts very much came from the Edinburgh clubs.
(inaudible) Edinburgh district should have become the new Edinburgh club.
But it was just actually created as a sterile entity on its own and with no
involvement with the clubs whatsoever. So it’s got to the stage now where
you have got a 2 tier system or maybe even a 2 and a half tier system.
You’ve got Borrughmuir, Heriots and Watsonians who are in the premier
division and who are perceived to be feeders in. But you’ve got other clubs
like Accies who need players of their own and they end up losing their
players to Heriots who need to get in bed with others (inaudible). To have
your own (ex-school association) players from Accies going from Accies to
Heriots. To have Murray Blair go from Accies to Burrughmuir and
eventually get into Edinburgh Gunners side oh (he sighs with frustration)
and if he comes back to play for his local club, he’ll come back to play for
Burrughmuir. From the age of 3 he went to Edinburgh academy and he only
got to play for Edinburgh Accies for half a season before he was popped into
the Heriots side, or Burrughmuir before playing for Scotland. And that I
think is what has been lost.

JK  Has that in any way affected the supporters /
The support base of any of these teams? I mean is there some sort of muddying of the waters?

There's a total muddying of the waters and that's why there is a polarisation of the few loyal who will go and watch Edinburgh Accies, like Vincent and Anne and John Patterson who you are going to meet, and the likes of me who watches rugby (self distinction between rugby and Accies – sport/club fans). I'm sorry I'm going to watch Edinburgh Gunners because I want to watch the best rugby. I want to watch the wasps when they come up. If the Wasps went and played the Accies they would beat them a hundred and fifty points to nil so what's the point? I would love to see the Accies being able to compete but it's not going to happen. I mean, could I actually live with Accies playing alongside Herioters and so on in order to make a better side? Yes I could if it was the will of us all. But the trouble is we had the opportunity to do that 10 years ago and they rejected it and that's because of the old school tie thing. The old school tie (inaudible) and Accies were totally arrogant saying we don't need this. (Maintaining own School/club ID in face of professionalism) What a mistake, what a terrible, terrible mistake. And there's been the same arrogance with Heriots and Stewarts Melville in saying the same.

You go to the regional games /

Yeah /

can I ask you about your opinion about the supporters who go to those games? Are they what you would describe as traditional rugby fans?

Yes, I would say they are traditional rugby fans. In fact I would say they are very traditional rugby fans. They are there for good rugby's sake and are
doing it with almost through gritted teeth, having probably preferred to be there watching Burroughmuir or Heriots or other teams but this is is the best way for them to see good rugby being played and you know the support that goes, the 2 or 3 thousand that go on a regular basis are actually very devout. Quite passionate about it, in an Edinburgh reticent kind of way you know. Go to Glasgow and watch the Glasgow teams through there and they are more animated in their support. Edinburgh are not really the most vociferous people as a support. And a lot of children go as well. A lot of dads and things. You know you’ll see them all wearing the Edinburgh (Gunners) rugby shirts and all the rest of it. You know my son will not want to go and buy the latest Edinburgh Accies shirt, although he wears it because he goes to the school, but he will want the Gunners one. They (Gunners) only get around 3,000 but give them a few games to win and it will grow. The trouble is they play in the wrong stadium away up in town. They shouldn’t be playing in Murrayfield, they should be playing somewhere else.

JK I see. I want to ask you about your perception of your national identity. If you had to choose which best describes the way that you think of yourself?

AS Mmmm ... slightly more Scottish than British ... I'm not a nationalist. But I'm a passionate Scotsman and that's quite a hard one to articulate. But I say to people that the work I have done, I was managing director of a company looking after the quality of Scottish lamb and beef. I'm not a nationalist. I have feelings about Scotland but I'm not a nationalist, I despise nationalism, but I'm a great patriot. So in that respect, I would put more Scottish than British.

JK Ok, and this one is more to do with your political identity and forgive the fact that it's quite a personal question, but if you had the choice which one of the following would you choose for Scotland?

AS What's the difference devolution and independence?
JK Well independence would mean a complete separate nation state and be completely autonomous. Devolved is what we have now.

AS Oh. Now I would have to say complete independence (so he hates nationalism, is happy to be British and yet desires complete independence), I would never have wanted that before. You can't be half pregnant. And at the moment we are and it's not working. (so his independence preference is based on pragmatic reasons linked specifically to the move to autonomy — rather than any patriotic or nationalistic expression) So they either have to go back to the original set up or it has to be complete independence. Does that answer your question?

JK Yes it certainly does. I mean I've really thrown that in as a bit of an extra. I'm not really sure if I'll get anything that's meaningful to me. But I thought I would take advantage of speaking to 3 rugby clubs' fans and 3 football clubs' fans to see if there was anything meaningful or patterned if ye like. Can I ask you a little bit about your support for Scotland?

AS Yep, yep.

JK Some of the questions may sound a little bit obvious but I have to ask them the way I'm asking them to remain consistent. Do you support Scotland?

AS Yes.

JK What level of support?

AS How do you mean?

JK Well do you watch them on TV, do you attend occasionally?

AS Every game home and away. I'm a diehard. The good times and the bad, mainly bad.
JK: Why do you support Scotland?

AS: I'm Scottish and I love my rugby.

JK: Has the link between Scotland's rugby support and Scottish national identity has that changed at all over the years or in recent years?

AS: Eh ... no. (he hums and haws and wee bit here)

JK: Part of what I'm getting at, I mean I've made it vague on purpose so that I'm not biasing your answer. But if I could just probe a little bit, the SRU adopted flower of Scotland for example before the SFA, which was seen at the time as /

AS: The SRU didn't. David Sole did and therefore we identify more with that. Ok, yeah the SRU did adopt it in that respect (but according to him, it was due to player wishes rather than a. patriotism/nationalism b. protecting GSTQ from 'embarrassment').

JK: I wonder if that is in any way linked to the political sphere?

AS: I would suggest that probably more of the Scottish (rugby) supporters would be less prone to independence and (inaudible) than your football supporter would have been. I.e they hate the English and can't wait to get away from them. It's just the fact that we're all passionate Scottish rugby supporters and we want to have an identity that say we can sing a Scottish song, eh, rather than some sort of anti-English song that would be sung at some football game. So I would say it certainly is, we are very patriotic at the rugby plus also we can always do better, the Scottish rugby team can always do better against the English rugby team generally on a consistent basis than the Scottish football team can do. And the Scottish football team would just be a gathering of people once n a while, whereas the Scottish rugby
fraternity meets a minimum of 4 times a year. So we are a much smaller community, I mean there are 7-8 thousand players in Scotland and as you already identified a lot of the people who support Scottish rugby are players themselves so it’s quite a tight-knit community passionate about that sport as opposed to probably a million or so Scottish supporters of soccer who really, linked to some tribalism are actually quite attached to the game, the tribalism is in their support to their club and all that crap, it doesn’t exist to the same extent in rugby. It’s an identity to the sport more that we’ve (rugby fans) got.

JK  Ok, it’s interesting that /

AS  Again, it might be a lone voice from me. I’m not a nationalist. I think Flower of Scotland is a dirge. I hate it with a passion. I do remember it being sung for the first time at the Grand Slam game in 1990, whoah, what an experience, but to be honest they could have been singing ye know ... ‘up murray’s wedding’ sort of thing (any Scottish song) at the time as we all thought ‘hey they have been pissing us off, we could win’. You know.

JK  I wonder to what extent though the rugby supporters, I wonder what extent your nationalism or rugby football patriotism or nationalism for the ones that are nationalistic in that way. I wonder to what extent that is stoked, as you touched on just a moment ago, you meet more regularly than the football team at the moment and also you play England at least every year and although Scotland are not very good at the moment, correct me if I’m wrong, but they are still touching on the world class, maybe just below that now, but they are always there and /

AS  Yeah, we are now second division rather than first division but you know.

JK  I wonder if the level on a world scale and the fact they play England on a regular basis has affected the supporters of Scottish rugby. And what I really mean is, do you think that some Scottish football supporters perhaps who are
not traditionally associated with the rugby code have maybe latched on in any way or/

AS There are certainly different people come to the internationals now than perhaps 10 years ago you wouldn’t have seen them at murrayfield. You sit next to them, you listen to them, you hear the language and you go, ‘these aren’t the people that we used to have here 10 years ago (Bourdieu ‘veering towards tastes of another class’). Now is that a snobbery in me and a (inaudible) and yes, but actually (inaudible) there are lots coming to watch us and filling the stadium and that’s not a bad thing. So yeah, there is a broader a Scottish kinda support and it’s almost like a Scottish uniform is starting to appear now of a Scotland rugby shirt, a jersey, a pair or timberland boots with socks down below the knees and it looks absolutely terrible /

JK And a kilt? /

AS And a kilt. I used to wear a kilt but now I wouldn’t be seen dead in it, I don’t want to be associated with that sort of em, almost false, false patriotism that seems to be walking around. I’m almost trying to disassociate myself from that now (Bourdieu’s symbolic capital – changing due to popularity and class signifiers. Also Goffman’s presentation – fostering impression which appears to have taken on a different meaning – so he changes his behaviour in order to maintain the impression he desires). I see those guys going around Paris and Dublin and all the rest of it at internationals. They can go that way and I’m going this way thank you very much. You know I’m still supporting my country but I’m not going to be associated with that. And that is that element / I don’t know whether if the fertilization has been, is magnetic because of people saying oh to hell with Scottish football because it’s even worse (football fans crossing codes) than Scottish rugby, hence we’ll move across to that. Or is it because we’re becoming more global and it’s an opportunity to go and support a Scottish team because we’re all patriotic? I just don’t know.
JK I wonder if they are football fans or are traditional rugby fans who are merely changing their modes of dress and behaviour?

AS I think they are traditionally rugby fans who just are changing with the rest of it. I'm sure we have got new fans coming to watch the game but we have also lost a lot of diehards who have left the game since for example professionalism. My father will not, since the day they went professional, my father will not enter murrayfield now. And I could probably ring 10 of my chums here who would say / 50 percent of their dads who would say the same. One or two of my individual friends won't go now either. Since professionalism they don't like it anymore. The whole spirit of Scotland in the past, of rugby was you do your day to day job 9 to 5, a few beers and training on a Tuesday and thursday and for an international you took a couple of games off work if you were lucky in order to go to the training sessions. And you gathered and you know you beat up the English and they beat up you on a Saturday afternoon. Ye'd go out into the pub and get blooted probably and Monday morning back at the surgery (professional jobs reflecting class habitus) or whatever. And (inaudible) 70,000 people cheered you on. Unfortunately I think a lot of that has been lost due to professionalism, you can't identify with it anymore.

JK Can I ask you a wee bit about football?

AS Yeah

JK Do you support any football club?

AS Yes, Celtic.

JK Oh that's interesting. Can I ask why?
I was brought up in Glasgow and one of my father’s best friends was a director of Celtic and I used to be taken to all the games. Late 60s and early 70s, so I just kept that feeling. But you know I’m a WASP, white anglo-saxon protestant so I’m very confused. But I’m still very loyal to Celtic.

Can I ask do you support Scotland’s national football team?

No, I mean I want them to win but I don’t go.

Have you ever been to see a Scotland football game?

Once. It was a bad experience. I ended up standing in about 6 feet of urine so …

Last question, can national identity be felt if you are living in another location do you think?

More so. When I was living in America I was more Scottish than I was here.

To what extent do you think that would carry on generation wise?

Oh, it’s strange, my kids began speaking in American accents. They try to assimilate. I mean so do we, I mean I almost started speaking in an American accent. So yeah, but as you said earlier about being Scottish or British, out there people would say oh here’s Alistair who is English and I would say I’m not English I’m Scottish. Actually we used to say on occasion because the Americans are so stupid that we used to say on occasion that we are from England. But you know my Scottish identity was stronger when abroad. But not in wearing my Scottish rugby or football shirt or my celtic colours when I’m going on the airplane to Magaluf. You know I can’t stand that tribalism (is is tribalism or is it really a class distinction?) I don’t wear rugby shirts, I barely have a Scottish scarf on when I go to murrayfield and a
lot of my friends say why. But you know my support is from there (the heart) and I don’t have to wear it.

JK Ok, thanks for that.