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This thesis examines the desire for inclusion in association football amongst minority ethnic communities in England. The thesis is based on two case studies informed by semi-structured qualitative interviews. These case studies focus on two minority ethnic groups, the Asian community in Bury and the black community in the City of Liverpool, and the relationship of these respective communities’ with ‘local’ professional football clubs (specifically Bury FC and Everton FC). The thesis notes that despite, by most ‘objective’ measures, football grounds being less dangerous places to visit nowadays, members of minority ethnic groups continue to reject live spectatorship. Such rejection exists despite evidence of engagement in football amongst the male members of these minority ethnic groups. Asian respondents expressed little civic pride in Bury or interest in Bury FC, and thus their rejection of spectatorship opportunities was unconscious. Data from black respondents identified widespread sense of belonging and identification with the City of Liverpool, but conscious rejection of spectatorship at Everton FC. Despite recognition of the clubs’ anti-racist work black respondents argued that the idea persists that Everton are institutionally racist with racist fans. While such a perception had also previously been ascribed to Liverpool FC (Everton’s near neighbours), such perceptions had changed quicker at Liverpool FC, who appear more effective at attracting minority ethnic spectators.

A number of factors emerged that contribute to the continued rejection of spectatorship amongst British minority ethnic groups at professional football clubs. One of these is the perception that football clubs are unwelcoming places and ‘white spaces’. Fear of racism and fear of violence were also often cited although these were found not to be absolute in nature for either minority ethnic group. Indeed, evidence from both groups found that they are developing their own ‘we image’ rather than internalising their own ‘group disgrace’, though it is also argued that Elias and Scotson’s notion of two groups, the ‘established’ (white’s) and the ‘outsiders’ (blacks), is too simplistic and a more fluid conceptualisation is called for. Overall, the data illustrated that the identities of members of minority ethnic groups are complex, multifunctional, context specific and fragmented and thus so are their relationships with football.
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Introduction

Research herein examines, using a figurational approach, an unanswered question relating to racism in football. The research centres on the under investigated area of what desire for inclusion in association football there is amongst minority ethnic communities in England. This investigation uses case studies to establish black and Asian minority ethnic groups relationship with association football. This sees consideration given to why some racial groups are present and others are absent (Birrell, 1999; Dunning, 1999). Related to this issue a Government Independent Football Commission report, issued February 2004, urged clubs to rid the game of bigotry. From the clubs perspective, however, as Dan Warren reports (www.news.bbc.co.uk/sport, 10th February 2004), ‘English clubs say they are mystified about why ethnic communities remain seemingly reluctant to embrace football’. To address this issue this thesis examines the engagement of members of minority ethnic groups with Bury and Everton football clubs.

A brief overview of the findings from this research shall now be provided in order to, in turn, encapsulate the argument contained herein. As far as football spectatorship was concerned existing research and data from interviewees has identified rejection of spectatorship amongst members of minority ethnic groups (Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 2001). Providing a, recent, example: evidence of rejection of spectatorship, was reported by Oldham Athletic after the football club had commissioned independent market research. Following this the club’s marketing director, Sean Davis, stated that ‘In Oldham, about 19% of the population is Asian, and we do not have that in the crowd – I’d say it was probably less than 5%’ (reported
by Warren, D. for www.news.bbc.co.uk/sport, 10th February 2004). While figures from the 2001 census suggest that the Asian population of Oldham is nearer to 12% (www.oldham.gov.uk.2001census) nevertheless the point about lack of members of minority ethnic groups in the crowd is comparable to the findings for the clubs studied here.

Amongst Asians in Bury, in relation to Bury Football Club, rejection of this nature was identified as being predominantly unconscious, whilst for the black community in Liverpool, specific to Everton Football Club, the rejection was more conscious. Whether ethnic minority groups reject football as a leisure activity (Waddington et al, 1999) was investigated and findings were mixed, although rejection of live spectatorship predominated in relation to both case study clubs. Factors behind rejection of spectatorship are developed and discussed in depth in this thesis. The most often cited was fear of racism and fear of violence, illustrating that whilst, by most ‘objective’ measures, football grounds are less dangerous places to visit nowadays, perceptions are more difficult and slower to change. Indeed the grounds of the case study clubs were identified as unwelcoming places and ‘white spaces’ (Vertinsky, 2004; Gaffney and Bale, 2004), which remain out of bounds to members of minority ethnic groups. Another issue identified was role modelling, in relation to which data from Asians in Bury indicates, contrary to the widely held beliefs of some previous research (Maguire et al, 2001; Garland and Rowe, 2001; Cashmore, 1982; Bains, 2005; Burdsey, 2007), that the importance of this issue has been overstated. Furthermore, none of the Asian interviewees ascribed to the idea that cultural differences are a factor in non-attendance, leaving the validity of this linkage
compromised. It emerged from these last two issues that amongst club ‘officials’ and those trying to foster inclusion there was a lack of understanding of how members of minority ethnic groups’ interest in football is manifest.

The empirical data has enabled conclusions to be drawn as far as the theory that informs this thesis is concerned and it is these that I turn to next. An appropriate, ‘illuminating’ theory (Bloyce and Murphy, 2007: 16), although one that does have ‘limitations’ (Bloyce and Murphy, 2007: 18), applied to this research is the theory of ‘established outsider’ relations (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994). As far as Bury is concerned the concept of there being ‘established’ (white’s) and ‘outsider’ (predominantly Asian) groups was a good fit. For the black community in Liverpool, however, it is argued that further reflection on the notion of ‘outsider’ and ‘established’ communities is required. Indeed, from the research in Liverpool, the notion of two groups, the ‘established’ (whites) and the ‘outsiders’ (blacks), is too simplistic and a more fluid conceptualisation called for. As noted above fear was often cited although upon investigation it seemed to be questionable whether fear is the key driver it seemed to be. Indeed the ‘outsiders’ illustrated that they do not simply accept the group charisma of the ‘established’ and instead of internalising their own ‘group disgrace’ could be said to be active in developing their own ‘we-image’ (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994). As with much of the work here such data supports the concept that football is a sphere where identities can be forged (Burdsey, 2007). Hence, the complex, multifunctional and context specific nature of ethnic identities are evidenced.
Maguire’s (1991b: 32) research into ‘exciting significance’ has also been utilised. Findings from Asians in Bury offer support for Maguire’s work, although data from blacks that support Everton FC seemingly contradict Maguire. Thus it is evidenced, again, that the creation of social identities, and the interrelationship between these identities and football spectatorship are highly context specific. Ultimately, therefore, a number of factors have emerged that explain why, despite significant changes in supporter behaviour in recent years, British minority ethnic groups remain largely absent from the grounds of professional football clubs.

Having outlined the findings and the argument encapsulated in the thesis this introduction will provide an overview of how the work is subdivided. Essentially the research can be broadly divided into four sections. In the first section (Chapters 1 and 2) existing research was investigated and the question to be addressed emerged. Section two (Chapter 3) focuses on research methods and issues for this research. The third section (Chapters 4 and 5) incorporates the findings from the two case studies and subsequent discussion of emerging trends identified by the data. Finally, section four is the conclusion. This draws together the themes, trends and discussions from the case studies, highlighting areas of commonality and difference as the argument encapsulated by this thesis is framed. These sections shall now be considered in more detail.

The first section commences, in Chapter 1, with a critique of theoretical issues and models related to race and sport. This includes investigation of racial stereotypes and how the concept of race has developed. Included in this is consideration of the
legitimacy of viewing race as a biological category and whether the concept of
cultural racism has superseded this categorisation. Existing research into race and
race relations is critiqued, as is the applicability of such research to sport. This sees a
range of existing research highlighted, but gives particular attention to the insightful
findings of Birrell (1999) and Dunning (1999).

From this work issues central to this research, such as power ratios and exclusion of
power inferior groups, are developed. As part of this process Elias’s concept of
power is considered as is, in more depth, Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) theory of
‘established outsider’ relations, which is forwarded as a useful tool when considering
racial equality. In turn the degree of fit between Birrell’s work and a figurational
sociological approach to race is considered. Finally (Chapter 1) pinpoints gaps in
existing research into race relations and sport and from this the central research
question of the thesis starts to emerge.

Having researched race and race relation’s theories, including their applicability to
sport (Chapter 1), the next element of section one involves a review of prior research
in the more specific area of race and association football (Chapter 2). As part of this I
identify why the research here focuses exclusively on males. I also highlight the
merits of advancing a multi-polar as opposed to bi-polar, study of minority ethnic
groups. Theoretically, this chapter supports the previous one by highlighting the
usefulness of Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) work relating to ‘established outsider’
relations as well their concept of ‘group disgrace’. In addition, Maguire’s (1991b: 32)
theory of ‘exciting significance’ and how it may affect attendance at live games, by
members of minority ethnic groups, is identified as being of use.

During this review of existing research into race and football various factors are examined including; sports structures, spectating patterns, the efficacy of football related anti-racist movements, Islamophobia, research into sites of sport, overt and covert forms of racism as well as national, social and cultural identity. This discussion illustrates how the question to be answered by the research here (as detailed above) emerges in its final form. In relation to this it is also indicated that previous research and policy initiatives have assumed that racist chanting generates an atmosphere that intimidates potential supporters from minority ethnic groups. The sociological theories noted previously are, in turn, to be considered in relation to the emergent question and by bringing the various strands together one will be in a better position to decipher the degree of desire for inclusion in football amongst minority ethnic communities.

In section two, research methods and issues for this work are discussed. This sees epistemology and ontology identified as false dichotomies for figurational research and, in relation to epistemology, the concept of involvement-detachment identified as a more appropriate paradigm for this research. Explanations arrived at through this process are identified as having varying degrees of adequacy and are related to the possibility of obtaining secure knowledge. This section consequently also looks at what is truth and who can legitimately study it. Also as part of this section, inductive and deductive approaches are discussed, as are validity, reliability and generalisability.
Whilst other approaches and concepts are considered ultimately case studies and semi-structured qualitative interviews are identified as being the most appropriate method for investigating how respondents view their social world. Having subsequently summarised and justified the choice of research philosophy to be employed the selection of case studies is looked at. For the two case studies detail is provided in relation to the geographic locations, minority ethnic groups and football clubs as well as who was interviewed and why. This includes detail of logistical issues, methods utilised and when and where such interviews, with the Asian community in Bury and the black community in Liverpool, were conducted. Without being of the scope of previous work in this area (Bains & Johal, 1998; Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 1999; Bradbury 2001) visual crowd surveys were also carried out to establish whether existing research relative to football crowd demographics held true for the two case study clubs. These offered a snapshot of the crowd demographics at Bury FC and Everton FC in terms of minority ethnic supporters and detail of how, when and where this research was done is also included.

The third section of this research (Chapters 4 and 5) is the findings and subsequent discussions in relation to the two case studies. Specifically these case studies focus on the interrelationships between the football club’s investigated and the wider social contexts in which association football is organised, watched and played (Dunning, 1999). In the first part of this section (Chapter 4) Bury and its ‘significant’ (Bradbury, 2001), predominantly Asian, minority ethnic population (www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001) is investigated. Following that Bury FC are reviewed and having established that under representation of minority ethnic group members at their live
games is occurring data from qualitative interviews is incorporated as I endeavour to
discover what is behind this rejection of spectatorship.

Themes that emerged to explain such under representation included: lack of role models,
cultural differences, fear of racism, fear of violence and discrimination, cost of attending
games, preference for other sports, and support of other clubs. From the date related to
these themes it emerged that football matches are not rejected as a leisure pursuit, but that
rejection is apparent amongst Asian interviewees as far as watching ‘local’ club (Bury
FC) play live is concerned. A link is also identified here between a lack of interest and
identification with Bury FC and the town of Bury. Ultimately, findings from this case
study are related to the aforementioned sociological concepts as a lead in to the
conclusion of the thesis.

The other case study (Chapter 5), that completes section three, focuses on the,
‘significant’ (Bradbury, 2001), black minority ethnic population of the City of
Liverpool. Having provided detail of this group, a review of the case study club,
Everton FC, is included. As at the other case study club visual crowd surveys were
conducted, at two, Everton games. These identified under representation of minority
ethnic group members at Goodison Park (Everton’s home ground).

With widespread interest in football being evident amongst members of minority
ethnic groups in Liverpool discovering what was behind their conscious rejection of
spectatorship at live Everton games was key. These black respondents did not reject
football as a leisure pursuit, meaning that other factors rather than disinterest in
football have led to rejection of spectatorship. The data compiled led to factors and themes being discussed, in relation to this rejection of spectatorship, including: fear of racism and fear of violence, that Goodison Park is a ‘white space’, longevity of association with the city, as well as sense of belonging and identification (on local and national levels). Having, as with the other case study, related these findings to the sociological concepts that inform this thesis I was able to turn to the conclusion.

Subsequently in the fourth and final section conclusions are drawn in relation to the factors discussed and in particular in relation to the theories utilised. This sees the data from the two case studies brought together with areas of commonality and difference identified. Ultimately, the findings and arguments put forward by this thesis, as described briefly above, are encapsulated in this section. This sees various strands developed by way of explanation for British minority ethnic groups absence from live football games. In this regard in one respect the decline in racism in grounds and the continued absence of ethnic minorities is indicative of a policy failure. Campaigns related to fostering inclusion in football have been in existence for a number of years, but in relation to the case study clubs members of minority ethnic groups continue to reject spectatorship. Furthermore, with evidence of failure to understand how minority ethnic groups interest in football manifests, amongst those who hope to foster inclusion, this situation does not seem as though it is about to change.
Chapter 1: Theories of Race and Their Applicability to Sport

Introduction

Research herein focuses on the issue of racism and association football in England. Before concentrating on football specifically an examination of theoretical issues and models that relate to race and sport is appropriate. Carrying out a critique of this nature will assist in the process of developing the key question to be considered, and subsequently answered, during the remainder of this piece of work.

This chapter commences by reviewing the concept of race and its development over time. Incorporated into this is consideration of stereotypes. Particular attention is paid to whether viewing race, as a biological category is a flawed concept and if so whether notions of cultural racism have superseded this categorisation.

Following this opening section existing research relating to race and race relations theories will be investigated and the applicability of such research to sport considered. When doing so a range of existing research will be noted, but the insightful findings of Birrell and Dunning shall receive particular attention. Developing from this process Elias’s concept of power shall be considered as will, in more depth, Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) theory of ‘established outsider’ relations.

Next the degree of fit between the work of Birrell and a figurational sociological approach to race is considered. Having done so this chapter concludes by looking at the importance of the existing research reviewed and in particular the usefulness for this work of the theoretical model identified. In addition, gaps in existing research
research into race relations and sport are pinpointed, and from this the central research question of the thesis emerges.
Race and Stereotypes

During globalisation’s early stages Europeans came across people who appeared very different from themselves and the concept that the world’s population could be divided into distinct racial categories gained credence. An unequal relationship subsequently occurred, characterised by Europeans enslaving indigenous peoples and colonising their lands. Accompanying this development, powerful concepts about the superiority of European peoples and their cultures evolved and with these uneven power balances Europeans were able to impose these concepts on others. It was, therefore, during the nineteenth century with theories of race as type and race as subspecies gaining credence (Banton, 1987) that the concept of race truly developed. Western scientists were at the forefront of this development, which popularised classification and ranking of the peoples of the world both within and beyond Europe. This led to categories of superior and inferior races emerging, with each believed to have its own inherent capacities and characteristics.

Birrell, citing the work of McLemore (1972) in relation to this course of events, states that, ‘The classical distinction made by social scientists has been to regard race as a biological category and ethnicity as a cultural one’ (Birrell, 1999: 10). Stereotypes have been used in an attempt to legitimise racial categories. Crude mental representations of the world, stereotypes distinguish the ‘other’ from one’s ‘self’. By their very nature stereotypes are dynamic and are amended to suit the prevailing thinking of the time. According to Gilman:
Because there is no real line between self and the other, an imaginary line must be drawn; and so that the illusion of an absolute difference between self and other is never troubled, this line is as dynamic in its ability to alter itself as is the self. (Gilman, 1985: 17-18)

Racial stereotypes have certainly been used to identify difference between ‘self’ and ‘other’ and have endured several metamorphoses. Outlining an early representation of a racial stereotype Andrews notes how:

Distinctions between *them* and *us* were thus enforced through the popular representation of the savage, bestial, and uncivilised black African, in *difference* to the restrained, cerebral, and civilised white European American. In this way a racial hierarchy was implemented that justified systematic slavery to the popular imagination on both sides of the North Atlantic. (Andrews, 1996: 127)

As noted racism, which stereotypes help legitimise, developed in tandem with slavery. However, the widespread abolition of slavery during the course of the nineteenth century did not result in the demise of racial discourse. In fact ‘the forces of scientific hegemony and accelerated Western imperial expansion, which dominated the post-Enlightenment world, combined to regenerate and scientisize racist ideology in justifying the subjugation of peoples of colour within the various imperial orders’ (Andrews, 1996: 128).

This regeneration of racist ideology resulted from nineteenth century racial science’s adoption of Darwin’s theories of the evolution of the species. Using Darwin’s theories, racial classifications were advanced that proclaimed the ‘superiority of the white races over the rest in the process of natural selection’ (Callinicos, 1993: 17). When this scientific racism was used to classify the African ‘other’, stereotypes emerged that were based on phenotypical differences or physical appearance, for
example; skin colour, hair type, nose shape, and most concertedly cranial dimension and capacity. In other words ‘savagery became a fixed condition for the ‘Negro’ or African ‘race’, a by-product of a small brain, and civilisation became an attribute of large brained ‘white’ people’ (Stocking, 1968; quoted in Miles, 1989: 33). With these biological differences strategically grafted on to equally distinct psychological and socio-cultural characteristics the hierarchy of races was formed.

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries geneticists, initially led by the eugenics movement, attempted to produce evidence that would provide legitimacy for their belief in precise definitions of race. By doing so eugenicists:

Unwittingly corroborated the residual stereotypes and representations that structured racial hierarchies throughout the Western influenced world; racial Otherness was now classified in terms of interconnected socio-cultural, phenotypical, and genotypical differences.

(Andrews, 1996: 128)

Subsequently the post World War II era saw advances in genetics that led scientists to re-examine previous work and having done so notions about racial hierarchies and classifications (that had provided the philosophical and scientific rational for the genocide perpetrated by the Third Reich) were increasingly debunked. After the war a backlash against the Nazi’s, combined with the maturation of genetic sciences, led to a dramatic reduction in the credibility of the notion of objectively verifiable racial groupings based on biological science. Genetic scientists found that genetic variations within the so-called races were more significant than the genetic variations between them. This is a conclusion that has been outlined by several researchers including, for example, Andrews (1996: 129) who cites the work of Lewontin, Rose & Kamin (1984) and Omi & Winant (1994). Consequently the notion of pure races
was undermined and scientists increasingly challenged the links between biology and
behaviour that had previously accompanied such beliefs. Despite such evidence, and the
weight of opinion being against them, some people still hold onto these theories
relating to pure races and linking biology to behaviour. For those who challenge the
notion of pure races, however, the classical usage of the term race is rejected as
flawed and the viewpoint that strictly speaking there is only one race, the human race,
favoured.

Despite belief in racial hierarchies and the biological basis of race losing a degree of
credence, especially amongst scientists, racially based conceptions retained some
validity as theories of race predominantly shifted emphasis from the hard natural
sciences to the soft social sciences. This effectively saw the idea that race was a
biologically constituted classification superseded by a model that comprehended race
‘not [as] a biologically given but rather [as] a socially constructed way of
interprets this re-classification of race (as detailed by, for example; Omi and Winant,
1994 and Miles, 1989) as meaning that ‘race can be understood as a category
popularly constructed along assumptions of biological distinction indexed by colour
and then naturalised through cultural practices and ideological work’. Birrell (1999:
11) adds that this approach attempts to deconstruct the ‘common sense’ definition of
race as a ‘biological category’ by focusing on the processes of racial relations, racial
formation, and racialisation.² Carrington and McDonald, citing the work of Barker
(1981) and Gilroy (1987), also summarise this shift and argue that:
There is a general argument within sociology that since the second world war the discourse of racism has shifted from a crude biological racism, based on the mistaken belief in biologically discrete ‘races’ each having their own innate characteristics, towards a cultural racism, based on the notions of absolute cultural difference between ethnic groups. Cultural racism posits that although different ethnic groups or ‘races’ may not exist in a hierarchical biological relationship, they are nevertheless culturally distinct, each group having their own incompatible lifestyles, customs and ways of seeing the world.

(Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 1)

Consequently it became possible to base racial phenotypes on ‘whatever behaviour the racist wishes to attribute to the other, whether it be passivity and laziness or violent hyperactivity’ (Dumm, 1993: 181). Fortified by stereotypes that defined the racial self, simply put, it became plausible for ‘the racist’ to apply virtually any behaviour to the ‘other’ that they wished, as a way of delineating difference (Andrews, 1996). During this post war era as a result, Andrews (1996) argues, racially orientated social scientific research has focused on investigating the perceived diseased, polluted, and corrupted nature of the racial ‘other’. By doing so social scientific research may be said to have reinforced the essential racial order (Andrews, 1996). For groups defined as races one consequence of these socially constructed racially based conceptions was that they could be impinged upon in a variety of, often negative, ways. Since sporting involvement is affected by what is conventionally called race this negative impact could occur in relation to sport just as much as it may to other areas of life.

Whilst biological racism, as noted above, became less credible and social-scientific racism emerged, this is not to say that the former disappeared altogether. One must be careful not to overemphasise this transition to a new more subtle form of racism

16
based on culture, since in reality both forms of racism can co-exist and often inter-
penetrate (Carrington and McDonald, 2001). Making this point it has been said that:

Despite more than a half a century of work by anthropologists, biologists and geneticists discrediting the fundamental organising principle upon which racism exists, namely ‘race’, the unsubstantiated constant recourse to this flawed concept by many scientists and the lay public remains deeply embedded, and is an indication of how entrenched racism has become in scientific and popular discourses.

(Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 5)

After coming to the fore in the 1950s social-scientific racism continued to garner support over time (for example; from Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994). Such research claims that people of colour are significantly more likely to commit violent acts than members of the white majority (Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985).3 Herrnstein & Murray (1994) support this contention and their ‘racist criminology significantly informed the instantiation of the racist popular politics of the American New Right’ (Andrews, 1996: 130). In America this theory gained approval during the administration of former president Ronald Reagan4 and was described as ‘new cultural racism’ (Denzin, 1991: 7; Giroux, 1994: 75). ‘New cultural racism’ impinged negatively on the African American population, since:

Rather than apportioning blame for the plight of the African American population at the feet of an increasingly negligent and disinterested state, Reaganism mobilised popular, residual racial stereotypes and pathologies that stigmatised and demonised the African American population as a very real threat to themselves (and, by inference, to American society as a whole).


Having reached maturity during the Reagan-Bush administrations, through stereotypical and divisive articulations of race and racial difference, African American culture was signified as being inherently deviant, unproductive,
irresponsible, uncivilised, promiscuous, and in contrast to (and thereby threatening towards) ‘white’ culture. Citing the work of Davis (1990) Andrews related this view of racism to sport and proposed that ‘closely tied to the stereotypical media representation of the pathologically violent and criminal black body, is the popular fascination with the supposed natural athleticism of the African American Other’ (Andrews, 1996: 134). Mercer also draws attention to the natural athleticism notion:

That most commonplace of stereotypes, the black man as sports hero, mythologically endowed with a ‘naturally’ muscular physique and an essential capacity for strength, grace and machine like perfection: well hard. As a major public arena, sport is a key site of white male ambivalence, fear and fantasy. The spectacle of black bodies triumphant in rituals of masculine competition reinforces the fixed idea that black men are ‘all brawn and no brains’, and yet, because the white man is beaten at his own game – football, boxing, cricket, athletics – the Other is idolised to the point of envy. (Mercer, 1994:178)

Perpetuated by the media this concept might lead one to believe that the theory of ‘new’ racism is founded upon a common assumption of the innate physicality of the black body. Since such racist discourse genealogy can be traced back to the era of systemic slavery ascribing the term ‘new’ to this theory is perhaps something of a misnomer. Having analysed ‘new’ racism Gilroy (1987) found it to be based around cultural rather than biological distinctions and suggested that in Britain at least, racism had become increasingly closely connected with a form of British nationalism. In a similar vein it has been highlighted that:
Many commentators have noted that critical to the emergence of the political right in Britain during the 1980s was the shift of emphasis in racial discourse. Labelled the ‘new racism’ or ‘cultural racism’ it operated within the realm of culture as opposed to biology and asserted the importance of ‘cultural difference’ as opposed to ‘race’ (Barker, 1981). In this new discourse, identity and ethnicity – and hence racial difference – are ‘constructed’ in the sphere of culture. It is not that racism based on biological superiority / inferiority has disappeared, but that racism is more likely to be expressed in other coded forms, hidden in narratives, and concealed by structures that invoke cultural (rather than physical) differences in the first instance.

(Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 56)

Gilroy (1987) argues that ‘new’ racism involves specifying who may be regarded as a legitimate member of ‘the Island Race’ and who is an outsider, with so-called ‘immigrants’ (even those born in Britain) classed as outsiders and portrayed as culturally different and consequently a threat to ‘the’ British way of life. In other words this ‘new’ racism claims not necessarily to be against Asians and blacks entering mainstream British society, ‘but only against those migrants unwilling to disown any referents to a cultural heritage not defined as British’ (Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 1). Using this theory ‘outsiders’ may be seen as a threat because their difference may undermine the homogeneity of British culture, which is seen, by some, as having given Britain its strength. As a result ‘It is in the defence of a mythic British / English way of life in the face of attacks from ‘enemies within’, i.e. black communities and so-called Muslim fundamentalists, that racism is perpetuated’ (Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 56). Indeed, Carrington and McDonald (2001: 2) maintain that what is firmly embedded in the British psyche is ‘the belief that blackness and Britishness are mutually exclusive categories’ and ‘that any attempt to ‘mix cultures’ is doomed to failure’. Offering an alternative viewpoint Gilroy (1987) claims that black culture has influenced white youth (for example, with black music
having been adopted by whites) and argues that since their cultures are not completely separate it may be possible, if black and white work together, to resist racism. In this regard Gilroy’s argument seems the more compelling especially when one considers how signifiers such as language, dress, musical preferences, sporting identifications and religion can act as key cultural markers that distinguish ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ groups (Bauman, 1989).

Sport is an arena where, on the one hand, racism has been challenged. On the other hand, however, sport has been used as a platform for racist sentiments to be expressed. Carrington and McDonald believe that this shows that British sport (and British society) is a long way from being equal since:

> By its very nature, sport is a complex protean cultural formation. It is too simplistic to argue that sport improves ‘race relations’, just as it is to say that sport can only reproduce racist ideologies.

(Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 2)

With reference to the British media, and in particular the tabloid press, Mercer (picking out two well-known British sportsmen one of whom is a boxer and the other an athlete) illustrates how sport can act both to challenge racism and to perpetuate it:

> On the front-page headlines black males become highly visible as a threat to white society, as muggers, rapists, terrorists and guerrillas; their bodies become the image of a savage with an unstoppable capacity for destruction and violence. But turn to the back pages, the sports pages, and the black man’s body is heroized and lionized; any hint of antagonism is contained by the paternalistic infantilization of Frank Bruno and Daley Thompson to the status of national mascots and adopted pets – they’re not Other, they’re OK because they’re ‘our boys’

(Mercer, 1994: 178-179)

Andrews (1996: 140) also considered how whites view black males and argues that many members of the white population are gracious enough to accept, even adulate,
African Americans (especially sports performers), but only if they do not explicitly assert their blackness (whereas black athletes that do so may well be labelled as having an attitude problem). This is indicative of a common theme of racialised debate that it is up to the black ‘outsider’ to change their behaviour since it is the black presence that is viewed as problematic whilst white attitudes form the basis of the status quo.

What is evident, from the above, is that sport is a legitimate area of sociological study, and that:

Sport is a particularly useful sociological site for examining the changing context and content of contemporary British racisms, as it articulates the complex interplay of ‘race’, nation, culture and identity in very public and direct ways.

(Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 2)

Relating sport to the expanded definition of race noted previously, Birrell believes, should enable us to make fresh inroads into explaining the ways that race and racial relations are produced and reproduced in sport. Specifically Birrell states:

Since sport also is thought to derive its essence from its physical nature, it would appear that the connections between dominant discourses on race and sport could offer the grounding for constructing a new understanding of the way that racial relations, and race itself, are produced and reproduced in sport.

(Birrell, 1999: 16)

Indeed, the research herein into race and sport aims to aid understanding of how race relations, and race, are produced and reproduced in sport.
Race and Race Relations Theories usefulness for Sport Sociology Research

Birrell and Dunning have investigated race and race relations’ theories and their usefulness for the study of sport as an area of social life. Their insightful findings are of some importance for studies in this field and shall be reviewed.

Birrell (1999) identifies four general theory groups that relate to racial relations, but notes that as sport sociology researchers who focus on race do not subscribe explicitly to any of them, their research tends to be atheoretical. The four theory groups Birrell identifies are: bias theories, assimilation theories, materialist theories, and cultural or colonial theories. Having reviewed these theories Birrell argues that bias models are too descriptive and assimilation theories are conceptually inadequate. More specifically, bias models, which were the earliest explanations of racism, offer descriptions of the social interactions that occur between members of different racial or ethnic groups. Birrell puts prejudice and discrimination models in this bias model category and notes that ‘some writers simply assume prejudice as a universal human trait while others provide fuller descriptions of the attitudes of prejudice that result in the behaviour of discrimination’ (Birrell, 1999: 9).

Having outlined the scope within this theory grouping Birrell concludes that bias models ultimately provide little theoretical insight. Earlier research can be used to support this premise, for example, Alkalimat maintains that prejudice and discrimination are static and descriptive concepts that obscure racism’s ideological power and provide only the:
The fact is that black people have been oppressed by a system unified on the basis of white racism. While the concepts of prejudice and discrimination are helpful on an analytical level of theory because they are so easily operationalised and quantified, racism is the more appropriate theoretical description of the problem precisely because it captures the qualitative character of the oppression.

(Alkalimat, 1972: 176)

A large body of sport sociology research has been located within these bias and discrimination models. Specifically, Birrell (1999) points to the following as examples of research that endorses bias models: centrality, stacking and positional segregation (Curtis & Loy, 1978; Loy & McElvogue, 1971; Medoff, 1986), discrimination in salary (Christiano, 1986, 1988) and athletic scholarships (Coakley and Pacey, 1984), and managerial succession (Fabiano, 1984). Although such work has some value, it should be possible to move our understanding of the dynamics of racial relations in sport beyond this descriptive level.

Birrell notes that the assimilation, or cultural deprivation, theories derive from Park’s (1950) classic model and have constituted the dominant theories in the study of race relations. These theories maintain that cultural conflict is pacified through accommodations and assimilation (or cultural annihilation). In relation to sport this approach can be seen in studies of cultural contact among ethnic and racial groups and within studies of the anthropology of play (Birrell (1999) identified a number of examples of such work including that by: Chu & Griffey, 1982, 1985; Rees & Miracle, 1984). Results from such studies in sport have, however, been disappointing and inconclusive (Birrell, 1999). Since assimilation theories, like bias theories, offer only limited, general accounts of race, racism and, to some extent racial relations, this
is perhaps not too surprising. Additionally, as Birrell pinpoints, assimilation theories contain serious conceptual flaws, such as a lack of conceptual distinction between race and ethnicity.

Having identified limitations to bias models and assimilation theories, Birrell suggests that:

If race is understood as a social construct, our analysis of racial relations and sport clearly must move beyond the treatment of race as a descriptive variable and address ideological questions about the production of race relations and the specific forms such relations take in particular times.  

(Birrell, 1999: 11)

Moving beyond bias and assimilation theories racial scholars considered materialist and culturalist (or colonial) theoretical models as possible replacements. Formed around a classically Marxist class conflict approach, materialist theories ‘see racial exploitation as a consequence of capitalist relations of production, and racism as a consequence of ideology that justifies oppressive relations of power and control’8 (Birrell, 1999: 12). In other words, these works suggest that white racism rose out of capitalism, which in turn legitimises oppressive relations of power and control. As far as sport is concerned materialist analyses of racial relations have been confined to descriptive applications of materialist concepts (Birrell, 1999).9 Opponents of this approach (for example: Staples, 1973, 1976) argue that materialist theories may explain the production of race relations, but such relations are reproduced through other cultural forms.

Those researchers who find fault in materialist theories tend to align themselves to the
fourth theory group Birrell identified, namely cultural theories. This culturalist approach focuses upon cultural suppression and cultural hegemony on the one hand and cultural regeneration, cultural survival or cultural nationalism on the other. Framing cultural domination and subordination as central to the production and maintenance of racial relations of dominance and subordination these cultural theories are tied to (US) black nationalism of the mid 1960s (Birrell, 1999). This approach, therefore, increasingly sees racial relations being explained as a consequence of cultural imperialism that is enforced by military and cultural conquests. Such conquests result in the destruction of traditional economic, political and family relations and the devaluation of traditional cultural forms such as art, religion, music and language. As Birrell notes:

Cultural domination and subordination are therefore the key dynamic in the production and maintenance of racial relations of dominance and subordination. As disruptive as the forces of cultural domination have been, however, the forces for nationalism and cultural survival have endured.

(Birrell, 1999: 12-13)

Tension exists between advocates of the materialist and cultural positions. Birrell notes that critiques of the culturalist model have largely come from Marxists. To provide a specific example Birrell leans on the work of Mirande (1985) and notes that for Marxists ‘a focus on cultural oppression is dangerous and counter-revolutionary because it obscures capitalist relations and promotes race war rather than a revolution based on class-consciousness’ (Birrell, 1999: 13). Conversely, those who favour the culturalist model, for example Forsythe (1973), believe that ‘Marxist theory is insufficient to produce a detailed understanding of Black life’ (Birrell, 1999: 13). Additionally, Omi and Winant (1986) claim that cultural theories are better able to deal with the diversity of racial experiences. Following this train of thought it may be
claimed that culturalist positions can avoid the heavy handed determinism evident in many Marxist arguments and consequently offer more room for an analysis of human agency and cultural resistance.

To benefit the theoretical study of race Birrell suggests, as several other scholars have (including, for example: Barrera, 1979; Blauner, 1972; Almaguer, 1975; Omi and Winant, 1986), that blending materialist and cultural analysis might be beneficial. From such a mixture the resultant framework, hopefully, would:

Be critical and reflexive; it would take into account the contours of the particular relations of dominance and subordination that exist among groups located at the intersection of class and racial conflicts; it would be grounded in an historical analysis of the origins of such relations; it would carefully attend to the production of ideologies of dominance and subordination; and it would utilise analytical strategies that respect the dialectical relationship between material conditions and cultural reproduction.

(Birrell, 1999: 13)

Birrell contends that if materialist and cultural theories intertwined the result might enable, as far as sport is concerned, a critical analysis of racial relations to occur. Additionally, she points out that an expanded cultural studies model of this nature would need to be ‘grounded socio-historically so that the origins of contemporary racial relations are not obscured’ (Birrell, 1999: 14). Ultimately, Birrell is convinced of the potential of a cultural studies model to be of use as an analytical approach to sport because:

It has a general framework for understanding relations of dominance and sub-ordination, an insistence on analysing the particular conditions of those relations, and an array of conceptual tools to advance the analyses.

(Birrell, 1999: 15)
In relation to such sociohistorical work Birrell (1999) identified the following four examples, which she suggested could be examined further:

(i) A discussion of resistance of racial groups to their total subordination\(^{10}\), by Omi and Winant (1986), noted that blacks under slavery in the USA developed cultural resistance based on music, religion, African traditions, and family ties. Interestingly sport is missing from this list and explaining why\(^{11}\) would be a forward step.

(ii) The specific contours of race relations during ‘sport’s formative years’ (which she cites as being 1880-1900) which would ‘enrich our understanding of the cultural meaning and power of sport during this important period’.

(iii) Absences in sport, for example, why some racial or ethnic groups are present in sport while others are absent.

(iv) The application of materialist and cultural traditions of racial relations literature. This would enable researchers to move beyond simple analogies and ask more profound / particular questions, such as ‘how is an ideology of legitimate exploitation produced’ (Birrell, 1999: 14).

Commenting on Birrell’s call for more socio-historical work Dunning (1999: 197) argues that Birrell must have been unaware of the work relating to sport engaged in by slaves carried out by Sammons (1990), Wiggins (1983) and others. Their work suggests that slaves had as rich a tradition of sport participation as one would have expected to emerge under the limiting conditions of the slave plantations. Dunning, for his part claims that sport was unlike music, religion or dance, since slaves took it on but for the most part did not add to, innovate in or otherwise independently develop sporting traditions. Therefore, he maintains, sporting prowess could be a
power resource for individual slaves in relation to their masters, but the sporting traditions of slaves generally cannot be considered as having made a significant contribution to the collective ‘culture of resistance’ (Dunning, 1999: 197).

Summing up the position in terms of race and race relations’ theories and the study of sport as an area of social life Birrell (1999: 6) notes that, whilst the sociology of sport had moved towards more critical theoretical frameworks and analyses of sport as a cultural form, what was ‘notably absent…. in sport studies and in the parent disciplines or fields as well, is any sophisticated, critical analysis of racial relations’. She found this absence to be unfortunate since sport ‘provides a particularly public display of relations of dominance and subordination’ (Birrell, 1999: 6). Specifically, Birrell (1999) urged researchers to ascertain what part sport plays in the construction of racial relations, and how dominant forms of sport continue to reproduce particular configurations of racial relations?

Having concurred with Birrell about this lack of sophisticated analysis of racial relations in sport Dunning (1999) strove to remedy this deficiency. In fact, Dunning states that it was his aim to:

Lay the foundations for a figurational / process-sociological understanding of the part played by sport in ‘race relations’ and, reciprocally, of some of the ways in which sport has been shaped by inequalities and struggles between so-called racial groups.

(Dunning, 1999: 179)

His attempt to achieve this led Dunning to undertake two basic tasks; firstly to develop a conceptualisation of race relations as fundamentally involving questions of power; and secondly to carry out an exploration of the social conditions under which
sporting prowess can become a power resource. To illustrate this concept Dunning conducted a historical / developmental analysis of race and sport in the US\textsuperscript{12} and critically analysed what he referred to as ‘old-fashioned approaches to race and race relations’ (Dunning, 1999: 180). By analysing these ‘old-fashioned approaches’ Dunning hoped to bring some recently neglected aspects of race relations into the discussion. Specifically, the approaches Dunning investigated were the work of; Lockwood (1970), Warner (1949), Warner’s associates Alison Davis and the Gardners (1941), and that of Frazier (1962).

Turning now to Dunning, an analysis of his main findings will be compiled in a similar fashion to the treatment previously afforded to the work of Birrell. According to Dunning in the late 1960s an attempt to accurately describe race relations as a sociological problem was made. Here Dunning confers with Birrell, by stating that this was necessary due to the ‘widely acknowledged failure of earlier sociological approaches’ (Dunning, 1999: 181). Discussion, at this time, centred on the extent to which race relations are similar to other types of social stratification and many American researchers accepted that race relations were simply a form of class and status relations. Lockwood, as far as these ‘older approaches’ are concerned, offers a theory that in the opinion of Dunning is the ‘most theoretically sophisticated’ (Dunning, 1999: 180). As part of his approach Lockwood contested the notion that it is satisfactory to apply class and stratification theories to problems of race. Dunning agrees with Lockwood on this point although his reasoning for doing so differs. He states:
Whereas, Lockwood focuses solely on the possibility that this may stem from the specificity or uniqueness of race relations, what I want to suggest is that, in many ways, the specificity of race relations is apparent rather than real, an artefact of the inadequacy of stratification theories in their current forms rather than of the total uniqueness of racial inequality as a form of stratification.

(Dunning, 1999: 180)

Dunning agrees with Lockwood’s overall premise relating to the inapplicability of class and stratification theories. He maintains that Lockwood does not fully appreciate certain aspects of Durkheim’s (1964) theory of the division of labour, and more specifically his concept of ‘mechanical solidarity’. Attempting to build on Durkheim, Dunning identifies societies as divided by ‘racial castes’ as an example of a social arrangement where mechanical and organic solidarity are mixed. This, Dunning states, occurs because:

Racial alignments are based on specific ‘similitudes’ which are either natural (e.g. skin colour) or socially constructed (e.g. Hindu caste marks, ‘Stars of David’ in Nazi Germany) rather than on bonds of interdependence established through a division of labour. Hence they are mechanical in Durkheim’s sense.

(Dunning, 1999: 182)

This suggests, according to Dunning, that the degree to which ‘racial’ alignments occur in modern, urban-industrial societies can be said to be an index of the fact that societies such as these remain partly mechanically integrated. As a consequence the social experiences of some groups in such societies mean that their members’ bond entirely or almost entirely with ‘their own kind’. When this occurs, Dunning notes, ‘such groups will be liable to develop extreme forms of racist identification and belief’ (Dunning, 1999: 182). Leaning on the work of Elias (1996), Dunning identifies examples of groups who may fit this framework as including; Poor whites in racially mixed rural or mainly rural communities, the poorest sections of the urban-
industrial working class in ‘multi-ethnic’ countries, and lower-middle and
downwardly mobile middle-class individuals who find it difficult to cope with status
ambiguity and failure. Basing his idea on the work of Elias, again, Dunning
additionally categorised the people who form these groupings as those who:

tend to have narrow life experiences, low levels of
education and feelings of frustration regarding what they
have achieved in life relative to their expectations, and
this makes them prone to bond with people who are like
themselves and to be intolerant of newcomers and strangers,
‘others’ whom they perceive as different and hence
threatening, contributing to a double-bind process or
‘vicious circle’ through which the narrowness of their
experiences is reinforced, hence intensifying their
intolerance, and so on.

(Dunning, 1999: 182)

In essence, this outlines the propensity amongst some members of society to bond
with people they consider to be like themselves and simultaneously being intolerant of
‘others’ (i.e. newcomers and strangers) who are perceived as being different from
them and are therefore seen as a threat. Dunning believes that this occurs not just
because of the status ambiguity of groups such as these (i.e. their high caste, but low
or falling class status), but is in addition a consequence of their mechanical (or
‘segmental’) solidarity, that is their bonding primarily in terms of ‘similarities’.

This line of analysis, that relates to racist identifications and beliefs, can cope with
such groups’ propensity for intra-class conflict (i.e. conflict with racially different
members of the same class), finding it to be ‘a corollary of the degree to which they
are segmentally (mechanically) bonded’ (Dunning, 1999: 183). In addition, this
analysis does not find it difficult to cope with racial identifications across class lines
because:
Such identifications follow from the degree to which the members of different classes are constrained by the strength of racial alignments in the wider society into identifying with other members of their own racial segment and into realising that they have shared as well as conflicting interests with the later.

(Dunning, 1999: 183)

As illustrated, Dunning during his discussion of the work of Lockwood introduces aspects of Durkheim’s (1964) theory of the division of labour and in particular the concept of ‘mechanical solidarity’. As part of this process Dunning reintroduces the concept of caste and outlines the significance of this term in relation to the formation of, what Frazier (1962) calls, the ‘black bourgeoisie’ (i.e. socially marginal upper and middle classes, that is classes of high class, but low caste status). This is of significance in relation to racial stratification since it involves the:

Emergence of upper and middle classes, segments of which have forms of politically radical potential, more specifically, of upper-and middle-class groupings which, although the majority of their members may not be radical in terms of their general political allegiances and beliefs, do tend to be radical in terms of their implications for the structures and dynamics of racial stratification. For example, whilst not all members of the black bourgeoisie in the USA join racial protest organisations… most such organisations were founded by members of the black bourgeoisie (together, of course, with sympathetic whites).

(Dunning, 1999: 183 - 184)

As highlighted Dunning’s research centres on the USA, but as far as that country is concerned he maintains that power ratios of blacks and whites have changed and that one of the principal reasons for this is the black bourgeoisie’s formation. Or to put it another way, formation of the black bourgeoisie has been the key to the degree of what Elias (1978) called ‘functional democratisation’ in American race relations14 (Dunning, 1999). Ultimately Dunning’s (1999) findings from his work involving
‘older approaches’ subsequently led him to investigate ‘established outsider’ relations and Elias’s theory of power. That being the case an overview of Elias’s conceptualisation of power as a sociological concept, incorporating consideration of ‘established outsider’ relations, shall be carried out and will include consideration of Dunning and other researchers findings in relation to these models.
Elias’s Conceptualisation of Power and ‘Established Outsider’ Relations

Dunning (1999) points out that Marxists and Weberians offered sociological concepts of power that dominated for a period. Weber states that ‘power means any chance within a social relationship to realise one’s own will, even in the face of resistance, regardless of the basis on which this chance rests’ (Weber, 1972: 28; cited in Dunning, 1999: 191). Picking up on the concept of the relational character of power Elias suggests that:

Balances of power are always present whenever there is functional interdependence between people….Power is not an amulet possessed by one person and not by another; it is a structural characteristic of human relationships – of all human relationships….We depend on others; others depend on us. In so far as we are more dependent on others than they are on us, more directed by others than they are by us, they have power over us.

(Elias 1978, cited in Dunning, 1999: 191)

Developing this idea Dunning suggests that Elias is saying: power is ‘polymorphous’, power is inherent in all human relationships, and that the key to understanding power lies in the interdependency of people. Having related this idea to the sporting domain Coakley argues that sport is a social construct that can affect access to power relations including race and ethnic relations.

Sports continue to be socially constructed through the struggles of various groups to integrate a range of challenging physical activities into their lives in ways that meet their interests. Therefore, sports remain integrally linked to commercial interests, power relations in general, and gender, class, and race / ethnic relations in particular.

(Coakley, 1999: 46)

Dunning, similarly, uses Elias’s model and relates it to sport. Having done so he argues that:
In a society where sport is highly valued, sporting prowess is a positive power resource and, under specific circumstances, it can be used to a greater or lesser degree to offset the disadvantages of racial stigmatisation, even slavery. Another way of putting it would be to say that, in a society where sport is valued, sporting prowess can be a form of ‘embodied power’, part of a person’s habitus which gives them what Bourdieu (1984) calls ‘cultural capital’.

(Dunning, 1999: 19215)

In addition, Dunning notes that this hypothesis is an empirically demonstrable process of equalisation. However, making that claim does not mean that Dunning denies that great inequalities remain or may even have increased in certain respects.

Elias’s conceptualisation of power is clearly illustrated in his joint work with John Scotson (1965, 1994), which examines ‘established outsider’ relations. In turn Dunning has examined how this theoretical framework may be related to ‘racial’ equality. Elias and Scotson’s work, relating to ‘established outsider’ relations, was carried out in the late 1950s and early 1960s and focused on two working class groups. These groups were located in Leicester (a city situated in the English East Midlands) and they differed, according to Elias, as far as all conventional indices of social stratification are concerned only in the fact that the ‘established’ group had lived in the community for some time, whilst the ‘outsiders’ were newcomers. Despite their similarities the ‘established’ group’s greater cohesion enabled them to distinguish themselves as higher and better than the ‘outsiders’. Elias noted that this is the type of figuration that one would normally find in connection with ethnic, national and group differences (such as those between classes). Summarising this key aspect of Elias’s work Van Stolk and Wouters (1987) state:
We believe that the established-outsider and the civilising process theories overlap and complement each other. For instance, they both clarify the connections between developments in power relations and developments in personality structure. The book *The Established and the Outsiders* (Elias and Scotson, 1965) is about the figuration formed by people from two British working-class neighbourhoods. It shows how the unequal power relations that developed between the neighbourhoods – between the established inhabitants and the newcomers – was reflected in the personality of the inhabitants. The unequal balance of power was recognisable by the feeling of superiority and gratifying self-esteem felt by the established, and the outsiders’ feeling of inferiority. The book’s main theme is the connection between power relations, respect for others (status or rank), and self-respect.

(Van Stolk and Wouters, 1987: 480 - 481)

Drawing on Elias and Scotson’s work it is possible to conclude, as Dunning (1999) has identified, that race relations are not unique as a type of social stratification.

Having established that race relations are not a unique form of social stratification, Elias and Scotson identified four common features that can be applied to, amongst others, ‘racial’ relationships. These common features are as follows: (i) members of established groups tend to perceive outsiders as ‘law-breakers’ and ‘status-violators’, (ii) the established tend to judge outsiders in terms of the ‘minority of the worst’, that is in terms of the minority of outsiders who actually do break the law and violate standards, (iii) outsiders tend to accept the established group’s stigmatisation of them, that is to internalise the ‘group charisma’ of the dominant group and their own ‘group disgrace’ and (iv) the established tend to view the outsiders as in some way ‘unclean’.

We can see then how ‘supposed’ as opposed to ‘real’ (i.e. those with a biological base) racial differences can become an issue in terms of ‘racial’ relationships. Indeed, as Elias states:
Terms like ‘racial’ or ‘ethnic’ .... in sociology and .... society at large are symptomatic of an ideological avoidance action. By using them, one singles out for attention what is peripheral to these relationships (e.g. differences of skin colour) and turns the eye away from what is central (e.g. differences in power ratio and the exclusion of a power inferior group from positions with a higher power potential).

(Elias, 1994, cited in Dunning 1999: 190)

From this we can see that Elias believes that the way two groups are bonded together (internally and externally) can endow one group with much greater power resources than the other. When this occurs the group with greater access to power resources can exclude members of the other group from access to the centre of these power resources, thereby relegating them to the position of outsiders. Furthermore, for the individuals involved in established outsider relations such as these the broader social experiences involved will effect how they view themselves and their place in society.

As far as sport is concerned a prime example exists that relates to the opportunity of access to the centre of power resources. Several researchers (for example; Dunning, 1999; Hoberman, 1997; Vasili, 2000; Garland & Rowe, 2001; Coakley, 1999) have identified the growth of representation of black sportsmen, particularly from the 1960s onwards, in terms of participation in professional sports including: association football, athletics, basketball, baseball, American football. In Dunning’s (1999) opinion, as far as the USA is concerned, the development of twentieth century American society has contributed to a slight but nonetheless detectable shift in the balance of power between these socially produced racial groups away from whites and towards blacks, leading to growing numbers of the latter becoming more self-confident and embracing ‘racial pride’. Specifically in relation to sport Dunning argued that:
Starting from a situation characterised by virtually total dominance of whites over blacks in which sporting prowess was one of the few power resources available to the latter, the long term dynamics of American social development led, especially in the course of the twentieth century, to the emergence of a societal figuration in which a slight but nonetheless detectable shift in the balance of power occurred, a shift which is more publicly apparent in the field of sport than in many other spheres of American life.

(Dunning, 1999: 190)

It is evident that Dunning believes this slight shift in the balance of power was figurationally generated. This shift led American blacks in growing numbers to begin to reject their stigmatisation by whites and to fight more openly, systematically and self-confidently against white dominance (which contributed to the racial violence and sporting protests that flared in the 1960s) (Dunning, 1999). In addition, a consequence of this was that, over time, social power based on sporting prowess developed and in turn contributed to the expansion of the ‘black bourgeoisie’ (Dunning, 1999). However, the process of racial desegregation in top-level sport participation is not mirrored as far as management and ownership are concerned (Dunning, 1999: 211). Picking up on this idea Back et al referred to other researchers’ findings and note:

[Stuart] Hall perceptively warns that the assimilation of black people within the national imagination as sporting heroes need not in any way be congruent with access to the centres of decision making and institutional power…Gilroy identifies the ways in which the economic success of black sportsmen also masks the enduring legacy of white supremacy.

(Back et al, 2001: 4)

Hoberman (1997: 32), in relation to elite male sports performers, argues that in American sports (i.e. athletics, professional American football, basketball, and baseball) from the 1960s onwards an, ‘era of so-called black dominance’ has ensued. This state of affairs has seen a model emerge in relation to the American sports world
that would lead one to believe that equal opportunity exists. In turn, Hoberman (1997: 32) maintains that this will lead to ‘a linear expansion of minority participation and power over time’. Hoberman, however, claims that this will not occur in the foreseeable future and that, to date, the expansion this model predicts has been very limited. His reasoning for this is based on the concept of domination characterised by what he calls ‘Western colonialism’, which effects access to power resources because:

The essence of Western colonialism has always been the monopolisation of authority and prerogatives by men of European origin, and these prerogatives have always included the mastery of administration and technology, which keeps “natives” in a pre-modern state.

(Hoberman, 1997: 32)

Developing this train of thought, and by way of offering more concrete information about why he believes that power resources in this context are unlikely to change hands, Hoberman adds to the above by outlining his belief that:

At a time when black political power is actually shrinking, there is no political mandate to enhance black representation in any social sector. The sports media, which serve predominantly white audiences, see no advantage in ceding a share of their power to blacks; the black media (and the black middle class they serve) have embraced the abundance of black athletic celebrities as emblems of racial achievement. There is not enough black wealth to purchase controlling ownership in professional teams or major media, and black athletes, like the vast majority of elite athletes around the world, possess neither the interest nor the political sophistication to mount a campaign against the prevailing order of things. This imbalance of power has made integrated sport an arrangement of convenience, a mutually profitable racial truce, rather than a partnership in a more meaningful sense.

(Hoberman, 1997: 32 - 33)

Prior research, as noted above, suggests that an increase in black participation in elite level male sport has occurred (Dunning, 1999; Hoberman, 1997; Vasili, 2000; Garland & Rowe, 2001; Coakley, 1999). Relative to the US this would appear to
have resulted in a slight shift in the balance of power away from one socially
produced racial group (whites) towards another (blacks) (Dunning, 1999; Hoberman,
1997). As far as management and ownership are concerned, however, access to the
centres of decision making and institutional power remain in the hands of whites and
are predicted to remain so (Dunning, 1999; Hoberman, 1997; Back et al, 2001). That
being the case one can speculate that blacks have attained more power in certain
circumstances, but only when it suits those whites that are in control of the centre of
power resources. This idea, however, rests on a debateable basic assumption of
absolute white power and control. Consequently, this makes it debateable as to
whether, in all cases, increasing black power has only been granted when it suits
whites.

**Birrell and Dunning Commonality / Difference**

Having analysed the positions of Birrell and Dunning areas of commonality /
difference need to be identified. In comparison to other research in this area the work
of Birrell and Dunning stands out as the more sophisticated sociologically. Indeed,
Dunning (1999) and Birrell (1999) agree that earlier sociological approaches have
failed to provide a sophisticated analysis of racial relations in sport. To fill this gap
Birrell advocates the use of a cultural studies model (a blend of materialistic and
culturalistic perspectives). Specifically, Birrell (1999: 16) suggests using this model
for ‘analysing the complex relations of dominance and subordination’ and to ‘analyse
how racial relations are articulated, reproduced, or resisted in sport’. Birrell, as
detailed, highlights gaps in prior sports studies research of race relations, but does not
make any attempt to fill these gaps using the cultural studies model she advocates.
Dunning (1999: 179), having started from a similar reference point to Birrell, hoped to gain an ‘understanding of the part played by sport in ‘race relations’” and to do so he suggests using a figurational / process sociological approach.

A key aspect of Dunning’s position is, following Elias (1978) to view ‘sporting prowess’ as ‘a positive power resource’ (1999: 192). Birrell (1999: 6) for her part refers to power in a sporting context and when identifying the need for a more critical analysis of racial relations, relative to sports studies, does note that sport ‘provides a particularly public display of relations of dominance and subordination’. However, Birrell does not attempt to carry out critical analysis, whereas Dunning (1999) not only conceptualised race relations as fundamentally involving questions of power, but also explored the social conditions under which sporting prowess can become a power resource. That being the case it would appear that further commonality between the work of Birrell (1999) and Dunning (1999) does exist, but that Birrell set parameters and made sensible suggestions for further research to be done, whereas Dunning, leaning on the insights of Elias and Scotson, proceeded with the task of actually doing such research and has consequently carried out the more sophisticated analysis.

Birrell (1999: 8) does not specifically consider established outsider relations, although she does mention the ongoing debate about who is best placed to provide an accurate analysis of black life ‘a black insider or a white outsider?’¹¹⁷ In other words, similar to the issue of power, it appears that Birrell (1999) is conscious of such ideas, although she has not investigated or expanded upon them. As evidenced Dunning is familiar with the prior research relating to established outsider relations and has used the work
of Elias and Scotson (1965, 1994) as a tool when doing further research of his own.

Overall, it would appear therefore that the work of Birrell (1999) does fit well with that of Dunning (1999). In addition, since Dunning has used what he sees as the ‘best bits’ of older research one can see how this research, that he uses to analyse racial relations in sport, meets Birrell’s criteria for sociologically sophisticated analysis.
Conclusion

Prior research predominantly suggests that race is a flawed term in relation to genetic validity, although that does not mean that race cannot act as ‘a social construct’ (Cole, 1996: 12). Rather than abandon the term ‘race’ attempts have been made to re-classify it. Having reviewed relevant previous research it seems appropriate to deconstruct race as a ‘biological category’, although as Birrell (1999: 11) argues ‘race can be understood as a category popularly constructed along assumptions of biological distinction indexed by colour and then naturalised through cultural practices and ideological work’.

Dunnning (1999), as detailed above, has drawn attention to the concept that race is a specific form of power relations and that sporting prowess can act as a power resource under specific conditions. Such issues as power ratios and exclusion of power inferior groups are thus perhaps even more central to the research here than discussion of the term race. In this regard, Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) theory of ‘established outsider’ relations emerged and will act as a useful tool when considering, for example, racial equality. This theory is based on the notion that people come to hold particular subjective views as a consequence of their broader social experience(s) and is hence appropriate to use for research into different ethnic groups. Also, issues such as length of association and networks of interdependence are central to this position and since these can be related to minority ethnic groups it is evident how this theory will be applicable to the empirical research, which forms the basis of this thesis.

As far as the race relations theories identified by Birrell (1999) are concerned
ultimately, the culturalist model, that places cultural domination and subordination as the key dynamic in production and maintenance of racial relations of dominance and subordination, was found to have firmer theoretical foundations. As noted, above, one’s concern with the materialist (Marxist) theory is whether it would produce a detailed enough understanding of the lives of members of minority ethnic groups. Nevertheless, as Birrell (1999) argues, both of these theories have something to offer and blending them could enable critical analysis of racial relations in a sporting context to be completed. Furthermore, it was found that this culturalist / materialist assimilation approach appears to be largely compatible with the work of Dunning and Elias (and in particular the theory of ‘established outsider’ relations).

Having considered the above combination of approaches, and more importantly for this research, Birrell (1999) identified gaps in current research into race relations in sport and compiled ideas for further possible research. These ideas included looking at absences in sport, which will be encompassed here as one endeavours to produce a more sophisticated, critical analysis of racial relations related to sport. Having researched race and race relation’s theories, including their applicability to sport, the next task is to review prior research in the more specific area of race and association football. It is to this that I turn in the next chapter.
Chapter 2: Race and Association Football

Introduction

This chapter examines existing literature on race and association football. That being the case some of the prior research covered is included to provide context for the research herein and simultaneously to help illustrate the development of research in this area over time. Ultimately, however, from this review gaps in existing knowledge will become evident, and thus the rationale for this piece of work will emerge.

Initially this chapter details and reviews literature, which highlights the disproportionately high number of black British professional footballers compared to the size of the black minority ethnic community. This in turn leads to discussion of whether or not sport is free of ‘racial’ discrimination, or in other words whether sport improves ‘race relations’ or reproduces racism (Ismond, 2003).

Secondly sport structures, and specifically existing research relating to centrality and stacking, are critiqued. Whether such work, focusing on sports structures, has led to researchers overlooking interrelationships between sports and wider social contexts (Dunning, 1999) is examined. This review of sports structures contributes to the explanation of the development over time of research into race and association football, but also helps one identify gaps in previous sociological work in the field, which relate to football and, for example; the construction and reproduction of social divisions, ethnic identities, and a whole range of prejudices and inequities (Burdsey, 2007). As a consequence, stereotypes and the idea of black athletic superiority (and
corresponding white athletic inferiority) shall be investigated, as will the concept of ‘group disgrace’ (Elias and Scotson, 1994) and its potential for internalisation by black minority ethnic groups.

The majority of work in this field is what Birrell (1999) terms bi-polar. Responding to calls to move beyond this emphasis on black / white race relations (Birrell, 1989; Waddington et al, 1999), this research will seek a more holistic approach by incorporating initial observations regarding South Asian minority ethnic groups’ involvement in football in England. Using this South Asian categorisation one would note means that differentiation is being made between the peoples of the Indian sub-continent (or those of sub-continental origin) and those originating from or residing in South East Asia (i.e. encompassing Japan, China or North or South Korea) (Johal, 2001). Throughout this work, therefore, when Asian is referred to it is this South Asian grouping which is being considered. Furthermore, at this time, justification is offered for why the work here focuses almost exclusively on males.

Third consideration is given to what existing research tells us about spectating patterns of members of minority ethnic groups. Ultimately, the weight of evidence in this area suggests there is striking under-representation of minority ethnic group members as spectators at football matches in England. While that appears to be the case what is behind this under representation remains unclear. Waddington et al (1999), for their part, have speculated whether this trend stems from feelings of indifference towards sport, or a more conscious rejection of sport spectatorship.
With the weight of evidence available suggesting that members of minority ethnic groups are not indifferent to sport other factors must be involved. Here various factors are reviewed that have, or are thought to have, impinged on spectating patterns of members of minority ethnic groups at live football matches in England. These include existing research in relation to, for example, ‘exciting significance’ (Maguire, 1991b: 29), national, social and cultural identity (Burdsey, 2006, 2007) as well as overt and covert forms of racism (for example, whether grounds are seen as threatening environments or whether minority ethnic group absence is more the result of feelings of not belonging).

Fourth the efficacy or otherwise of anti-racist movements is considered as is their role in the [supposed] decline of overt racism in football in England. This consideration of anti-racist initiatives will also be of use subsequently to locate the clubs identified for the case studies in relation to their anti-racist work.

Next, the widespread prejudice (Burdsey, 2007a: 620), Islamophobia is investigated. This has impacted, negatively, upon South Asian communities, and in particular Muslim communities, in the last decade. With South Asian minority ethnic groups being central to the research here focussing in on Islamophobia is relevant since it has been argued that such prejudice makes members of this minority ethnic group feel increasingly vulnerable and affects their sense of identity, community and belonging. As well as the post 9/11 and 7/7 climates, the 2001 disorders in northern England are considered, with reference to The Cantle Report (2001: 9) that found evidence of communities living segregated, ‘parallel lives’. In turn with the growth of the
significant phenomena that is Islamophobia instances specifically related to football have occurred. Using, as a start point, investigation of an instance of Islamophobia that occurred during a game in August 2007, between Middlesbrough and Newcastle United, (Millward, 2008) this phenomena, which has received little academic attention previously (Burdsey, 2007), is focussed in on.

Finally research relating to sites of sport shall be reviewed since this is an area that may be associated with attendance at sporting events. In particular this will involve looking at space and place and how people identify with a place, such as a football stadium. Conclusions will thus be drawn about the usefulness and relevance of these bodies of literature for the empirical research, which forms the basis of this thesis.
Sports Structures

As far as participation in sport is concerned much of the available literature outlines the high rates of, predominantly male, members of British minority ethnic groups in elite British sport. Specific to association football this trend has been identified by Bradbury (2001) who calculated that roughly 13 per cent of professional football players, during season 1999-2000, were UK born (predominantly) black British players. Prior to this Vasili was the primary researcher for a survey (the results of which were broadcast by BBC’s ‘Black Britain’ programme in August 1997), which indicated that approximately 15 per cent of all professional footballers are black (Vasili, 2000). Commenting on this Bradbury tentatively suggests that the difference in his findings and those of Vasili may be due to the proportion of black European, African and South American imports playing in English football. Having noted that Bradbury (2001) suggests that overall around 15 per cent of professional players in English football are black. Whilst this figure is lower than that reported in ‘The Guardian’ newspaper (17th August 1994), which claimed that almost 20 per cent of professional footballers are black (Waddington et al, 1999), what is clear is that the proportion of black British males playing in professional association football far exceeds, in percentage terms, their proportion of the overall population. Statistics such as these have offered support to a popular assumption that the scale of African-Caribbean sports participation means sport, as an area of social life, is relatively free from racial discrimination. Unwilling to accept this notion a number of sociologists (for example; Macpherson, 1999; Hoberman, 1997) have questioned whether it is correct to equate this representation with an absence of discrimination. Neither of these positions, that on the one hand asserts that sport improves race relations through
inter-racial contact or on the other hand that sport can only reproduce racism, in terms of perpetuating biological racial ideologies and inequalities seems wholly accurate. This leads Carrington and McDonald to state that:

Sport, like many other cultural arenas, is a site of contestation, resistance and struggle, whereby dominant ideologies are both maintained and challenged at particular historical points and in specific social contexts.

(Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 12)

In a similar vein Ismond (2003: 93) claimed that ‘sport is an area of contested and shifting ideologies, rather than a consistent and functional ideology working in the interests of a domain group’, whilst one of the conclusions that may be drawn from the earlier work of James (1963) is how sport is a vehicle for popular struggle, particularly against racial inequality.

Initiated by Loy and Elvogue (1970), a series of studies illustrated how, in a variety of team sports, there is a tendency for members of minority ethnic groups to experience ‘stacking’ (i.e. to be employed in roles that can be classified as relatively peripheral and / or less significant to the outcome of the game (Malcolm, 2001: 258)). In relation to association football in England research found evidence of ‘stacking’ with disproportionately high numbers of black players operating as wingers and strikers (Maguire, 1988, 1991a; Melnick, 1988). Research of this nature offered, at the time, an insight into stratification by race. Subsequent research related to this area has replicated and re-iterated these findings (for example; Vasili, 2000; Back et al, 2001). Such research has, however, failed to advance beyond the descriptive and offer theoretical insights. Bearing this in mind and laying down a marker for advancement within the study of race and sport Birrell states:
In the past, our approach has been to assert that race exists and to ask what effect membership in a particular race or ethnic group has on sport involvement. A more profound approach is to conceive of race as a culturally produced marker of a particular relationship of power, to see racial identity as contested, and to ask how racial relations are produced and reproduced through sport.

(Birrell, 1999: 7)

Along similar lines Carrington and McDonald (2001: 12) indicate that ‘racism is actually about socially (and historically) inscribed power relationships, embedded within structural constraints that often lie beyond the scope of the individual to change’. They add that this has not been ascribed to sport studies since race and sport ‘has been so poorly theorised up until now’ (Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 12).

Dunning (1999), as highlighted previously, in a similar vein argued that with a focus on sports structures (i.e. studies into centrality and stacking) contexts such as the interrelationships between sports and the wider social contexts in which they are organised, watched and played have been overlooked. Dunning added that researchers have failed to examine ‘the often profound ways in which these wider contexts have become “racialised” over time and the conditions under which processes of at least partial “de-racialisation” can occur’ (Dunning, 1999: 180).

Supporting this train of though Carrington and McDonald (2001: 7) maintain that ‘there is not a critical school of sociological thought on race and sport within Britain’. They add that what work has been done in this area has tended to come from America and focuses on: ‘stacking’, stereotyping, discrimination, and the inability to progress into senior management. Picking up on such gaps in sociological work Burdsey refers specifically to association football and argues that:
There is still a tendency in academic and popular discourses to overlook the critical role that sport – and especially football – plays in the construction and reproduction of social divisions, ethnic identities, and a whole range of prejudices and inequities. (Burdsey, 2007: 142)

Whilst for this thesis further investigation into sports structures is unnecessary, consideration of explanations for stacking are of interest since they, for example, relate to stereotypes concerned with black physicality and mental capabilities. These long held stereotypes (see also chapter one) have been used to discriminate against blacks and state that black people, compared to whites, possess ‘athletic superiority’, but ‘intellectual inferiority’ (McKay, 1995: cited in Dunning, 1999: 217). Hoberman (1997: 36) thinks that the legacy of this mindset, of black intellectual inferiority, persisted into the twentieth century and helps explain why whites hold most leadership positions in professional sport. Indeed, as far as this idea of black athletic superiority and corresponding white athletic inferiority is concerned, Hobermann (1997: xxiii) argues that it does ‘more than anything else in our public life to encourage the idea that blacks and whites are different in a meaningful way’.

Furthermore, Hoberman (1997: 5) maintains that this linkage has support from members of the white and minority ethnic communities and that the stereotype of black athletic superiority has ‘become nothing less than a global racial folklore’. Following this train of thought, with athletic superiority aligned with intellectual inferiority, it has been argued that sports help maintain the traditional view of blacks as essentially physical and thus primitive people (Hoberman, 1997: Andrews, 1996). Others, however, disagree with Hoberman and Cashmore. Carrington and McDonald, for example, offer up a position that from a personal standpoint appears to provide a
a greater degree of legitimacy, when they argue that:

The mistake of both Hoberman and Cashmore is to read the lack of black social mobility outside sport as being the result of some cultural ‘dysfunction’ within the ‘abnormal’ black family structure, as opposed to there being real barriers to progression in other areas such as education and employment. It is a classic way in which those discriminated against are then blamed for their own subordinate position, diverting attention away from structural inequalities, and towards the perceived moral inadequacies of the individuals themselves.

(Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 11)

Noting that minority ethnic groups suffer from rigid perceptions of how they should, or should not participate in sport, Coakley (1994: 32) believes stacking ‘acts both as a “bar” to outside cultural influence and as a “selection process” to determine the ranking or “pecking order” in which outside groups should be placed’. Investigating this Coakley (1994) suggests further explanations for stacking (in addition to stereotypes relating to physicality and mental capacity) including: economic factors (with, for example, some groups ‘targeted’ for funding or provision ahead of others), psychological factors (due to internalisation or self-discrimination by a cultural group self-esteem may be low and can effect how minority groups perceive themselves which in turn may effect their sports participation). As noted, therefore, Coakley provides a wider range of explanations for stacking than Hoberman and Cashmore. However, while the scope may be broader with this psychological factors explanation Coakley’s argument has similarities with the, aforementioned, argument put forward by Elias and Scotson (1994) that ‘outsiders’ have a tendency to accept ‘established’ group’s stigmatisation of them. In other words they internalise the ‘group charisma’ of the dominant group and their own ‘group disgrace’. Consequently, this appears to be something of a rebuttal of Carrington and McDonald and closer to the ideas of Hoberman and Cashmore detailed above.
It is noticeable that the existing research referred to above almost exclusively relates to black male athletes. Birrell (1999) critiqued this emphasis on black male athletes, claiming that it has several limitations, including that an image of race and sport as homogenous and undifferentiated can be produced. Whilst Dunning (1999) concurred with Birrell’s critique his work, once again, focused on black male athletes in the US. Since emerging as a sub-discipline in 1960s the sociology of sport has been dominated by North American research. That being the case the emphasis on black male athletes is somewhat more understandable, although as Waddington et al, like Birrell, indicate this bi-polar standpoint restricts our understanding:

the majority of findings concerning ‘race’ / ethnicity relate to bi-polar, black / white, ‘race’ relations. This largely American based model may, however, be less helpful when studying relations between other ethnic groups. The pattern of black / white social relations, of which specific mythical / stereotypical beliefs are an important characteristic, is very different from those between some other ethnic groups, and Susan Birrell (1989) has properly called for a move in the sociology of sport towards multi-polar studies of ‘race’ and ethnicity.

(Waddington et al, 1999: 16)

This thesis therefore seeks to encompass black and Asian communities in England, and investigate their inclusion / exclusion in association football. Differences between these two minority ethnic groups exist as far as their relationship with association football is concerned (see chapters 4 and 5). At this juncture it is worth noting that whilst numerous black British players have played professional football in England, ‘only a handful of players of South Asian background have ever played professional football in England’ (Burdsey, 2007: 1). Expanding on this statement Burdsey points out that:
Minority ethnic groups in Britain share a common historical experience of racialisation and subjugation within Western sporting ideologies, yet the components on which images and discourses are based differ considerably.

(Burdsey, 2007: 17)

On the one hand African-Caribbeans are said to possess physical capabilities that make them natural sportspeople (Cashmore, 1982; Hoberman, 1997; Entine, 2000) whilst on the other stereotypes of British Asian physicality and representations of the body, have led them to be classed as the non-sporting ‘Other’. Discussing such categorisation Johal notes how:

A popular and enduring myth of South Asian physical inferiority, with its associations of stamina and strength deficiencies, continues to predominate… The standard stereotype of South Asian people, is, one of the submissive, naturally placid and physically frail individual.

(Johal, 2001: 157 and 160)

As far as association football is concerned the low level involvement of British Asians in the professional game will not have helped counter dominant imagery that claims Asians lack toughness and other masculine qualities. For black British players this situation is different since generations of black players have played professional football in Britain leading, it might be argued, to a degree of erosion, although it is certainly not universal, of some of the stereotypes aimed at them. Having said that, however, one can see how this pattern can also be seen to simultaneously offer support for the dominant imagery and stereotypes discussed above.

It is hoped that the multi-polar research contained in this thesis helps to fill the void highlighted by Carrington and McDonald (2001: 12) who state ‘that Britain lacks a critical sociology of ‘race’ and sport’. This research does, however, perpetrate the
male-bias in the field. In this respect one would point out that: (i) the vast majority of football fans are male, and (ii) professional footballers (in Britain) are almost exclusively male. As far as football fans are concerned Bromberger (1995) identified two striking characteristics of football crowds, these being that they consist primarily of young people and that they are overwhelmingly male. Bromberger’s studies were carried out in France and Italy, but when Waddington et al (1999: 23) undertook a comparative overview of similar studies, they concurred with Bromberger and stated that football spectating is a ‘predominantly – indeed overwhelmingly – male activity’. As far as professional players in England are concerned the men’s game has approximately 3,000 registered male professional players (Bradbury, 2001), whilst English clubs have, rarely employed more than a handful of professional women players.³
Minority Ethnic Groups Spectating Patterns

Another issue that has been the focus of prior research has been access to sports events amongst members of minority ethnic groups. Waddington et al (1999), for example, researched whether being a member of a minority ethnic group, in societies across Europe, restricted or facilitated access to top-level football matches. They found that, in relation to black and Asian spectators, ‘in Britain, sports spectatorship is a sphere of social life in which members of ‘outsider’ ethnic groups participate only to a very limited degree’ (Waddington et al, 1999: 19). Another study identified a ‘considerable under-representation of ethnic minority group members as spectators at sports events in England’ (Malcolm et al, 1999: 42).

Further evidence of this trend has been provided by the FA Premier League Fan Survey 1999-2000 (relating to season 1998-1999), the findings of Bradbury that relate to season 1999-2000 and the work of Bains and Johal (1998) relating to attendance by Asians at a game played during 1995. Specifically, and more recently, the 2001 FA Premier League Fan Survey found that Black British or Black Asian fans comprised, only, 0.8% of the total sample of active top level fans and that even in areas of the country with large minority ethnic populations match attendance from amongst these groups is very low (NB: Since 2001 further Premier League Fan Surveys have been conducted, but these have concentrated on other areas of fandom than attendance by members of minority ethnic groups).

Overall, therefore, research suggests that the under-representation of minority ethnic group members as spectators at football matches in England is striking. Only
Waddington et al (1999) distinguish between and specifically comment on the differences between blacks and Asians in this respect. They found that ‘fewer Asians than blacks attend English football matches’ despite the fact that the Asian community make up a greater proportion of the population, of Britain, than the black community (Waddington et al, 1999: 22).

Having established that few members of minority ethnic groups attend live football games in Britain, Waddington et al (1999) speculated as to whether this was associated with: (i) feelings of indifference towards sport, or (ii) a conscious rejection of sport spectatorship, by members of certain ethnic groups. In relation to the first possibility Maguire (1988: 259) notes that research evidence indicates ‘that West Indian males place a high value on achievement in sports and view sport as a central life interest’. Furthermore black males have made significant inroads as elite level participants in many sports, including association football, so indifference towards the sport does not appear to be evident. However, whilst playing football does show an interest in sports participation it does not necessarily follow that this will lead to other manifestations of sporting interest (for example, spectating at live games). Indeed, sporting interest can take many different forms (for example: watching it on television, following it in the newspapers or on the internet, coaching, etc) that can, but will not necessarily, overlap. In other words, proving that an interest exists for one manifestation of a sport, such as playing, does not necessarily mean that an interest in others, such as spectating at live games, is evident.

A possible explanation for the significant involvement of black males as elite level
sports performers, but their under-representation as spectators at football matches in England can be found in the work of Elias and Dunning (1986). They argue that a principal function of leisure forms is the ‘arousal of pleasurable forms of excitement’ and that sport is appealing generally for those who have a ‘quest for excitement’. Furthermore, they believe that excitement is elicited by the creation of tensions: this can involve imaginary or controlled ‘real’ danger, mimetic fear and / or pleasure, sadness and / or joy. Elias and Dunning (1986) claim that this controlling decontrolling of excitement is at ‘the heart of leisure sport’. Since sport, especially ‘achievement sport’, can involve pleasurable excitement developed from struggles between human beings some sport forms resemble battles. In other words, the quest (as far as sport is concerned) is for battles enacted playfully in a contrived context, which can produce enjoyable battle excitement with minimal injuries.

Refining the above concept Maguire (1991b: 28-29) notes that ‘the manner in which this quest for enjoyable excitement finds expression in social institutions and customs varies greatly over time and space’. Consequently, Maguire (1991b: 29) feels that ‘sport involves the quest for exciting significance’ (emphasis added). This is not merely a question of semantics, but ‘a more subtle application of Eliasian theory to the phenomenon of sport’ that takes into consideration ‘the fact that identity formation in sport also involves the quest for self-realisation and the presentation of self’. Maguire notes that this re-emphasis:

requires one to recognise that the modern quest for “exciting significance” is bounded and contoured by both interdependency chains inherited from the past and by contemporary cultural relations.

(Maguire, 1991b: 32)
Using this framework one could see how members of minority ethnic groups with a ‘quest for excitement’ may become sports performers. However, for these individuals to consider spectating at live football matches it would, according to this model have to provide them with ‘exciting significance’. Significance in this context refers to the individual believing that a particular person or team represents ‘them’. If one accepts this premise one can see how a black male may play association football because they have a ‘quest for excitement’, but not attend live games because they cannot identify with or do not feel a sense of belonging to a particular team (i.e. the ‘exciting significance’ is missing).

Carrington (1998) provides some evidence of this phenomenon with his analysis of the 1996 European Championship Finals, held in England, which he argues reinforced discourses of exclusion and cultural racism. Specific to the black minority ethnic community in Britain and feelings towards the English national football team, he states:

> The fact that the majority of the black population living in England had either a large degree of ambivalence towards England or openly supported ‘anyone but England’ underscores the points being made that the form of national identity produced failed to be inclusive and actually alienated large sections of the nation from view.

(Carrington, 1998: 118)

Making a similar point, although less specific to football, Burdsey (2006), with reference to research by Back (1996) and Gilroy (1993), points out that ‘A significant number of authors have identified that popular manifestations of ‘Englishness’ are often exclusionary, alienating or irrelevant to African-Caribbeans’. As far as Asian males in Britain are concerned evidence about attitudes towards sport are less readily
available, particularly as far as association football is concerned. Much of the existing research has concentrated on South Asians and cricket (Ismond, 2003; Burdsey, 2006), prompting one researcher to state in relation to Asian (with particular reference to British Pakistanis) alienation and disaffection from British society, that:

Substantial attention – both in academia and the media – has focused on the relationship between cricket and national identity amongst British Asians. Due to the fallacious, yet pervasive, belief that participation in football is anathema to British Asians, little investigation has focused on this sport. (Johal, 2001: 17)

As far as attitudes to sport are concerned Fleming (1991) indicated that sport is of importance to certain groups of Asian men and, whilst there are currently less than a handful of Asian players employed by professional clubs in Britain, a report published in 1991 (Verma, et al, 1991) showed that ‘the Bangladeshi community in Britain have an interest in playing football that exceeds every other group, including white people’ (Bains and Johal, 1998: 104). To date a follow up study (which may act as corroborating evidence) into this interest in playing football amongst the Bangladeshi community has not been conducted. However, further evidence of interest amongst Asians generally has materialised with Burdsey (2007: 143) claiming that his research suggests that football ‘is hugely popular amongst, and played by large numbers of, British Asians throughout the country’.

As far as research into and related to spectating patterns is concerned a survey (Eastern Eye, July 2004) relating to interest in football and potential spectating patterns found that a third of their [predominantly Asian] respondents expressed an interest in becoming a season ticket holder at a professional football club and 75% of respondents said that they supported the England national team (Bains, 2005: 9).
Similarly, Perryman’s (2006) anecdotal evidence has suggested that there has been a gradual increase in the number of British Asians supporting the English national football team and attending live games. Furthermore, Burdsey investigated British Asian fandom and found a difference when comparing cricket and association football, leading him to note:

> It is apparent that whilst young British Asians may cite cricketers such as India’s Sachin Tendulkar or Shoaib Akhtar of Pakistan as heroes, in football they are far more likely to idolize familiar, non-British Asian figures such as David Beckham. Indeed, few young British Asians will be familiar with any subcontinental footballers.4

(Burdsey, 2006: 21)

Social identities are constantly in process, contextually specific, and the product of numerous different, and often seemingly conflicting or contradictory influences (Hall, 1990). In a similar vein, at another juncture, Hall (1992, 225) stated that cultural identity ‘is a matter of “becoming” as well as of “being”… cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything that is historical they undergo constant transformation… subject to the continuous “play” of history, culture and power’. Taking this into consideration Burdsey (2006, 2007) maintains that it is no surprise that British Asians, like various other sections of the population, follow different sides in different sports, due to diverse personal reasons and social factors. This is a view also subscribed to by Parekh who states:

> A multicultural society requires that the prevailing view of national identity should allow its members to entertain dual and even multiple identities without arising fears of divided loyalties.

(Parekh, 2000: 205)

Specific to football, like Bains (2005), Burdsey (2006, 2007) found evidence of support amongst British Asians for the England national team. For British Asians,
Burdsey (2006: 23) believes, this involvement in football may be thought of ‘as a situating strategy, literally a means of signalling their attachment to what is regarded as “home” rather than to what might be perceived as the “homeland(s)”’. With this participation in football (especially the affiliation to the England national team) Burdsey (2006: 24) believes that a specifically British Asian identity is being constructed, rather than an insular Asian or British one, due to a ‘desire to construct a multiracial social identity that simultaneously emphasises their British citizenship and their ethnicities’. In other words, a British Asian may simultaneously see themselves as, British, Asian and Muslim and not consider this to be contradictory.

Consideration of this process shows how sport, ‘operates as an arena of contestation where individuals and institutions can maintain – or, indeed, challenge – the existing distribution of power and capital’ (Burdsey, 2006: 24). Although a seemingly plausible claim for sport Burdsey (2006, 2007) basically concedes that if indeed this trend is occurring it is in its early stages. Furthermore, he admits that, to date this process does not signify that British Asians have universally, unconditionally embraced ‘Englishness’ or that there has been a substantial shift towards multiculturalism in the game. Summarising, his findings in this regard he argues that:

British Asians are articulating a sense of identity based on their status as British citizens and the importance of the England football team in its expression, but one must remain cautious about the extent to which it signifies either a tangible improvement in racial equality in football or society, or a dramatic shift in British Asians’ wider social location.

(Burdsey, 2007: 99)

As far as spectating at live football is concerned, Bains and Johal, state that in relation to British Asians:
amongst the many who, for a variety of reasons stay away, there are those whose devotion is as great, if not greater, than that displayed by the majority of white committed fans. (Bains and Johal, 1998: 93)

Bains and Johal come to this conclusion by collecting anecdotal, rather than systematically researched, evidence so their claim about British Asians devotion to football remains unproven. With reference to overt racism and xenophobia amongst fans and some of the popular symbols and manifestations of English fandom,7 Burdsey (2006: 25) states that ‘despite their support for the team, minority ethnic fans are still, sadly, likely to find the “live” public England football experience – whether in the stadium or in pubs and bars – a hostile experience’ and, as a consequence, articulations of English football identity may be restricted to their own private social spheres. One factor in making it a hostile experience can be racist chanting, of which Maguire, et al (2001: 66) note ‘much of the current abuse is aimed at Asians’, a situation also identified by Brown (1995) who argues that such chanting does not make Asians feel welcome. Turning to Waddington et al, they have done, research that suggests that whilst blacks and Asians appear to reject football spectatorship they do not reject football as a whole. They state that there is:

no evidence to suggest that blacks and Asians are in general indifferent to towards football, and it therefore appears rather more likely that their under-representation in football crowds in England may be associated with a more or less conscious rejection of spectatorship at football matches as a leisure pursuit.

(Waddington et al, 1999: 20)

Similarly, as noted above, Burdsey (2007: 143) identified interest in playing amongst British Asians of whom he said ‘many would relish the opportunity to become professional players’. Garland and Rowe (1996) have also argued that members of Asian communities are actively involved in playing football. In support of this they
outline how every year, dozens of teams from the Patel community (of Indian origin) participate in their own competition which attracts several thousand spectators, and that over thirty teams compete in the Laurentian Life Asian Football League.

Overall the available evidence suggests that members of minority ethnic groups are not indifferent to football. If accurate, then other factors must be influencing members of minority ethnic groups and leading to rejection of football spectatorship as a leisure pursuit.

Although speculative, it has been claimed that one reason why minority ethnic group members do not attend live football matches is that they can be threatening environments for blacks and Asians. Garland and Rowe (2001) note that a 1996 survey of 1300 schoolchildren by CARE (Charlton Athletic Race Equality partnership) identified high levels of interest in football amongst black and Asian communities, but also identified that around 40 per cent of the black and Asian schoolchildren surveyed stated that racist abuse was a factor in their non-attendance at live football games. Academic research to support this survey does not appear to have materialised, although results from other local research projects and anecdotal evidence, relating to how hazardous attendance at football matches can be for members of minority ethnic groups in Britain, is readily available (Hill, 2001; Beck et al, 2001; Garland and Rowe, 1996 and 2001; Bradbury, 2001, Burdsey, 2007 and various fan’s surveys). Garland and Rowe claim that the effect of witnessing overt racism, at certain live football games in England is that it creates ‘an environment where at most clubs the high-profile success of black players on the playing field
failed to attract more than a handful of minority ethnic spectators to the stands’ (Garland and Rowe, 2001: 5). It is not just fans however who maintain that racism is a factor in such non-attendance. Bradbury (2001: 31) in his survey of professional clubs found that 33 per cent of respondents, which equated to around 42 per cent of those clubs who say they have local minority communities from which to draw support, suggested that minority ethnic fans had ‘disqualifying concerns over racism at football’. This is a significant percentage, although in view of the results of research projects and anecdotal evidence Bradbury (2001: 31) expressed surprise that even ‘more clubs did not consider concerns over racism to be of greater significance in discouraging minority ethnic groups from attending their own club’s matches’. 8

Garland and Rowe (2001: 84) conclude that ‘there is evidence that fear of racist abuse and intimidation discourages minority ethnic groups from attending professional matches’. Along similar lines Burdsey (2007: 41) believes that ‘Despite the efforts of the anti-racist football movement in challenging terrace racism, many English football stadia continue to be hostile environments for minority ethnic groups’. However there are grounds for thinking that the barriers to attendance are more complex than this. Offering some contradictory evidence Bains, (1996) having interviewed young Asians who played football, found that the majority of these fairly committed footballers attended professional football matches (although few did so regularly) and these respondents denied the significance of this fear of racism link as far as non-attendance at live games is concerned. Furthermore, if fear of racist abuse and intimidation does discourage members of minority ethnic groups from attending live matches then one would expect the relative decline in racist chanting inside English
football grounds (Garland and Rowe, 1996) to lead to a concomitant rise in spectatorship by black and Asian football supporters. Since a discernable rise of this nature has not occurred doubts still exist about this contention. Hegemonic notions of masculinity might make young males unlikely to admit to being scared as an explanation for their actions, but such findings are enough to leave one unconvinced that fear of personal safety is the sole, or even main, reason for the absence of black and Asian spectators.
Anti-Racism and Football

During the 1970s, the presence of far right groups (such as the National Front and the British Movement) at football matches, rock concerts and on the streets came to the attention of counter movements, usually organised by the political Left, such as the Anti Nazi League. Such initiatives have since expanded in scope and now aim to combat racism in football more broadly. They range in scale from national programmes funded to the tune of hundreds of thousands of pounds, through to localised projects run by a few motivated individuals. What effect these strategies have had is of interest, although before reviewing them it is worth pointing out that two surveys conducted during the mid-1990s both found that there was an emerging trend, which was that levels of racism at football matches had declined over the last five years. This led several commentators to highlight racism perpetrated by fans from outside Britain and to imply that Britain has eradicated racism in football. In reality this seems overly optimistic. Indeed, while overt racism in English football grounds may have declined, that does not mean that racism within clubs has been addressed (Back et al, 2001).

An outline of the history of anti-racist movements in English football and the frameworks for understanding racism associated with them is now provided. When considering specific anti-racist projects quantifying their success is a necessary, yet complex, task. Several groups and researchers (for example; Garland and Rowe, 2001; McArdle and Lewis, 1997; Back et al, 2001; various fans surveys, the Football Task Force, etc) have reported on the efficacy of such initiatives and their evaluations will be useful when considering the effect of anti-racist projects. Covering the detail
contained in individual policy interventions is unnecessary, it has been done before and replicating it would not offer any new theoretical insight. However, a review of the academic coverage of these policies will help provide context for the forthcoming club specific case studies, specifically with regard to the anti-racist work of the individual clubs in question.

Categorising the interventions made to counter racism in association football is not easy, especially since many campaigns do not originate from a single source. Garland and Rowe (2001: 53) note that a number of them involve a combination of organisations that have ‘drawn strength from employing such a partnership approach’. Nevertheless, broadly speaking, football based interventions that have an anti-racist agenda can be broken down into: national and regional; club-based; and fan-based (Garland and Rowe, 2001). These categories will be used to structure this overview of efforts made to combat racism in football.

**National & Regional Initiatives:** At the start of the 1993-1994 football season the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) and the Professional Footballers Association (PFA) launched the nationwide ‘Let’s Kick Racism out of Football’ campaign. At this time the CRE were concerned about: (i) the number of incidents of racial harassment (including racist chanting) and violence at football matches, and (ii) the perceived increase in the attempts by far right parties to recruit young people, especially in and around football grounds on match-days (Garland and Rowe, 2001). Simultaneously, the PFA were concerned about racial abuse directed at its members (Back et al, 2001). Because of these concerns, and wanting to highlight anti-racist
and equal opportunities messages within the context of football, the ‘Let’s Kick Racism out of Football’ campaign was set up. Despite initial reservations, by January 1995 it had gained the backing of all bar one of the clubs, which play in the four professional leagues in England and Wales.

Since its inception the ‘Let’s Kick Racism out of Football’ campaign has evolved / broadened its scope\(^1\) and in 1997 it was taken over by ‘Kick It Out’ (KIO) (Garland and Rowe, 2001). This growth saw a major shift of emphasis away from the main focus of the vast majority of previous campaigning (that concentrated on the hooligan or unruly neo-nazi fan) by, for example, challenging racism within the institutional structures of the game (Back et al., 2001). Overcoming British Asian exclusion was identified as a primary objective (Bradbury, 2007). Surveys indicate that this campaign has raising awareness about the issue of racism and it has certainly attracted enormous media interest and support. Evidence of this nature is located in the Football Supporters’ Association survey of 1995-1996 and the work of Garland and Rowe (1996) who found that all of their respondents (made up of ‘fanzine’ editors) had heard of the ‘Let’s Kick Racism Out of Football’ campaign. Similarly, turning to the clubs themselves, Bradbury (2001) in his survey found that all 88 responding clubs had heard of KIO, illustrating the high profile nature of the campaign.

Despite the apparently high profile of the ‘Let’s Kick Racism Out of Football’ campaign is not without its weaknesses. Identifying one of them Garland and Rowe (1996: 114) point out that support for the campaign from many clubs has been somewhat limited since ‘putting the CRE’s posters up and issuing statements was as
far as many clubs went’. Some clubs perceived racism as being beyond their control and any attempts to address it were kept separate from the mainstream organisation (for example: utilising Football in the Community Schemes to implement KIO policies). This meant clubs could be seen to be doing something, but in reality were not tackling the racial stereotypes and assumptions that may be pervasive within their inner workings. Adding weight to the argument that not all British professional football clubs were doing all they could to eradicate racism Garland and Rowe (2001) report that when McArdle and Lewis (1991) surveyed clubs about the extent of their involvement in ‘Let’s Kick Racism Out of Football’ they found that, of those who responded: only 15 per cent had implemented the three basic parts of the campaign (anti-racist statements in programmes and over the public address system, and the installation of ‘Let’s Kick Racism’ perimeter fence hoardings), and 45 per cent had only implemented one of them. Bradbury’s (2001) findings confirm those of McArdle and Lewis prompting him to state, in relation to ‘Kick It Out’ that ‘club responses to the issue of implementation remain patchy’. Despite that this campaign does seem to have, at least, made clubs and the Football Association realise that they have a responsibility to tackle racism (Garland and Rowe, 2001; Back et al, 2001).

Subscribing to ‘Let’s Kick Racism Out of Football’ / ‘Kick It Out’ does not, necessarily, mean that an individual club has a genuine commitment to developing anti racist agendas. However, for those who do wish to act the evidence suggests that this campaign has: helped to raise awareness of the issue of racism in football; helped develop ‘a conducive atmosphere for anti-racism’; provided the impetus for many localised / regional campaigns; and has helped to facilitate and precipitate others
Since the CRE are an independent campaigning body raising awareness of the issue of racism in association football can be considered as one of their aims and it appears that this has been achieved. However, their broader aim would be to eradicate racism from the game and this, difficult if not impossible, aim has not been met. In fact, a survey of ‘fanzine’ editors conducted by Garland and Rowe (1996: 111) indicated that the respondents felt that the anti-racist initiatives of the CRE and the Football Supporters Association ‘were relatively ineffective in reducing levels of racism’.

Club schemes: Club based initiatives, designed to bring clubs and their communities closer together in one form or another, have been in place at some clubs since 1986 (Garland and Rowe, 2001). These ‘Football in the Community’ schemes, are usually run by the clubs’ ‘community officers’ and some clubs place greater emphasis on this side of their operations than others. Prior to the advent of ‘Football in the Community’ schemes most clubs were not concerned about attracting minority ethnic spectators, as they did not view them as part of football’s ‘traditional’ public (Garland and Rowe, 2001). Indeed many clubs responded to the issues of racism by denying its existence at their stadium, although admitting it may be present elsewhere in football. Garland and Rowe (2001; 82) believe denial of racism is a problem that needs to be countered by those who develop anti-racist agendas in football. They add that the specific nature of racist abuse and intimidation needs to be acknowledged because a section of the football community still sees it as being no different from heaping abuse upon players who are, for example, bald or fat. Furthermore, Garland and Rowe (2001) believe that certain clubs remain ambivalent when it comes to minority
ethnic communities. For example, they note, that stereotypes about the lack of interest in football among Asian communities still predominate at some clubs. This in turn can see clubs develop schemes targeted at other social groups, even when the club may be based in an area with a high Asian population. Balancing out this picture, they add that a handful of clubs have made a commendable effort to encourage local Asian communities to participate in club-related activities, and have developed closer ties with these groups. In this regard Johal (2001; 166) points out that the Football Association have set up a ‘Working Party on Asians in football’ that aims to develop measures to tap into and encourage the South Asian footballing population. Johal adds that Leicester City, Sheffield United and West Ham United are amongst the more prominent clubs that have specifically engineered their ‘Football in the Community’ schemes, so that they target the South Asians in their locality.

Garland and Rowe (2001) have speculated that the degree of emphasis clubs place on anti-racist work varies due to some clubs not understanding the dynamics of racism and the reasons for campaigning against it. Bradbury (2001) points out that for many clubs the Football in the Community schemes remain the only real point of co-ordinated and regular contact with local minority ethnic communities. Garland and Rowe (1996) believe that professional football clubs in Britain are by their very nature essentially conservative and those who have taken the initiative and started anti-racist programmes of their own, such as Derby County’s ‘Rams Against Racism’ scheme and Charlton Athletics with their ‘Red, White and Black’ scheme, are the exception rather than the rule.
In October 1996 Northampton Town became the first professional club in England to adopt an equal opportunities policy (Garland and Rowe, 2001). Other clubs have followed their lead, but the real significance of this is, Garland and Rowe (2001) believe, that by adopting such a policy clubs may start promoting understanding of issues of racism and anti-racism throughout the whole football club, rather than it being seen as the remit of the community officer only. In other words, using such a policy may help to develop a ‘club culture’ of anti-racism, to counter institutional racism that can occur in organisations, and as a consequence could see a move away from the community office being the only department that understands race issues.

Supporters Projects: Having studied supporter led campaigns Garland and Rowe (2001: 72) found them, in the main, to have a narrow focus because they directed their efforts against a certain ‘type’ of racist: ‘namely the skinhead thug stereotype, seen as being epitomised by members of far-right racist organisations’. By concentrating their efforts against these ‘demonic racist thugs’ a visible target was identified (Back et al, 2001: 192). This led to some success against the activities of the far right, seeing their influence at grounds on match-days often reduced or eradicated. On the down side, however, this may have resulted in the more banal, individualistic racism of ‘ordinary’ fans sometimes being unacknowledged (Garland and Rowe, 2001).

Be it the campaigns of local based fan groups or the work of supporter led multi agency national campaigning bodies (for example: the Football Supporters Association and the Football Supporters’ Federation) these campaigns do seem to have raised awareness about racism and provided a boost to other anti-racist initiatives. Having surveyed ‘fanzine’ editors Garland and Rowe (1996) found that
90% of respondents felt fan-based initiatives (to counter racism) had been successful because such campaigns were organised by and for supporters. In view of the nature of the respondents to this survey one might expect this factor to have been disproportionately selected, although as Garland and Rowe note the CRE also believe that supporter-led campaigns are the most effective method of combating racism. Despite that, the degree to which supporter-led campaigns can be called a success is debateable. Taking ‘Foxes Against Racism’ as an example, Garland and Rowe (2001) note how the campaign, which received the backing of Leicester City FC, aimed to challenge racism in the ground in order to create a match-day atmosphere with which the city’s large minority ethnic population would feel more comfortable. Following a survey in 1998 the Sir Norman Chester Centre claimed that about 1% of Leicester City’s season ticket holders for the 1996-1997 season were from a minority ethnic group, despite the fact that the minority ethnic population of Leicester is about one-third of the total the population. That being the case it would seem that whilst ‘Foxes Against Racism’ may have raised the profile of issues of racism and exclusion it has not made a sizeable impact as far as attendance at the clubs stadium is concerned. This, therefore, is evidence of a campaign specifically aimed at attracting members of minority ethnic groups to attend live games that has apparently failed to do so.
Islamophobia

Development of Islamophobia is a factor that needs to be considered and one that has been linked to association football. Prejudice of this nature has impacted upon the lives of South Asian communities, and in particular Muslim communities, in the last decade. That being the case Islamophobia will initially be investigated with particular reference to how the climate has changed post 9/11, 7/7 and the disorders of 2001. Following that investigation, which illustrates why South Asian communities in Britain may feel more vulnerable, specific links between Islamophobia and football in England are made and scrutinised.

The term Islamophobia, Rana (2007: 148) argues, has a fairly recent origin having emerged in the 1970’s to explain pre-existing racism felt by Muslim populations in Western societies. Whilst agreeing that the label Islamophobia is new Miles and Brown (2003) state that prejudice against Muslims in European societies has been evident, since the Middle Ages at least. However, as Vertovec (2002: 33) argues, Islamophobic attitudes have increased massively post 9/11 era. This claim is supported by Miles and Brown (2003: 164) who maintain that many white non-Muslim citizens in Britain object to changes in ‘their’ country, which have been made in order to accommodate (British or non-British) Muslim ‘outsiders’. Hence, as far as South Asians (and Muslim communities in particular) are concerned the climate in Britain, especially since the terrorist attacks of 11th September 2001 (9/11) in the US and the terrorist incidents in London on 7th July 2005 (7/7), would appear to have changed in ways that could have a negative impact on their lives. Over the course of the last decade evidence of such a process occurring can be found in the growth of
Islamophobic prejudice towards such communities. This state of affairs is encapsulated in one report, which states that:

In the wake of bombings in New York, Madrid and London and in the context of the so-called war on terror, the Muslim community in the United Kingdom has come under increased scrutiny and suspicion. The visible “otherness” of the Muslim community, expressed through their ethnicity and culture, is highlighted and Islam is often linked with extremism and terrorism.

(Brice; cited in Glendill, 2010: 8)

Furthermore, an inquiry into the impact of disorders during the summer of 2001 that involved South Asian communities in a number of towns in northern England (which, see Chapter 4, encompasses the geographical area the research here centres on) found that communities were living separate, parallel lives and further highlighted developing Islamophobia (Cantle, 2001).

Investigating how, in the post 9/11 era, Islamophobic attitudes have increased Vertovec (2002: 33), for example, argues that such attitudes are ‘sold’ by drawing upon pre-existing xenophobic perceptions, which conflate Muslims with ‘asylum seekers’ and terrorists. Indeed this era has seen many scholars (for example, Larsson, 2005; Marranci, 2004: 103; McDonald, 2002 and Sheridan, 2006) argue that right-wing media and far-Right political parties have used the threat of bombings as a pretext to develop prejudices against Muslims. Consequently, Western fears and anxieties are created due to the perception that Muslim aggression has increased (Halliday, 1999; Marranci, 2004), which in turn Abbas (2007) maintains has led to an increase in the volume and level of anti-Islamic sentiment in Western societies. Indeed, such processes have led Millward (2008: 9) to argue that ‘For many in the UK in the age of the “war on terror”, Muslims have automatically become cast as
potential terrorists’.

Evidence of the aforementioned separation and segregation of communities in relation to Greater Manchester (which incorporates the location for one of the case studies forming part of this research) has been reported on by government commissioned reviews and highlighted in prior research. Specifically a report into the 2001 riots in Bradford, Oldham and Burnley stated it was ‘struck by the depth of polarisation of our towns and cities’ where they witnessed segregated communities living ‘a series of parallel lives’ (Cantle, 2001: 9). Furthermore, this report argued that:

There is little wonder that the ignorance about each others’ communities can easily grow into fear; especially where this is exploited by extremist groups determined to undermine community harmony and foster divisions.

(Cantle, 2001: 9)

A report by The Home Office (2002), similarly, identified residential segregation as an important factor in shaping the nature and extent of racist violence. Previous research by Rees and Philips (1996) found that amongst minority ethnic groups in the outlying areas to the north and west of Manchester much higher degrees of segregation were in evidence than in the city centre, which they identified as being metropolitan and cosmopolitan. Having conducted research in Greater Manchester Ray et al (2004: 364) similarly found evidence of segregation of this nature with, for example, a female participant in a group discussion criticising local South Asians for supposed cultural exclusiveness, when claiming that.
But they don’t mix, the – erm – Pakistanis, they don’t seem to mix
with our English people, British people. Because if you speak to
them they don’t answer you….they’re not even friendly. And if
you go to Bury market they tread on your feet and push you out
of the way….they’ll push you out of the way to get served first,
they really will.

(cited in Ray et al, 2004: 364)

At one of the meetings organised during the formation of the Cantle report further
anecdotal evidence of such community segregation was provided by a Muslim of
Pakistani origin who stated that ‘When I leave this meeting with you I will go home
and not see another white face until I come back here next week’ (cited in Cantle,
2001: 9). Similarly, in the same report, a young male from a ‘white council estate’ is
reported as having said that ‘I never met anyone on this estate who wasn’t like us
from around here’ (cited in Cantle, 2001: 9). Evidence exists, therefore, of lives that
do not seem to touch at any point, let alone overlap and promote any meaningful
interchanges (Cantle, 2001). An Independent Review into the Oldham riots also
aligned itself to this argument having identified ‘deep rooted’ segregation between
communities (Oldham MBC, 2001).

Factors that may be behind such segregation were pinpointed by the research of Ray
during interviews and group discussions, with ‘vulnerable’ white residents of
deprived and run-down council estates in Rochdale (north-east of central Manchester)
and Trafford (west of central Manchester) about their perceptions of the
neighbourhood. These white respondents’ contact locally with minority ethnic groups
was ‘almost entirely’ in neighbourhood shops, which ‘were almost all owned and run
by South Asians’ who were ‘manifestly more successful than themselves in economic
terms’ (Ray et al, 2004, 352). This experience led, Ray et al found, to racist assumptions based on feelings of resentment and grievance amongst white respondents. Such resentment was ‘fuelled by local myth and folklore’ as evidenced by one female respondent who claimed that South Asians get:

Special treatment to start work and businesses. The Asians get free driving lessons. Some whites would like that. People resent that stuff. Like we are struggling to buy our house off the council, but they get special deals on the payments.

(cited in Ray et al, 2004: 352)

During interviews Ray et al (2004: 357) conducted the racist hostility that was expressed was ‘far more often directed specifically against Asians than against Blacks’ with the overriding view of these Asians, who controlled local businesses, being that ‘they were un-integrated, not “properly British”, and culturally and religiously exclusive’. Ray et al (2004: 355) also interviewed people who had committed crimes in which there was evidence of some racist motivation. Summarising their findings from such individuals, along similar lines to findings from the respondents detailed above, they pointed out that the ‘cultural racism’ on which these offenders often drew was ‘characterised by the ideas and imagery which scholars (Smith, 1989; Solomos, 1989) have long associated with racist ideology’.

The racist ideology they are referring to here being ‘of national identity and local tradition under threat, of fears of “alien” encroachment and being “swamped”, of defensive territoriality and hostility towards “outsiders”’ (Ray et al, 2004: 355).

As Ray et al note such thinking is not new with, for example, Brah (1996: 24) arguing that Asians in Britain are regarded as ‘outsiders’ and ‘undesirables’ who practise ‘strange religions’.
At a local level of neighbourhoods, groups and individuals recurrent themes from the whites Ray et al (2004) interviewed were of Asians, supposedly, being given preferential treatment and a privileged status by public authorities, contrasted with the alleged neglect of whites who were expected to change in order to accommodate an Asian presence in the community (while no similar accommodation was required of Asians). In support of these arguments interviewees cited incidents of; whites being unfairly treated by police (compared to Asians), Asians getting special rights with the council over housing, and anti-racist policies that generally favour Asians.

As highlighted above, amongst these white respondents, resentment and grievance seemed to be factors in their racist attitudes and views. Another factor offered up from the interviews Ray et al (2004: 363) conducted came from a white participant in a group discussion in Oldham who suggested that the origins of racism are founded in ‘jealousy’, due to the perception of Asians as powerful and successful, thus objects of envy, who have obtained their success illegitimately. This linkage led these researchers to conclude that: ‘Hatreds and resentments based on class as well as racial difference are at work here, as in the construction of Jews as symbols of oppressive capitalism’ (Ray et al, 2004: 363).

With the nature of the findings from governmental reviews and prior research detailed above it is perhaps not surprising that the British Crime Survey, of 2000 (in relation to the picture nationally) noted that, broadly speaking, those from minority ethnic populations suffer a higher risk of racist victimisation than those from white backgrounds, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities being the most at risk.
Garland and Chakraborti (2006: 166) maintain that for minority ethnic populations generally ‘their higher risk of racist victimisation is reflected in perceptions of personal safety’. As support for this they turn to the British Home Office’s *Citizenship Survey* for 2003, which shows that white respondents feel safer in their local neighbourhoods when walking around after dark than those of any other ethnic group (aside from ‘mixed race’) (Home Office, 2004). This idea of minority ethnic peoples being victimised was again pinpointed by Garland *et al* (2006) who argued the new lines of criminological enquiry have challenged popular notions of black deviance and criminality by offering up what they call:

> a more enlightened stance that affords recognition of the status of minority ethnic peoples as racialised victims of a discriminatory criminal justice system, and as marginalized households who tend to suffer disproportionately higher rates of victimisation and greater fear of crime than the rest of the population.

(Garland *et al*, 2006: 423)

In relation to this concept of a discriminatory criminal justice system Garland *et al* (2006: 425) point to the ‘furore’ surrounding the 2002-2003 statistics relating to stops and searches conducted under counter-terrorism legislation. These figures revealed that stops and searches amongst ‘Asians’ had increased by 302 per cent in a year (compared to a rise of 230 per cent for ‘blacks’ and 118 per cent for ‘whites’). These Statistics saw the Muslim Council of Britain claim that ‘the police are misusing their new powers … We think that the institutional racism highlighted by the Macpherson report is morphing into institutional prejudice against Muslims. We are worried a generation of young Muslim men is being criminalized’ (Cowan, 2004: 8). Garland *et al* (2006: 425) maintain that due to the ‘crude’ categorisation of ‘Asian’ used by the police when compiling these statistics suggestions of Muslims being made scapegoats by the police cannot be substantiated, although they do illustrate a sharp increase in
the number of Asians stopped or searched.

Following on from the above Garland et al (2006: 429) argue that research into faith identities is urgent, because since 9/11 and 7/7 Muslims and their places of worship have ‘increasingly become the targets of hate crime’. This they believe evidences how:

Events that take place in the global political arena can thus have a significant impact on individuals’ safety and their sense of well-being, and the long-term nature of the so-called “war on terrorism” intimates that religious communities are likely to continue experiencing violence, harassment and abuse from the general public.

(Garland et al, 2006: 429)

Such a situation is increasingly likely to occur in a country such as Britain where, Garland et al (2006: 431) argue, ‘White people’s experiences continue to form the basis around which norms are created and around which minorities’ lives are judged’. Following this argument individuals who lie outside the white category are increasingly easy to stigmatise as ‘other’ and may find their lives judged according to the notion of a monolithic white experience that is rarely openly articulated and challenged (Bonnett, 2000).

Fekete (2004) has similarly investigated the impact of the “war on terror” and argues that it is rolling back multiculturalism. Further, she maintains that the “war on terror” is impacting on race relations’ policies with ‘new legislation, policing and counter-terrorism measures casting Muslims, whether settled or immigrant, as the “enemy within”’ (Fekete, 2004: 3). To support this argument the counter-terrorism measures the European Union (EU) has adopted since September 11 are highlighted, which
Fekete (2004: 6) says ‘expand the definition of terrorism and spread the tentacles of the security state in previously unthinkable ways’. Specific to the UK one such development Fekete (2004: 6) identifies is the UK Anti-Terrorism Crime and Security Act 2001 (ACTSA), which ‘introduced internment without trial for foreign nationals only’. In a climate such as this, Fekete believes, that adherence to Islamic norms and values may be seen as a threat to ‘the notion of Europeaness itself’ and in turn ‘Under the guise of patriotism, a wholesale anti-Islamic racism has been unleashed which itself threatens to destroy the fabric of the multicultural society’ (Fekete, 2004: 4).

From her research Fekete identified factors associated with the processes detailed above. One of these relates to how security services across Europe have expanded rapidly. Within the UK, for example, Special Branch is two and a half times larger than it was during the cold war and the conflict in Northern Ireland (Fekete, 2004: 7). Another consideration is how constant reference to spectacular events, such as 9/11, may serve a wider political agenda by ‘manufacturing consent to increasing intrusive surveillance and the circumspection of personal freedoms through the evocation of fear’ (Fekete, 2004: 7). At the same time this can see the media demonise particular groups, even nations, and shape public opinion into a global warfare against Muslims. Such factors, Fekete argues (in concurrence with the findings of Garland et al (2006) detailed above), have seen the intelligence services in the UK, and elsewhere in Europe, profiling Muslim communities wholesale, citizens and non-citizens alike. In conjunction with this, and of primary concern to the UK Muslim Community is ‘the effect of heavy handed police raids on Muslim meeting places and homes’, which has seen the Muslim Safety Forum (set up in the wake of 9/11 to liaise with the
Metropolitan police claim that ‘British Muslims feel discriminated against and victimised and are losing faith in the police’ (Fekete, 2004: 12). Fekete also notes (as have Garland et al (2006)) that of particular concern in this regard is the extension of the police’s stop-and-search powers.

As a consequence, Fekete (2004: 19) argues, governments and security forces fear of anything and everything associated with Islam has led to stereotyping of Muslim culture as ‘backward’, created ‘a climate where politicians and the media can attack multiculturalism’ and acted ‘as the cover behind which reactionary cultural practices flourish’. Such thinking maintains that liberalism, by treating different cultures as of equal merit, endorses religious fundamentalism. Against this backdrop Fekete links global and local events and states that:

> While the urban riots in northern England in summer 2001 followed years of heavy-handed policing of Asian communities, especially youth, economic collapse of those areas and local authority collusion in de facto segregation, the later deliberations of the government into these events, and the conclusions reached, came to be underscored by the fears and stereotypes engendered by September 11.

(Fekete, 2004: 19)

Subsequently, post 9/11, The Home Office’s Community Cohesion Task Force opened up a debate into the need for a national framework of core values, based on installing a sense of civic responsibility into communities perceived to be culturally lacking in such qualities. In combination with applications for British citizenship needing to take an oath of allegiance to the Queen and being expected to pass compulsory language and civics tests (or take instruction in ‘values’, www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk) overall this debate was negative and likely to ‘fuel hostility towards outsiders’ (Fekete, 2004: 22).
Indeed, Fekete (2004: 22) argues, that this debate ‘sends out a political signal that those with a different mother tongue and from a different cultural background pose a threat to national homogeneity.’ In turn the media have tarred ‘all Muslims with the same fundamentalist brush’ (Fekete, 2004: 23), making any Muslim who practices their faith guilty by association. This, in the UK, has led to trustees of mosques and their activities being more closely regulated, despite pleas from Muslim organisations ‘not to exaggerate the influence of “political Islam” in the Muslim community or to stigmatise all Muslim religious leaders for the anti-democratic attitudes of the few’ (Fekete, 2004: 24).

Islamophobia in English Football

We currently live in an era when, Burdsey (2007a: 620) argues, Islamophobia has become a widespread prejudice. Specific to football, Burdsey (2007: 57) maintains that identifiable Islamophobia in English football is a relatively recent phenomena and one which has received little academic attention. An instance of Islamophobia that occurred when Middlesbrough played Newcastle United on the 26th August 2007 led Millward (2008) to make inroads into focussing more attention on this phenomena, and it this work that will be considered here.

At the aforementioned match large numbers of Newcastle United fans apparently repeatedly chanted that Middlesbrough’s recently signed Egyptian forward Mido (full name; Ahmed Hossam Hussein Abdelhamid) was a terrorist bomber. As Millward (2008: 1) reports, two days after this match The Guardian newspapers front-page headline was ‘Islamophobia: a new racism in football?’. Millward (2008: 1) argues that this abuse was not personally about Mido, but rather a ‘conduit to an Islamophobic conflation of Muslims with terrorism’. Subsequent reporting of this incident included calls for Newcastle United and its fans to be severely punished and for police intervention (Hyde, 2007). Talk of policies, and punishments (including, for example, points deductions), that might be implemented in such cases were also on the agenda of the first ‘Faith Summit’ meeting whose aim was to stamp out religious abuse in football and in particular that aimed at Muslims and Jews (Butt, 2008).

Whilst Islamophobic in substance Millward (2008: 11) argues that Newcastle United
fans’ abuse of Mido is an example of how fans verbally attack the opposition and
opposition players. Nevertheless he argues that such abuse is problematic in a
football and wider context for two reasons:

First, the chants and discourses within a football ground may
become accepted by many Newcastle United fans who hear them,
which could unless widely challenged, create Islamophobic
cultures. Second, it would be extremely unpleasant if such abuse
became normalised, as football grounds might become
increasingly exclusive spaces and further develop tensions from
white British people towards all ‘others’.

(Millward, 2008: 11)

Millward (2008) collected data in the form of message-board commentary from the
electronic versions of the two clubs’ (Middlesbrough and Newcastle United) best
known fanzines. Having done so one of the consistent themes he identified from this
data was the notion that Muslims / Islam are ‘enemies within Britain’ and of:

Muslims as non-British (irrespective of birthplace), eroding
socio-cultural rights and resources from ‘British’ people, and in
the mildest form, having split loyalties between a sense of
morality and terrorist ties. Muslims are overwhelmingly
confounded with terrorism and typecast as ‘bad’.

(Millward, 2008; 12)

Such findings, Millward argues, are of interest when compared to the work of King
(2003). Following his research King (2003: 223) maintains that football fans will find
‘some externally identifiable characteristic’ of their rivals and seek to berate them for
it. Specific to cultural and social factors King (2003) found evidence of these being
used in the form of banter, which sometimes becomes offensive. Having applied this
idea to the abuse of Mido, Millward (2008: 13) claims that a typical form of racism in
football emerged since ‘Newcastle United fans have found Mido’s religion –
particularly in the post 9/11 climate – as something by which Middlesbrough football
club can be verbally attacked’. In a noteworthy twist to this typical racism Millward
notes how the Middlesbrough fans subsequently attacked the Newcastle United fans and labelled them racist. In doing so, Millward (2008: 13) argues, the Middlesbrough supporters, at least temporarily, adopted ‘an open position towards Muslims – and use that as a form of one-up-man-ship’.

It is contentious to ascribe, as King (2003) does, instances of this nature to banter. Speaking (after the aforementioned 2008 Faith Summit) of instances of anti-Semitism and Islamophobia that occur Alex Goldberg (a member of the Board of Deputies of British Jews) argued that ‘There is no such thing as friendly banter, it’s abuse’ (found in Butt (2008: 1)). In turn, Goldberg called for more effective mechanisms to deal with such abuse and maintained that clubs should be liable and held responsible for the actions of supporters. As far as the Newcastle United fans chanting abuse at Mido is concerned this was done to try and insult / goad the Middlesbrough fans and therefore:

Goldberg is correct that such banter is not friendly and does sometimes take racist forms when charging existing rivalries: racism and anti-racism stances opportunistically become metaphorical sticks to verbally beat opponents.

(Millward, 2008: 14)

Nevertheless, from his research Millward found that the trend was that fans do not want unfriendly banter eliminated from the game. In conclusion, he also argues that, on the one hand, Islamophobic mockery (such as that aimed at Mido) is shaped by wider societal prejudices. In this instance therefore, ‘Newcastle United fans’ chants would not have developed without the 9/11 and 7/7 bombings’ (Millward, 2008: 14).

On the other hand, Millward states that ‘the concern with Islamophobic chants in
football should not be downplayed’ (Millward, 2008: 14). Explaining why Millward explains his belief that whilst Islamophobic chants may not immediately create widespread societal prejudice, unless they are stamped out there is a risk that they may begin to seep into mainstream culture. Furthermore, he points out that:

> The unpleasantness of such chants for Muslims and other liberal people at football games – whether such individuals are participants or fans – may be considerable and the continued existence of such behaviours could further pronounce football grounds and training pitches as non-Muslim spaces.

(Millward, 2008: 14)

This leads on to the debate about what should be done when racist abuse, of the nature detailed in this case relating to Mido, occurs. The 2008 Faith Summit (Butt, 2008) called for coercive measures such as points’ deductions and widespread fans lockouts. In this regard Millward (who cites the work of Copsey, 2004; Richardson, 2005; Rydgen, 2003 and 2004) argues that it should be remembered that:

> many contemporary racisms grow from the perception that non-white British citizens receive preferential treatment from authoritative organisations and it is likely that punishing an entire set of supporters for the actions of a sizeable minority may reinforce such attitudes.

(Millward, 2008: 14)

Following this concept through it is evident how such punishments, for example for instances of Islamophobic chanting, not only do not address the underlying social prejudices that are used to berate football opponents, but may even accidentally deepen such prejudices. Offering an alternative Millward (2008: 14) suggests that the FA and football clubs should work with, rather than potentially punish, fan groups to genuinely change public stereotypes of Muslims. He admits, that this may be a slow process, but he believes that it is far more likely to be enduringly successful than draconian methods.
Sites of Sport

An area of study that may be associated with attendance at sporting events is research relating to space and place. Bale and Vertinsky (2004) maintain that the significance of space and place as a central dimension of sport is well recognised by scholars, including sociologists. Christian Norberg-Schultz (cited in Bale and Vertinsky, 2004: 1) distinguished between spaces and places, claiming that ‘spaces where life occurs are places’ and that a ‘place is a space which has a distinct character’. Humanist geographer Yi-Fu Tuan (also cited in Bale and Vertinsky, 2004: 1) believes ‘space is formless’ whilst places, on the other hand, have ‘unique faces’ and that from their uniqueness springs ‘a sense of place’ which creates sites possessing meaning and memories. One can see how these definitions can be applied to football grounds / stadia, which certainly possess meaning and memories for players and supporters and have their own distinct character.

Relating these concepts to sport Vertinsky (2004: 8) ponders if the effects of globalisation have been to increase uncertainty about what is meant by a ‘sense of place’ and how people relate to, what she sees as being, the changing landscape of sporting and recreational life. Vertinsky (2004: 8) goes on to speculate about whether it is possible, as mass globalisation continues, that one can ‘retain any sense of local places and their particularities?’ and, further, whether one should ‘try to reassure ourselves that one of the crucial roles played by sport may be that of delineating and confirming a “sense of place”, and a more secure sense of embodiment?’ With reference to the work of Clifford Geetz about ‘sense of place’ Vertinsky believes that it may be:
Helpful to reflect anew upon the meaning of places of sport and physical culture we have seen or imagined in our historical and comparative studies, and the nature of the spaces (of sporting practices) that we have inhabited, transformed or been excluded from.

(Vertinsky, 2004: 8)

Further, Vertinsky (2004) with reference to Karl Raitz notes how the ‘sport place’ not only shapes the play, but also provides a context for the different experiences and social interactions that occur within and beyond it. This in turn has seen Vertinsky claim that:

Places touch the ground as spatially located patterns and forms of behaviour and are defined, maintained and altered through the impact of unequal power relations. From this perspective, different sporting places can be distinguished from each other through the operation of the relations of power that construct boundaries around them, creating spaces with certain meanings in which some relationships are facilitated, others discouraged. Places are made through power relations, which construct the rules, which define the boundaries; these boundaries are both social and spatial. They mark belonging and exclusion – who belongs to a place and who may be excluded.

(Vertinsky, 2004: 9)

As far as association football is concerned Vertinsky, drawing on the work of Anthony Giddens, claims that with modernity distant places and events have become as familiar or more so than nearby influences, and are easily integrated within the frameworks of personal experience. Giddens provides a highly relevant example of this process; namely a football fan who may be more at home and identify more closely with distant World Cup events than his or her local club. Such identification is indicative of a decline in local attachment (if this attachment existed in the first place that is) and a partial and cultural separation from a ‘sense of place’ (cited in Bale and Vertinsky, 2004: 11). This, Giddens would maintain, could lead to place disappearing and thus lead to what Bale (2004) characterises as a ‘placeless’ sporting
Relative to association football, in England, several clubs and the national team have moved to new or improved stadia (particularly in the aftermath of the Taylor Report). These stadia tend to be designed along similar lines meaning that one may claim that the ‘spatial parameters of the immediate physical environment’ are ‘as identical as possible, regardless of global or local location’ (Bale, 2004; cited in Bale and Vertinsky, 2004; 11). Such places are close to what Lefebvre called ‘abstract space’, with differences between global and local spaces virtually erased (cited in Bale and Vertinsky, 2004: 11). Vertinsky (cited in Bale and Vertinsky, 2004: 11) believes that ‘paradoxically this can make the elaboration of place-bound identities more rather than less important’ and that the modern sports landscape is by no means immune to local resistance. Consequently, Bale (2004) maintains, a sense of place cannot be totally replaced by space. If that is the case one may see how global influences may actually reconstruct rather than destroy localities. Specifically then, drawing on this work by Vertinsky, if one looks historically at the formation of many football clubs in England it could be that exclusive claims were made to places such as the football field / ground as an:

Attempt to fix the meanings of particular places by staking claim to them, enclosing them and controlling the activities within them through the use of particular power discourses.

(Vertinsky, 2004: 12)

Existing research has identified a process similar to this at Yorkshire County Cricket Club (YCCC). One report argued YCCC had ‘a racial problem that prevented young Asian and black cricketers from playing for Yorkshire’ (Long et al, 1997; 21) adding that the cricket club actively promoted a culture of exclusion. The majority of black
and Asian respondents interviewed for this report recounted stories of exclusion from YCCC ranging from the informal process of YCCC being perceived as a ‘white space’ to more overt forms of discriminatory selection practices. Indeed it would appear that YCCC have controlled the activities in the cricket club to produce a strongly insular, ethnocentric and exclusive sense of identity. Whether such a process can be identified in association football clubs in England may be open to conjecture and will be examined herein.

In relation to this Gaffney and Bale (2004: 26) talking of how people identify with a place state that ‘People are attracted and repelled by certain spaces and places for a myriad of reasons’. Developing this idea they outline how one’s senses are engaged in producing the ‘feeling’ one gets at a stadium. All of our senses\(^\text{15}\) may play a part in this process, but they maintain that for humans sight is the most important sensory receptor. As far as English football grounds are concerned they note how many modern stadia have changed in their appearance and using one club as an example state:

The former mono-functional soccer stadium has given way to a multi-functional business facility. The first impression the visitor gets when visiting Old Trafford, Manchester, is that of a hypermarket rather than a ‘football ground’.

(Gaffney and Bale, 2004: 27)

Further, in relation to the sense of sound (that occupies space and gives fullness to experience), Gaffney and Bale (2004: 31) believe that ‘we should not be deluded into believing that the sound of the stadium is always benign. The malignant sound of racism and sexism may also by present’. Discussing racism in relation to British Asians Burdsey touched on the malignant sound of racism that may be evident within stadia and linked it to ‘space’, when he states that:

94
Racism – threats, abuse, violence and symbolic events – serves to construct professional football (as an occupational sphere) and the stadium (as a space) as out-of-bounds for British Asian players and supporters.

(Burdesy, 2007: 46)

In addition to the traditional five senses Gaffney and Bale (2004: 34-35) consider, similar to Vertinsky, sixth senses including ‘sense of history’ and ‘sense of belonging to a crowd’. As far as a sense of history is concerned, with reference to association football in England, they pinpoint how:

Particularly intense or meaningful stadium events are talked about for years and can be seminal moments in a person’s life. The more such important events happen in a stadium, the more sacred the stadium will become – even developing a sense of religiosity. The pilgrimages of fans to certain stadiums such as Old Trafford (Manchester) or Anfield (Liverpool) is well documented. They are almost ‘sacred places’, inducing in fans what Tuan has termed ‘topophilia’ – a love of place’.

(Gaffney and Bale, 2004: 34)

If this happens a sense of belonging can occur in relation to processes which extend both forward and backward in time and that are contained within the stadium and help to foster the sense of shared purpose, historical process, and cultural belonging (Gaffney and Bale, 2004: 35). In such circumstances history is one of the ways in which collective identity is both formed and maintained. This concept of a sense of belonging is relevant for this body of research. Indeed Gaffney and Bale (2004: 36) raise as a basis of further study the concept of ‘how individuals identify themselves as both part of and separate from the crowd’. Furthermore, they state:

The realities of the stadium are as complex as life itself. Hopefully ways in which we sense the stadium will come to be part of the larger discussion about the ways in which stadiums and the events which transpire within them help to shape individual, group, community and national constructions of identity.

(Gaffney and Bale, 2004: 38)
Summary of Key Points to Guide Research

Despite the proportion of black British professional footballers in England far exceeding the proportion of black British people in the overall population there is evidence to suggest that football is not free from ‘racial’ discrimination. Prior research into stacking, for example, (Maguire, 1988, 1991a; Melnick, 1988; Malcolm, 2001) illustrates this. Attempts to prove or disprove that stacking is still occurring are unlikely to offer any new theoretical insights (Birrell, 1999; Dunning, 1999). That being the case research here will focus on the interrelationships between association football and the wider social contexts in which it is organised, watched and played (Dunning, 1999).

Most of the research into race and sport to date has been bi-polar. By investigating the desire of black and Asian minority ethnic groups for inclusion in association football research here is multi-polar by comparison. However, the research does centre exclusively on males, due to virtually all registered professional players in England being male (Bradbury, 2001) and the vast majority of football fans attending live games being male (Bromberger, 1995; Waddington et al, 1999).

Under representation of minority ethnic group members at football matches in England (for example: Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 2001) has been found, although this does not appear to be due to feelings of indifference towards sport (Maguire, 1988; Verma et al, 1991; Waddington et al, 1999; Garland and Rowe, 1996, 2001). That being the case it would be instructive to discover if ‘conscious’ rejection of football matches as a leisure pursuit is occurring amongst minority ethnic groups (Waddington
et al, 1999: 20) as opposed to the absence of members of minority ethnic groups being attributable to less conscious processes, and a sense of, for example, indifference towards particular teams. This, unproven concept, will be one of the central tenets of this research.

When researching this issue a number of associated factors will also be investigated. These shall include whether ‘exciting significance’ affects attendance at live games (Maguire, 1991b: 32), if football grounds are threatening environments for minority ethnic group members, issues surrounding identity and as noted in the previous chapter Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) work on ‘established outsider’ relations will be lightly used.

Anti-racist initiatives are associated to this sphere of research. Evidence suggests that the impact of such initiatives has been relatively superficial and ineffective, although they have raised awareness and developed ‘a conducive atmosphere for anti-racism’ (Garland and Rowe, 2001:58). Hence, they may have played a part in the decline in overt racism in football, in England, in recent years (Garland and Rowe, 1996). With this decline anti-racist initiatives focus tends to now centre on more banal individualistic racism of ‘ordinary’ fans (Garland and Rowe, 2001) and racism within the institutional structures of the game (Back et al, 2001).

Furthermore, with this supposed decline in overt racism a contradiction is highlighted. Whilst previous research and policy initiatives have assumed that racist chanting generates an atmosphere that intimidates potential supporters from minority ethnic
groups, the reduction in such behaviour as a consequence of high profile (anti-racist) public campaigns begs the question, why there has not been a substantial increase in the number of black and Asian fans attending games? This contradiction highlights, again, why establishing whether members of minority ethnic groups consciously reject spectatorship at football matches (and if they do what is behind this rejection) is of interest.

Members of Asian minority ethnic groups shall be focussed in on during this research. That being the case Islamophobia, a widespread prejudice (Burdsey, 2007a: 620), has been investigated. Such prejudice has impacted upon the lives of South Asian communities, and especially Muslim communities, in the post 9/11 and 7/7 climates and the aftermath of the disorders in northern England in 2001. Having investigated Islamophobia it is evident how South Asian communities in Britain appear segregated and increasingly vulnerable. Specific to the 2001 riots one report (Cantle, 2001: 9) evidenced such segregation having found communities living ‘parallel lives’, that in turn can foster ignorance leading to fear, which is easily exploited by those wishing to undermine community harmony. In turn it is evident how such processes may affect South Asian communities sense of belonging and identification. These seem increasingly likely to be compromised if one also factors in that post 9/11 and 7/7 Britain has been said to be involved in a “war on terror” with Muslims targeted as the “enemy within”. Consequently, Fekete (2004: 22) argues, multiculturalism is being rolled back and ‘outsiders’, especially those from different cultural backgrounds, are increasingly seen as a threat to national homogeneity.
Specific to football identifiable instances of Islamophobia, are a recent phenomena Burdsey (2007: 57), but worthy of investigation. Indeed the growth and significance of this phenomena was evidenced when in 2008 a ‘Faith Summit’, aimed at stamping out abuse in football directed at Muslims and Jews, was held (Butt, 2008).

Prior research related to space and place, may also be linked to the attendance of minority ethnic group members at football matches in England. Relative to this consideration of how and why people identify with a place (Gaffney and Bale, 2004) is of interest. For instance, it might be posited that the removal of racist chanting is a necessary though insufficient pre-condition for an increase in football spectatorship amongst members of minority ethnic groups, and that a more deep rooted change is required which fundamentally shifts people’s perception of space and representation in relation to professional football clubs. Consequently whether as spaces English football grounds are out of bounds to black and Asian members of minority ethnic groups will be researched.
Chapter 3: Research Methods and Issues – Introduction

An overview of research philosophy is included at the commencement of this chapter. This looks at epistemology and ontology, but further suggests that, for figurational sociologists, such notions are normally discussed in falsely dichotomous terms. Consequently, the concept of involvement-detachment is discussed and ultimately identified as a more appropriate paradigm for this research. It is also highlighted that explanations arrived at through using this process will have varying degrees of adequacy (Elias, 1978) and can help to maximise the possibility of obtaining relatively secure knowledge. As part of this review inductive and deductive approaches are also discussed, again with the suggestion that, following Elias, such concepts need not be presented as a dichotomy.

Since adequacy of research tends to be assessed according to its validity, reliability and generalisability these concepts are also reviewed. In turn suitability of case studies and semi-structured qualitative interviews are looked at in terms of how these methodologies fit with the figurational approach identified. Having done so these methodologies are found to be the best option for finding out how respondents view their social world and will be used in conjunction with Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) work into established outsider relations.

Having summarised the research philosophy to be employed, and justified the choice, consideration is given to the selection of case studies for this research in terms of the geographical locations, minority ethnic groups and professional association football clubs. Ultimately, the work here involves two case studies, one focusing on the Asian
community in Bury and the other on the black community in the City of Liverpool. Following this sampling rationale, is the explanation of who was interviewed, and why, at the two settings. This includes detail of the times and places where interviews were conducted as well as consideration of logistical issues and the specific methods utilised.

Prior to doing the qualitative interviews crowd surveys were conducted at the two case study clubs in order to establish if existing research relative to football crowd demographics held true for these two clubs. This chapter then has descriptions of when, where, why and how this research was conducted. Finally, within this chapter an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the research methods used is included.
Research Philosophy

*Epistemology and Ontology:* Social ontology refers to the theory of the ‘nature’ of social entities or in other words the ‘nature of knowledge’ (Bloyce, 2004: 146). Bryman (2001: 16) contends that the ‘central point of orientation’ as far as ontological considerations are concerned ‘is the question of whether social entities can and should be considered objective entities that have a reality external to social actors, or whether they can and should be considered social constructions built up from perceptions and actions of social actors’.

In relation to social ontology two positions are frequently referred to: objectivism and constructionism. Objectivism asserts that social phenomena exist independently of human perception and thus beyond our reach or influence. This can, for example, be applied to cultures and sub-cultures, which may be seen as places where shared values and customs are located. People are socialised into these values and customs and thus function as ‘good citizens’ or full participants in a given culture or sub-culture, and are in turn constrained by internalising the cultural or sub-cultural beliefs and values. In this example the social entity (the culture, although this can equally apply to an organisation) comes across as something external to the individual and as having an almost tangible reality of its own (i.e. it has the characteristics of an object and has objective reality).

Constructionism (also referred to as constructivism), maintains that ‘social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors’ (Bryman, 2004: 17). This position suggests, therefore, that social phenomena and
categories are not just produced through social interaction, but are also in a constant state of revision. Following this train of thought a researcher may be said to be constructing their own account of the social world rather than a definitive one.

Constructionism views culture as an emergent reality that is constantly changing, being constructed or reconstructed. As Becker (1982: 521) suggests, ‘people create culture continuously’.

Epistemology refers to the methods of procedure leading to knowledge (Bloyce, 2004). Hence, an epistemological issue concerns ‘what is (or should be) regarded as acceptable knowledge in a discipline’ (Bryman, 2004: 11). Bryman (2001: 11) also argues that ‘a particularly central issue’ is ‘whether the social world can and should be studied according to the same principles, procedures, and ethos as the natural sciences’.

Positivism is an epistemological position, which advocates applying the methods of the natural sciences to the study of social reality (Bryman, 2004: 11). From this basic principle positivism has been stretched to encompass other principles including deductivism and inductivism. The principle of deductivism, which is more commonly aligned with quantitative research, maintains that the purpose of theory is to generate hypotheses that can be tested and will allow explanations of laws to be assessed. On the other hand the principle of inductivism, which is more commonly aligned with qualitative research, maintains that knowledge is arrived at through the gathering of data that provide the basis for laws.
In other words, the deductive approach, which often guides empirical research, involves investigating what is known about a certain domain by deducing, from theory, a hypothesis and then subjecting it to empirical scrutiny. When utilised by social scientists this involves skilful deduction of a hypothesis that will subsequently drive the data gathering process. In its purest form the deduction process sequentially involves: theory, hypothesis, data collection, findings, hypotheses confirmed or rejected, revision of theory (Bryman, 2004: 9). The last of these steps involves a movement that is in the opposite direction from deduction and is called induction, as the researcher infers the implications of their findings for the theory that prompted the whole exercise (i.e. theory is the outcome of the research).

An inductive process will involve drawing generalisations from observations. In practice deduction will often entail an element of induction and the inductive process is likely to entail a modicum of deduction. The use of inductive strategies to link data and theory is typically associated with qualitative research. However, this is not a straightforward alignment since qualitative research does not necessarily generate theory. This means that theory is often used as a background to qualitative investigation, as in the research here and the utilisation of the theory of established outsider relations. Overall, one may conclude that since deductive and inductive strategies are not clear-cut they are possibly better thought of as tendencies than hard and fast distinctions (Bryman, 2004: 11).

Realism is an alternative epistemological position to positivism, which purports to provide an account of the nature of scientific practice. Whilst realism is a distinct
position it does share with positivism the belief that the natural and social sciences can and should apply the same kinds of approach to data collection and explanation. That being the case both positions, it has been argued, are committed to the view that there is a reality separate from our descriptions of it (Bryman, 2004: 12).

It has been debated for some time whether natural science models, such as those detailed above, are appropriate for the study of society. A contrasting epistemological position, proposed by those critical of the application of the scientific model to the social world, is interpretivism. Based on the concept that the social sciences are fundamentally different from the natural sciences this position maintains that the study of the social world requires a research procedure that reflects the distinctiveness of humans as against the natural order (Bryman, 2004: 13). Consequently, one may say there is an epistemological clash between positivism and interpretivism. On the one hand the positivist approach puts the emphasis on explaining human behaviour whilst on the other the interpretivist approach attempts to understand human behaviour. Interpretivism, therefore, is concerned with the empathetic understanding of human action rather than the forces deemed to act on it. Indeed, Bryman (2004: 266) states that the interpretivist position puts the emphasis on ‘understanding of the social world through an examination of the interpretation of that world by its participants’. Consequently, such an approach would lend itself to the notions of exclusion, community and identity that are important for this research. For those with allegiance to this interpretivist approach human behaviour is viewed as a product of how people interpret the world around them and effects how the philosopher should bracket out preconceptions in his or her grasp of the world. In this regard, Bogdan
and Taylor (1975: 13-14) state that ‘in order to grasp the meanings of a person’s behaviour, the phenomenologist attempts to see things from that person’s view’.

Which of these models is used is relevant to the concept of what is truth, and who can study it. In this regard critique of realist (positivistic) epistemology is located in the work of, for example, Burdsey (2007) and Ward (1997). At this juncture, since philosophical questions of what is truth and who can legitimately study it are major issues within sociology (Sugden and Tomlinson, 2003), it is appropriate to provide a review of the debate surrounding a white researcher conducting fieldwork with minority ethnic participants (as is the case in the research here).

Prior to focussing in on the legitimately of a white researcher interviewing minority ethnic groups it is useful to pause and consider what truth is being sought when conducting fieldwork of this nature. For his part Clegg (2000), argues that sociologists should be committed to the objective, rigorous and systematic quest for a socially constructed truth. By this Clegg means sociological truth, i.e. ‘what passes as truth’ (Clegg, 2000: 141), rather than absolute truth or in other words what people believe to be true in the context of the social worlds within which they abide. From such an approach it is likely that there will be multiple truths and it is up to the sociologist to construct a model of the social whole from them.

Returning to the issue of who can legitimately research minority ethnic groups Garland et al (2006: 431) note that ‘The question of whether minority ethnic researchers are best placed to understand the lived experiences of minority ethnic
communities has been repeatedly raised by social scientists’. As far as this question is concerned on the one hand it is argued that even when they are ‘outsiders’ white researchers can legitimately study such communities. To do so, effectively, however it is argued that what is required is active involvement with minority ethnic organisations and individuals in order to understand and portray their worldviews and lifestyles (Gelsthorpe, 1993). To achieve this it is necessary to attempt to understand a person’s behaviour by seeing things from that person’s view, or as Bryman (2004: 266) maintains (similar to Clegg, above) by gaining an ‘understanding of the social world through an examination of the interpretation of that world by its participants’.

On the other hand it has been suggested that, for example, only black people can study and interpret the behaviour of black people. For those who take this standpoint it is argued that as ‘insiders’ minority ethnic researchers are better placed to study such communities. Consequently, it is argued that, these ‘insiders’ have greater awareness and understanding of minority ethnic issues and can provide accounts of experiences and perceptions that are more genuine and legitimate (Papadopoulos and Lees, 2002).

This later viewpoint, however, takes away the overviewing and interpretive role of the sociologist. Whilst aware that at any stage of a project different aspects of a researchers self-identity will influence the outcomes (Garland et al, 2006) the research herein is based on the idea that despite being an ‘outsider’ a white researcher can legitimately study minority ethnic groups. In this regard one concurs with Gouldner who, with reference to empirical work, argued that sociologists have to:
Take the standpoint of someone outside of those most immediately engaged in a specific conflict, or outside of the group being investigated… It is only when we have a standpoint somewhat different from the participants’ that it becomes possible to do justice to their standpoints.

(Gouldner, 1973: 56-57).

Along similar lines Young (2004) has suggested that, the dispassionate, dislocated stance of the ‘outsider’ researcher can actually be beneficial to the work, as it can lessen bias and bring analytical objectivity. This does not mean that one is suggesting that by working with minority ethnic groups a white researcher can simply ‘solve’ the problem of outsider status (Garland et al, 2006, 434). Indeed, when working with minority ethnic groups as Back (2004) states, what is needed is a clear understanding of the inherently political nature of such work, and that the invocation and adoption of an anti-racist stance by the researcher does not shield them from the politically sensitive, emotive and contestable nature of their studies. Having said that, such problematic issues are not the sole preserve of those white researchers who are involved in ‘race-related’ work, since:

researchers from minority ethnic backgrounds also share some of the same dilemmas, as, like white researchers, their own self-identity is itself complex. Issues of ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, age and religion are just some of the factors that can influence identity constructions, and indeed these perceptions can, in any case, fluctuate temporally.

(Garland et al, 2006: 434)

As well as the factors noted above, as Stanfield (1993: 7) argues, the professional status of a minority ethnic researcher can also cause problems, even when studying those with whom they share a common ethnic background. One may maintain therefore, as Bartunek and Louis (1996: 67) state, that ‘No-one is simply or solely an “insider” or “outsider”’ in any particular inquiry situation’. That being the case it is evident how ‘we’ as researchers ‘can have similarity with, and empathy for, our
subjects and this means that it is hard to remain truly “on the outside”’ (Garland et al, 2006: 434).

In conclusion, as far as this debate reviewed above is concerned, one largely concurs with Burdsey (2007: 8) who states that ‘Ethnic differences between researchers and respondents are not unassailable, but they also cannot be fully eviscerated’. He, additionally, suggests it is necessary to engage in a continual process of self-reflexivity and to seek to critically scrutinise and interrogate how ethnicities impinge on the research process. If such processes are adhered to Burdsey (2007: 8), sensibly, argues that it is not necessary for a researcher to share the respondent’s social position to fully understand and explain it. Indeed, in research that focuses on more than one minority ethnic group (as is the case here) it would be impossible for the researcher to share the social position of all respondents.

Having looked at the legitimacy of a white researcher doing fieldwork with minority ethnic groups one now returns to the overview of ontological and epistemological considerations central to this section. Ultimately, which of these is more suitable for use in this research, needs to be considered. As far as these positions are concerned Bloyce (2004) argues that:

One’s ontological position governs one’s epistemological considerations, because those who advocate an objective ontological position, for example, will argue that the nature in which we can acquire knowledge can follow the ethos of the natural sciences. Whilst these are important ways of characterising research issues, it is argued that this distorts the research issue from the outset.

(Bloyce, 2004: 146)

Consequently, figurational sociologists tend to avoid writing about epistemology and
ontology because there are more object-adequate ways of understanding human relationships. Following this Eliasian train of thought notions of epistemology and ontology represent something of a false dichotomy. Explaining this view further Bloyce (2004: 146) maintains that ‘it is not that the two considerations are diametrically opposed, rather epistemology and ontology are so integrally related, they are so interdependent, there seems little sense in discussing them separately’. By making this link the suggestion is that, rather than being distinct entities, knowledge and ideas are part of the same process. This linkage has seen Green (2003: 22) argue that, ‘knowledge and ideas should not be seen as the products of individual thinking’ and ‘hence the significance for figurational sociology of the concept of involvement-detachment is an appreciation of the social “nature” of knowledge’.

Taking a figurational sociological standpoint, the research process should involve a combination of involvement and detachment (Bloyce, 2004: 147). Having rejected subjectivity and objectivity as means of understanding the social world, Elias (1978) suggested thinking in terms of explanations with varying degrees of adequacy (or reality-congruence). Explaining this further it has been argued that:

One important implication of Elias’s approach is that researchers can realistically only aspire to develop explanations that have a greater degree of adequacy than preceding explanations. Notions such as “ultimate truth” and “complete detachment” have no place in this approach.

(Murphy et al, 2000: 104)

As a result, causes have multiple effects and effects become partial causes (Bloyce, 2004: 147). Furthermore, Bloyce (2004: 148) claims that figurational sociologists strive for an appropriate blend between involvement and detachment, therefore being ‘both relatively involved and detached’ (Maguire, 1998b: 190). Since the sociologist
is involved in their research, and part of the human relationships studied, achieving complete objectivity or “detachment” is impossible. Thus figurational sociologists prefer the concept of involvement-detachment as a more accurate reflection of the reality of social researchers’ personal situations than traditional concepts of objectivity and subjectivity.

In other words, ‘the aim for figurational sociologists is to recognise their involvement as far as possible and in so doing strive to distance oneself as far as possible from one’s values’ (Bloyce, 2004: 149). Using this methodology involves, Maguire (1998b: 190) maintains, the ‘sociologist-as-participant’ being ‘able to stand back and become the sociologist-as-observer-and-interpreter’. Hence, such an approach, figurational sociologists argue, maximises the possibility of obtaining secure, or reality-congruent, knowledge. To achieve such detached levels of thinking requires a greater capacity for distancing oneself for a while from the situation of the moment (Elias, 1987). Additionally, Dunning (1992: 252) contends, as is the case in the work here, researchers need to relate their work ‘to the existing body of knowledge’ in the field and by doing so can achieve greater levels of detachment. Maguire in relation to involvement and detachment argues that it is not just about gathering facts, but that one’s task involves tracing and analysing the significance that specific processes have in time and their conjunction with other processes. To achieve this he states that:

The researcher must come to terms with both the particular events which he / she documents and interpret the place which such events have in the phenomena under investigation. Explaining how the event happened is not sufficient. It is necessary to make clear what sort of event it was at that moment in the figuration in question.

(Maguire, 1998b: 192)
Inductive approaches (the generation of theory) and deductive approaches (to test existing theory) were highlighted above. For Elias such conceptualisations once again represent something of a false dichotomy, and he has argued that ‘the separation of theory and method proves to be based on a misconception’ (Elias, 1978: 52). As highlighted, theory influences and has implications for choice of methods. Consequently, assuming a researcher aims to generate explanations that have a reasonable or greater degree of adequacy, Elias advises them to distance themselves as much as possible from their own values (Elias, 1978). In relation to this Dunning (1992) argues that if one tests theory as opposed to simply applying it, then greater levels of detachment will be achieved. Explaining this further Bloyce states that:

If we approach research in a frame of mind that is more committed to a desire to understand more adequately rather than a greater commitment to sustaining pre-formed views, then we are more likely to want to test as opposed to confirm theories.

(Bloyce, 2004: 152)

However, while on the one hand it may be suggested that we may ‘test’ the figurational approach through empirical research, on the other hand we should be aware that research is guided by theory. In relation to figurational sociology, therefore, theory formation and empirical enquiry are interwoven and indivisible, due to the ‘mutual contamination of theory and evidence’ (Maguire, 1998b: 188). A consequence of this is that researchers should be committed to working ‘on the empirical without dominating it with theory and, at the same time, develop theoretical insights firmly informed with evidence’ (Maguire, 1998b: 188). By doing so the aim, as Dunning et al (1988: 267) state, is ‘to develop theoretically-grounded empirical work’.
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Following this discussion of research philosophy in relation to research strategy it is evident that figurationalists ‘hold that the arguments for adopting a qualitative or a quantitative research strategy is a false dichotomy’ (Bloyce, 2004: 153). The choice of methodological framework, figurational sociologists suggest, flows from the nature of the problem being investigated and researchers should utilise the most appropriate research tool to address a particular research question. Of greater importance, figurationalists argue, is that the research strategy is processual. Research of a processual nature involves looking at how social phenomena develop over time and how they have come to be how they are today. Using this strategy means that in order to make sense of the present one needs to know something of the past (Elias, 1987).

Specifically, the work herein is based on case study research that, as Bloyce (2004: 155) argues, ‘offers great potential for extrapolation from the particular to the general’. In addition, Bloyce (2004: 155) maintains that ‘combining a “case-study” design with a “cross-sectional” design is crucial for more object-adequate conclusions to be drawn’. This is achieved here in relation to ‘race’ and racism relative to association football in England. Respondents’ opinions have been gained here using semi-structured interviews, which ‘lend themselves particularly well to a figurational approach’ (Bloyce, 2004: 161). Such a method can help one acquire particular information and crucially ‘glean the ways in which research participants view their social world’ (Bryman, 2001: 317).
Validity and Reliability

Adequacy of research is normally assessed according to its validity, reliability and generalisability. During this research members of minority ethnic groups and people who might be said to work for the ‘establishment’, in roles that involve them in consultation with the general public, have been interviewed. Thought, therefore, needs to be given to the validity and reliability of the views of these respondents. To achieve this, consideration of how these terms have been defined is necessary. Mason (1996: 24) states that validity entails consideration of whether ‘you are observing, identifying or “measuring” what you say you are’. Others, such as LeCompte and Goetz (1982) and Kirk and Miller (1986), have considered validity in relation to qualitative research, but arrived at a different viewpoint to Mason’s. LeCompte and Goetz (1982), for example, maintain that external validity is whether there is a good match between researchers’ observations and the theoretical data they develop.

As far as external reliability is concerned LeCompte and Goetz (1982) argue that this is difficult to achieve within a social setting. However, in principle it may be possible to pick up the research methodology used in one study and generalise it to another setting in order to carry out similar work (for example, to study other English professional football clubs, with significant minority ethnic populations in their geographic location).

It has been claimed that it is the quality of the theoretical inferences that are made out of qualitative data that is crucial to the assessment of generalisation (Bryman, 2004: 285) (and thus the qualitative research conducted here generalises to theory not
populations). In relation to this, and particularly with reference to case study research, other viewpoints do exist. Williams, for example, argues that qualitative researchers are in a position to (and often do) make moderatum generalisations, these being ones in which aspects of the focus of enquiry (minority ethnic groups in my case) ‘can be seen to be instances of a broader set of recognisable features’ (Williams, 2000: 215). Using this concept when generating findings in relation to a minority ethnic group from a specified geographic location would involve drawing comparisons with other research relating to a comparable group or groups. Despite the original nature of the research question herein there is scope for making such moderatum generalisations, although (as is their nature), they will be more tentative than those based on statistical generalisations.

Internal reliability relates to whether members of a research team agree about what they see and hear and is not applicable to this piece of work. Internal validity, as noted above, concerns whether there is a good match between researchers’ observations and the theoretical ideas they develop (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). For qualitative research that involves prolonged participation in the social life of a group over a long period of time and a high level of congruence between concepts and observations this is, LeCompte and Goetz (1982) believe, possible. During this research participation was not especially prolonged and theories shall be compared to findings from fieldwork, as opposed to the development of new theoretical ideas. As discussed above external reliability is the degree to which a study can be replicated, whilst external validity is the degree to which findings can be generalised across social settings. Since qualitative researchers have a tendency to employ case studies
with comparatively small sample sizes (which is the case here) external validity can, LeCompte and Goetz maintain, be problematic. Nevertheless, that is not to say that such problems are insurmountable. Indeed, it would seem possible for the research findings here to be generalised to another setting.

Definitions for reliability and validity provided above relate to qualitative researchers using these terms in similar ways to quantitative researchers in relation to developing criteria for assessing research (Bryman, 2004: 273). Other researchers, for example Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim that qualitative research should be judged and evaluated according to different criteria from those used by quantitative researchers. Lincoln and Guba when offering alternatives to reliability and validity suggest using two primary criteria: trustworthiness and authenticity.

Trustworthiness is made up of four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. These criteria, which are now considered in turn, have parallel criterion in quantitative research: Credibility (which parallels internal validity) relates to when, as if often the case, there are several possible accounts of an aspect of social reality. The feasibility or credibility of these accounts determines their acceptability to others (Bryman, 2004: 275). To establish the credibility of findings involves ensuring that best practice is employed when research is conducted as well as submitting the findings to the members of the social world studied for confirmation that the researcher has correctly understood that social world. Transferability parallels external validity, and relates to whether one’s findings hold up in some other context, or even in the same context at some other time (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 116).
Dependability parallels reliability, and in order to establish one’s research in terms of trustworthiness, Lincoln and Guba think researchers should use an auditing approach. To achieve such an approach they suggest that complete records are made and kept in relation to all phases of the research process. Confirmability parallels objectivity, and whilst for social research complete objectivity is not possible it has been argued that researchers should be able to limit the degree to which ‘personal values or theoretical inclinations manifestly sway the conduct of the research’ (Bryman, 2004: 276). Lincoln and Guba provided these criteria, in essence, because they disagree with the (realist) notion that there are absolute truths about the social world that it is the job of social scientists to reveal. Rather they argue, plausibly, that there can be more than one and possibly several accounts or truths. While that seems sensible, one should not consider that all these truths have equal validity.

In addition to these trustworthiness criteria, Lincoln and Guba suggest the criteria of authenticity. This relates to the wider political impact of research and is broken down into the following: (i) fairness, being whether the researcher fairly represents different viewpoints among members of the social setting, (ii) ontological authenticity which relates to whether the research helps members of the social setting to arrive at a better understanding of their environment, (iii) educative authenticity which relates to whether the research helps members better appreciate the perspectives of other members of the social setting, (iv) catalytic authenticity, being whether the research has acted as a catalyst for members to engage in action to change their circumstances and (v) tactical authenticity which is attained if the research empowers members to...
take steps necessary for engaging in action. These authenticity criteria, whilst thought
provoking, have not proved to be particularly influential although they do show that
seeking criteria for evaluating qualitative research, that represent a departure from
those employed by quantitative researchers, has occurred (Bryman, 2004: 276).

Lying midway between the positions outlined above Hammersley (1992) has
reformulated validity and provided, what he calls, a ‘subtle realist’ account.
Hammersley maintains that we can never be absolutely certain about the truth of any
account. Expanding on this position he explains that an account can be held to be
‘valid or true if it represents accurately those features of the phenomena that it is
intended to describe, explain or theorise’ (Hammersley, 1992: 69). In addition,
Hammersley suggests that relevance is important for qualitative research in relation to
the importance of the topic in its substantive field or the contribution it makes to
literature in that field.

One may conclude that the simple application of the quantitative researcher’s criteria
of reliability and validity to qualitative research is undesirable. Whilst the positions
outlined in brief above (adapting quantitative research criteria, alternative criteria and
subtle realism) do not represent the full range of stances on this issue, they are a good
reflection of the degree to which a realist position is accepted or rejected. Without
specifically endorsing Hammersley, most qualitative researchers now ‘operate around
the midpoint on this realism axis’ and ‘treat their accounts as one of a number of
possible representations rather than as definitive versions of social reality’ (Bryman,
2004: 278). Overall, as far as truth and reality are concerned it seems sensible to
maintain that when interpreting usefulness and validity no single voice should be considered as the truly authentic one. This does not mean absolute truth, but rather (as identified previously above), a sociological truth, or as Clegg (2000: 141) notes ‘what passes for truth’. In other words, the aim is to elicit from respondents what they believe to be the truth in relation to the social setting within which they reside.
Research Philosophy Summarised

For the research being conducted here, following the above review, rejection of the integrally related considerations of epistemology and ontology has occurred having identified their traditional conceptualisations as characterised by false dichotomies (Elias, 1978; Bloyce, 2004). Rather a figurational sociological standpoint is adopted which in relation to this research process sees a combination of involvement and detachment being utilised. By using this methodology explanations of the social world are considered to have varying degrees of adequacy (Elias, 1978).

In practice, the above means that an appropriate blend is sought for the research topic in question as the researcher is, ‘both relatively involved and detached’ (Maguire, 1991b: 190). As Bloyce (2004: 149) argues, for the figurational sociologist this means recognising their involvement and striving to distance oneself as much as possible from one’s values. By doing so the aim is to maximise the possibility of obtaining secure knowledge and providing explanations of the social world that have a reasonable degree of adequacy. Consequently inductive and deductive approaches are similarly viewed as false dichotomies (Elias, 1978) and are largely rejected here.

Specifically, case studies are being employed due to their ‘potential for extrapolation from the particular to the general’ (Bloyce, 2004: 115). Also semi-structured interviews are to be conducted, this being a research method that lends itself to a figurational approach (Bloyce, 2004: 161) as one works towards ascertaining how respondents view their social world (Bryman, 2001: 317) and what they believe to be the truth in relation to the social setting in which they reside.
Sampling Rationale

As outlined in previous chapters the majority of inclusion work done in relation to association football in England has focused on the black and Asian minority ethnic communities. It is these communities that my research will focus on and in the first instance it was necessary to identify geographical locations that have significant numbers of members of these minority ethnic groups. Having done so the intention was to focus in on two professional football clubs, one in each of the geographical locations identified, to use them as case studies for research into desire for inclusion in association football amongst members of black or Asian ethnic minority groups.

Figures from the 2001 census (www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001) indicate that just under 59 million people (58,789,194) live in Britain of whom over 4.6 million (4,635,296 people, 7.9 per cent of the total population) classified themselves as coming from a minority ethnic background. Indians were the largest minority group, followed by Pakistanis, those of Mixed ethnic backgrounds, Black Caribbean’s, Black Africans and Bangladeshis (www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001). Geographically when breaking the minority ethnic population down it becomes evident that different minority ethnic groups tend to be concentrated in certain regions ‘largely reflecting the areas where the first settlers from these groups found work or were otherwise “allocated” on their arrival in Britain’ (Bradbury, 2001: 11).

As far as Britain’s black population is concerned the ‘longer-standing black communities are based in the historic seaports of Cardiff, Bristol and Liverpool’ (Bradbury, 2001: 11). Although, in terms of size, over time larger black communities...
have developed in Britain (for example in Greater London) Liverpool’s black community has been described as the oldest in Europe (Fryer, 1985: xi). In addition to this longevity, what distinguishes the black community in Liverpool from other cities, such as Bristol and London is, as Costello (2001: 8) states, ‘its continuity, some black Liverpudlians being able to trace their roots in Liverpool for as many as ten generations’. In conjunction with these factors the City of Liverpool’s minority ethnic community, at the time of the 2001 census, remained ‘significant’ (using Bradbury’s (2001: 12) categorisation) and accounted for 5.68 per cent (24,947 people) of its total population (439,473 people), of whom 2.25 per cent (9,892) were either Black / Black British or Mixed, White and Black (see chapter 5 for more detail). Ultimately, for my research Liverpool and its long-standing, continuous black community, was particularly apposite to use.

One should note, however, that not all members of the black community in Liverpool are long-standing. A prime example of this is the Somali component of the cities minority ethnic community. Evidence of Somali’s, in relatively small numbers, living in England can be traced back more than a century (predominantly settling in London, Cardiff and Liverpool). This situation changed after, in 1991, the Somali government was ousted leading to civil war and violence. Many people subsequently fled Somalia leading to substantial numbers of asylum seekers and refugees arriving in Europe. Of those who have fled many live in Britain and Somalis are now one of this countries largest ethnic minority groups. Numbers of Somalis in the City of Liverpool have in turn increased significantly and rather than being long-standing the majority of Somalis in Liverpool are relatively recent arrivals.
As well as for the factors detailed above Liverpool also made sense as a location for this research due to its geographical convenience and the researcher’s familiarity with the City (having previously lived there for 23 years). Furthermore, the football club in Liverpool being used as a case study is Everton FC. As well as being a longstanding supporter other links with the club meant access was expected to be easy to facilitate. In addition to this accessibility Everton FC are of particular interest, as the club has been labelled institutionally racist in relation to certain periods of their history. Indeed Back et al (2001) have related racism displayed by Everton fans with the actions of the Everton boardroom, by linking abuse aimed at John Barnes (by Everton fans during late 1987) with a 19 year period when Everton did not have a black player in their first team:

The subsequent [after the abuse of Barnes] failure of Everton to sign any black players until Daniel Amokachi in 1994, whilst Liverpool went on to sign several black players …. led to a whole series of accusations that Everton was a ‘racist club’. It was suggested that the attitude in the boardroom reflected that identified on the terraces during the derby match with Liverpool and that there was a policy of not signing black players. (Back et al, 2001: 52)

Whether this was the case or not is unproven, but relating to the same period (i.e. around the time of the racist abuse of Barnes in 1987) Hill referred to ‘the violently racist behaviour of Everton fans’ (Hill, 2001: 189) and the production of ‘button badges saying “Everton Are White – Defend The Race”’ (Hill, 2001: 194). Having grown up as an Everton fan and being a, minor, Everton shareholder access was likely to be easier for me to obtain at Everton than Liverpool FC and when combined with the above it was an easy decision to pick Everton rather than Liverpool for this aspect of my research.
Having made reference to institutional racism above it is worth pausing to look at this term, relative to this linkage to Everton FC, before considering the sampling rationale in relation to the other case study setting. Defining institutional racism the Macpherson report into the death of Stephen Lawrence outlined it as being:

The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amounts to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people.

(Macpherson, 1999: 28)

The aforementioned period of 19 years, when Everton did not feature a black player in their first team, predates Macpherson, but has subsequently (with reference to that period) seen the club labelled as institutionally racist. As will be returned to later this accusation of Everton as a racist club has lingered in some quarters despite, in recent years, the club doing their utmost to eradicate it. Summarising this situation one Everton historian highlighted that:

Everton had been without a black player since the days of Cliff Marshall in the mid-1970s and had at times attracted gibes that the club was institutionally racist. Despite the best efforts of anti-racism campaigns by the club, the local newspapers and fanzines, it was an image they had found hard to shift until Amokachi’s signing.

(Corbett, 2003: 320)

Along similar lines Vasili (2000) spoke of the playing patterns up to the end of the 1990s in relation to not just Everton, but all three Merseyside clubs. With specific reference to a game at Goodison Park on the 19th October 1991 when Everton played Aston Villa Vasili points out that Villa used seven black players in that game and then argues that:
Up to this date Everton had only employed two Black footballers, Mike Trebilcock and Cliff Marshall. Before the signing of Barnes, the professional clubs on Merseyside, an area with one of the oldest Black communities in Britain, had operated what looked suspiciously like a colour bar. Liverpudlian Howard Gayle was Anfield’s first player of colour, signing professional in November 1977. Tranmere Rovers had Elkanah Onyeali in the early 1960s and then decided to look only at White boys. Yet such clubs were now, at the turn of the decade, a small minority.

(Vasili, 2000: 188)

Furthermore, with reference to how the lack of employment of Black players by Everton and Tranmere Rovers was against the prevailing trend in the 1990s he adds that:

Until recently a small number of teams, such as Tranmere Rovers, Everton and Hartlepool had a noted absence of players of colour. This isn’t the case in the late-‘90s but how do these clubs explain their past employment practices which led them in the opposite direction to demographic trends in and out of football?  

(Vasili, 2000: 191)

One can see therefore the chain of events that have led some researchers and football historians to argue that during a period in their history Everton FC were institutionally racist. Indeed it is plausible to suggest that there is some evidence of Everton being involved in a process, which illustrates disadvantage for minority ethnic people based on attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination.

Adding further weight to this concept that Everton’s boardroom was institutionally racist (during the period highlighted) are events surrounding the resignation of Howard Kendall during December 1993 (bringing to an end the second of three spells he has had as manager of Everton). This resignation came about after the Everton board refused to sanction a £1.5 million bid Kendall wished to make for black, Manchester United, forward Dion Dublin (Corbett, 2003). This could have been a
financial issue or an illustration that the board had lost faith in Kendall, but Vasili (2000: 191) argues in relation to the board’s failure to agree to sign Dublin, ‘Was it the money or his colour that worried them? There may have been a culture of institutional racism prevalent in the boardrooms of some clubs that “explains” their consistent non-employment of Black players’. At this juncture one would note that it was not long after this that Everton signed black forward Daniel Amokachi (August 1994, reportedly paying FC Bruges of Belgium £3 million for his services), who Corbett (2003: 320) claims was ‘hailed as a landmark signing for a club sometimes tainted by criticisms of racism’. Whilst the signing of Amokachi was not long after Kendall’s resignation the events occurred with the club having changed hands in-between. When Amokachi was signed Peter Johnson was chairman having finally taken over in June 1994, after protracted negotiations that dragged on for months, a period during which Corbett (2003: 319) describes Johnson as ‘chairman elect’. Kendall’s resignation, therefore, occurred under a different board, which at the time was chaired by Dr David Marsh (Prentice, 2003).

The sampling rationale in relation to the second setting to be utilised for this research shall now be outlined. In the first instance one would note that Liverpool, located in the North West of England, has (as identified above) a sizeable black minority ethnic community, but by comparison a small Asian population. Having identified a City in the North West of England it was decided, for reasons of continuity, to stick with this broad geographic location for the comparison club. A number of clubs in Greater Manchester and Lancashire are situated in places with ‘significant minority ethnic communities’ (Bradbury, 2001: 17). Furthermore, several of these clubs are in areas
where Asians form the largest minority ethnic community. With that being the case there were a number of possible locations to consider when deciding which town or city to use.

Much thought was given to this from using the City of Manchester itself to using any one of the following, which were all considered as they have a professional football team and a significant minority ethnic community: Accrington, Blackburn, Preston, Oldham, Bolton, Rochdale, Burnley, Bury, Stockport. Ultimately Bury seemed particularly suitable. Some of the alternative locations are bigger in terms of their physical size and some have larger minority ethnic communities, but the Metropolitan Borough of Bury, at the 2001 Census, had a ‘significant’ minority ethnic population (11,058 people, 6.1 per cent of the Borough’s population) the majority of whom were Asian (see chapter 4 for more detail). Bury was also geographically convenient and like Liverpool a familiar location to the researcher having lived in the Borough for 11 years. In addition, Bury was of interest since (although it is not unique in this regard) the area of the town with the largest minority ethnic population is ‘Bury East’, which has within its boundaries Bury FC’s home ground. Furthermore, of the three electoral wards that make up Bury East, Redvales in particular has a high Asian population and this is the ward within which Bury’s Gigg Lane ground is situated.
The Selection of Interviewees

In the first instance people in positions of some authority in relation to the case study clubs were interviewed. From these interviews with club officials, club associates, supporter groups and local council employees the aim was to gain an appreciation of their perceptions in relation to the problems surrounding inclusion in football prior to speaking to the people who are actually excluded. In other words, by interviewing those who have roles that involve consultation with the general public it was hoped that a better understanding of current thinking in relation to the issue of inclusion in football would be achieved. Furthermore, following the research done for previous chapters (especially Chapter 2 and the review of anti-racist initiatives and campaigns) it may be argued that those involved in inclusion work believe that members of minority ethnic groups would want to go to football if they had the chance. This was a perception that could be assessed for the case study clubs, both from the viewpoint of those in positions of power and members of minority ethnic groups themselves.

Bury and Bury Football Club

Survey findings (see below for their methodology) agreed with prior research and pointed to a lack of attendance by members of minority ethnic groups at Bury FC matches (see Chapter 4). Having established that qualitative interviews were conducted to establish what is behind such non-attendance. Following consideration of Bury Football Club’s structure (internally and in relation to the local community) the following were identified as those for whom this lack of attendance was of particular concern:
1. Bury Football Club: Bury FC have a Customer Charter which includes an anti-discrimination policy. This policy states that:

Bury Football Club is committed to confront and eliminate discrimination whether by reason of sex, sexual orientation, race, nationality, ethnic origin, colour, religion or disability…

Bury Football Club will not tolerate sexual or racially based harassment or other discriminatory behaviour, whether physical or verbal, and will work to ensure that such behaviour is met with appropriate disciplinary action in whatever context it occurs.

(www.buryfc.premiumtv.co.uk/Club/Charter.html)

Having reviewed the organisational structure of Bury FC and the information made available by them (www.buryfc.premiumtv.co.uk/Club/Community) it was apparent that their Football in the Community officer was the person primarily involved in attempting to ensure that this policy was adhered to. At the time of this fieldwork (season 2005-2006) Stephen Raynor was Bury’s Football in the Community officer.

Bury FC claimed that under Raynor’s management Football in the Community had put their ‘emphasis on enjoyment and participation no matter what your ability level, colour, social background, cultural beliefs or gender’ (www.buryfc.co.uk/page/community).

Back et al (2001, 197) have argued that it is not unusual for Football in the Community personnel to be involved in implementing anti racist policies and that at some clubs they are used to give the impression that the club is ‘making the “right kind of noises” about politically sensitive issues whilst racist stereotypes and assumptions continue to be pervasive within the inner workings of the club’. At this juncture one is not suggesting that this is the case at Bury Football Club, but this does illustrate how the Football in the Community officer is often central to professional
football club’s anti-racism initiatives and from the information provided by the club themselves this seems to be the case at Bury FC.

In light of the above, in the first instance, attempts were made to contact Stephen Raynor. These attempts numbered well into double figures (and ranged from phone calls to e-mails and letters between August 2005 and March 2006) and included getting a Bury Metro Football Development Group (B.M.F.D.G.) member to speak to Raynor in an effort to encourage him to get involved in this research. Ultimately, Raynor declined to comment, although on the 13th of March 2006 Seb Piper, Stephen Raynor’s ‘assistant’, made contact and a 15 minute interviewed was conducted. This interview was recorded, with Piper’s permission, using a micro-cassette recorder. Subsequently the recorded interview was transcribed, before reading it through in order to identify the key themes that emerged based on the frequency with which they occurred in the transcript and with reference to what the literature review had previously suggested was of importance. The work of Strauss and Corbin (1990) offers useful guidance in relation to discovering the themes in data. More recently Ryan and Bernard (2003), drawing on the work of Strauss and Corbin, suggested ways to discover themes in data. Their guidance was instructive when identifying themes from interviews conducted during the work here, for example, in relation to; word repetitions (looking for commonly used words and words whose close repetition may indicate emotions), indigenous categories (terms used by respondents with a particular meaning and significance in their setting), key-words-in-context (looking for the range of uses of key terms in the phrases and sentences in which they occur), compare and contrast (the grounded theory idea of constant comparison) and introduction of social science
queries (by introducing social science explanations and theories to, for example, explain conditions, actions, interaction and consequences of phenomena). In turn key themes identified were, using the traditional technique (Ryan and Bernard, 2003), copied and pasted into another folder/file, which grew as further interviews were conducted, using the same process, during the course of this research.

Other than Stephen Raynor, Patricia (Trish) Keppie (the club’s Education and Welfare Officer) is also in a position that engenders involvement in the issue of racism in football and involves her in consultation with the town’s broader community. On the 8th of June 2006 a telephone interview with Keppie was conducted that lasted approximately 20 minutes. As with Piper the main themes discussed during this interview were the desire for inclusion in sport, and specifically association football, amongst members of minority ethnic groups in Bury as well as whether such groups consciously reject spectatorship at Bury FC and if they do what lay behind such rejection. Overall, attempts to get responses from the employees of Bury FC were disappointing although some useful data were generated.

2. Supporters of Bury Football Club: Bury FC’s supporters formed a group called ‘Forever Bury’ (The Bury FC Supporters Society Limited) on the 4th of July 2002. This group are now one of Bury Football Club’s major shareholders and have a seat on the club’s board.6 One of Forever Bury’s aims, typical of fan groups of this kind, is to encourage community involvement in Bury FC and as part of this they give one of their society’s objectives as being ‘to widen interest in football regardless of the sex or ethnic origin of those involved’ (www.forverbury.org). Similarly, Forever Bury’s
Vision Statement states that they are ‘Owned by the community… Sustained by the community… Benefiting all sections of the community… Our goal is to make Bury Football Club an integral part of the community and a focus for community involvement.’ (www.foreverbury.org/society/strategy). With their involvement with Bury FC and their commitment to the community, Forever Bury aim to work with and consult with the broader community in Bury.

From initial research of the Forever Bury website, due to their publicised involvement in the groups Vision Statement, Andy Barlow and Brian Richardson were contacted. Barlow responded immediately and was initially interviewed on the 23rd of February 2006. This interview lasted in excess of an hour and was followed up by 4 further telephone conversations (of 10 to 15 minutes each; 27th and 28th February 2006; 13th and 14th June 2006) and e-mail contact to clarify with Barlow matters discussed in relation to issues surrounding Bury FC, Forever Bury and inclusion.

Following further investigation of the Forever Bury website contact details were obtained for Susan Tunstall, who is the groups Secretary. Tunstall agreed to be interviewed, with the initial discussion, which lasted nearly 40 minutes, taking place on the 24th of September 2005. A further interview followed, of 15 minutes duration on the 25th of September 2006, and in addition Tunstall responded to a couple of supplementary e-mails. In turn, Tunstall provided me with contact details for Forever Bury Treasurer Derek Boulton. On the 26th of September 2006 an interview with Boulton, lasting approximately 35 minutes, was conducted and he also subsequently responded to a follow up e-mail. Ultimately experiences with Forever Bury where
markedly different from those with the employees of Bury FC. Barlow, Tunstall and Boulton, were all willing to offer their opinions and discuss issues related to this research.

3. Bury Metropolitan Borough Council: Bury MBC’s support of Bury Football Club is evidenced by the fact that Bury Metro, are the team’s shirt sponsors. Bury MBC have a Sports Development Unit and one of their key areas of activity is Community Sport and Health that incorporates, amongst other areas, ‘inclusion and equality work - ensuring all communities have access to sport’ (www.bury.gov.uk/Bury/Council Services/leisure/sports/sportsdevelopment). Another of the Sports Development Unit’s key areas of interest is Physical Activity and Sport, which incorporates ‘Football Inclusion Work’ (www.bury.gov.uk/Bury/CouncilServices/leisure/sports/sportsdevelopment). With this remit the Sports Development Unit at Bury MBC aim to be involved in work with a wide cross section of the local community. Bury MBC’s Sports Development Department has 10 employees. Of these the Football Inclusion Development Officer, Robin Philp was identified as a particularly appropriate interviewee. Philp was happy to be interviewed and was generally very helpful. Philp was interviewed in his office on the 8th of August 2005. This interview lasted about an hour and a half and was followed up by several e-mails and a short phone conversation. Philp, appeared, honest and open when interviewed and also acted as a ‘gatekeeper’ (see below in relation to the advantages and disadvantages of this method), by making introductions, and helped to set up interviews, with a couple of the other members of Bury MBC’s Sports Development Team. By interviewing Carly Ibbott, a Sports Development Officer, and Yvonne Hall, a Disability Sport and
Inclusion Officer, the aim was to get a broader range of opinion from the personnel within this Sports Development team. Ibbott and Hall were interviewed, separately but on the same day (6th of September 2005), with these interviews being of approximately 15 minutes each.

4. Members of Ethnic Minority Groups: Other than the opinions of those in positions of authority engaging with people who are excluded was key to this research. As a middle-aged, middle-class, white researcher with a Liverpool accent one wondered whether getting responses from this sector of the community would be problematic. In the end, concerns about doing productive research with these British Asians proved unfounded as inroads were made and productive research based around qualitative interviews was accomplished. In the first instance, during early August 2006, 20 young (between the ages of 18 and 36) male Asians from Bury were interviewed. These interviews usually commenced by asking the potential respondent if they had any interest in sport and could spare a few minutes of their time. If they did the interview developed. At the end of the interview respondents were asked if they would be willing to take part in a more in depth interview. Subsequently, this led to longer interviews being conducted with a couple of these respondents.

Access to these 20 respondents was facilitated by initially gaining the acceptance and trust of a ‘gatekeeper’, i.e. those ‘actors with control over key sources and avenues of opportunity’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995: 34). In this case the gatekeeper, with whom contact was made was Manjote (NB: names attributed to these Asian respondents are, in all cases, pseudonyms to ensure anonymity). Manjote owns a food
outlet, which attracts a high degree of patronage by Asian customers and is an area
where young Asian men congregate.

After the initial introductions were made via a mutual friend my conversation with
Manjote went well. Indeed, a good degree of mutual trust and a decent rapport were
established with Manjote who in turn made introductions to a number of potential
respondents. In turn, word got round and the remaining interviews came about
through ‘snowball’ sampling and by utilizing the contact networks of respondents
(Burdsey, 2006: 13). Initial interviews with these 20 respondents were of
approximately 15 minutes each. Subsequent second interviews (of approximately 40
minutes duration) were conducted with two of these respondents (Manjote and
Jahinger). A concern with using a ‘gatekeeper’ can be that they influence the set of
respondents and their thoughts. There was no evidence of this occurring, as it was
pure chance on the days in question who was in and around the food outlet, and
Manjote just asked his Asian customers if they minded sparing a few minutes of their
time to be interviewed. Subsequently other people started to come forward who
where willing to be interviewed. Whilst to some degree, therefore, a self-selecting
group, they were most probably motivated by their interest in the research topic, and
thus the group most central to this thesis (i.e. those interested in sport in general, and
football in particular). Overall, using this method in this manner mutual trust was
engendered and the individual views gained from the respondents appeared to be just
that (i.e. their own opinion(s)). Table 1 gives details of the initial 20 interviewees.
The categorisation of ethnicity was self-defined by the interviewees.
**Table 1:** Bury Interviewees (11th & 18th August 2006):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity provided</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nature of Employment</th>
<th>Sporting Involvement / Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ishaq</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Factory Worker</td>
<td>Watch football &amp; support Bury FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krish</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>Watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikram</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td>Watch cricket &amp; also occasionally watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akshay</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch football. Play snooker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Security Officer</td>
<td>Play / watch football &amp; basketball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishal</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Call Centre Agent</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amir</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football / volleyball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalat</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Play / watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>On a training course.</td>
<td>Play / watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahinger</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anwar</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Road Worker</td>
<td>Play football recreationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Customer Service Advisor</td>
<td>Watch, read about and play football (JJB Soccer Dome).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rashid</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch and play football / cricket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnan</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sales Assistant</td>
<td>Play football &amp; cricket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zesh</td>
<td>British Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Play football, badminton, tennis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Liverpool and Everton Football Club

Following the crowd demographic visual surveys (see Chapter 5) qualitative interviews were conducted. These were used because they were the most appropriate method of getting the findings required and ascertaining what is behind non-attendance at Goodison Park by minority ethnic group members. As with Bury, in the first instance these were conducted with people in positions of authority who work for or who represent Everton Football Club. Having spoken to them, to get an appreciation of their perceptions as far as inclusion in football is concerned, those who are actually excluded (i.e. members of minority ethnic groups) were subsequently interviewed.

1. Everton Football Club: Compared to Bury FC, Everton FC have considerably more employees. One consequence of this is that Everton FC, have employees whose job roles relate specifically to the issues of racism and inclusion. With a much smaller number of employees this is not something that is feasible at Bury FC, who work with other agencies (as detailed above) in relation to anti-racist initiatives. Everton for their part, on the official club website, have a dedicated ‘Everton Against Racism’ section, which states that:

   The policy at Everton Football Club is to help keep racism and hooliganism out of football. As far as we are concerned, racial abuse directed towards any player or supporter will not be tolerated inside Goodison Park. Any offenders of such abuse could by subjected to a ban from our stadium. At Everton, we are committed to providing a football club that is truly accessible to supporters from all sections of the community as we strongly believe that there is no place for racism at Goodison Park or in society as a whole. Over the years, we have worked hard in implementing this fundamental policy and we are dedicated more than ever to actively eradicating any such behaviour and we urge all our supporters to embrace this ideal.

   Club Policy, Alan Johnson, Race & Diversity Manager
   (www.evertonfc.com/club/everton-against-racismhtml)
Everton Football Club’s efforts in working towards these aims have seen them achieve the Preliminary Level of the Racial Equality Standard that is awarded to professional football clubs by Kick It Out. Also, for their anti-racism work in the community Everton Football Club have received a Hall of Fame award from the Show Racism the Red Card campaign. Formal announcements by the club suggest that such awards and achievements ‘reflect the efforts of the Club in striving to ensure that racism has no place in football’ (www.evertonfc.com/club/04-eliminating-racism.html page 2 of 2).

Prominent in such anti-racist and equality work is Race and Diversity Manager Alan Johnson who was interviewed on Wednesday the 24th of January 2006. The interview took place in one of the executive boxes at Goodison Park and lasted around two and a half hours. Johnson has been at Everton for 12 years and although previously employed by Football in the Community in recent years he has been employed directly by Everton. A black British male who lives in Toxteth (Liverpool 8) Johnson is involved in various schemes and outreach work that aims to foster inclusion amongst members of minority ethnic groups at Everton FC (for example; Johnson is given sixty tickets to give away, free, to every Everton home game with the idea being that these will be used to try and foster inclusion). After this interview Johnson clarified a couple of points via e-mail and overall was very accessible.

Everton Football in the Community (EFITC) and Everton’s Youth Academy are also central to the club’s work with the broader community and these sectors of the club were contacted. As far as Everton’s Youth Academy was concerned, once contact
was made via a mutual friend, Mike Dickinson was approached and interviewed on
the 27\textsuperscript{th} of February 2007. This interview was held in Dickinson’s office at Everton’s Youth Academy (in Netherton, Liverpool at the time) and lasted just over an hour. Dickson, a club employee in various roles since May 1998, subsequently also replied to an e-mail. In his current role Dickinson, predominantly, oversees the work of other people in relation to the education and welfare of the young players at Everton’s Academy.

Having researched Everton Football in the Community (EFITC)\footnote{Chris Clarke, a white British male, who is one of the Everton Football In The Community coaches was interviewed (17\textsuperscript{th} April 2007). The interview lasted approximately 20 minutes. Having interviewed Johnson, Dickinson and Clarke a good degree of research data had been gathered from those in positions of some authority. That being the case the next step was to engage with those people who are actually excluded.}

2. Members of Minority Ethnic Groups:

A primary research goal was to get responses from young black males who live in Liverpool. A similar approach to that utilised in Bury was tried but proved unlikely to provide the quantity of research respondents required. Consequently, alternative methods were investigated and one of the Community Centres in Toxteth was contacted. Initial contact when entering this establishment was with one of the youth workers there. This individual was Joleon (NB: pseudonyms are used to ensure anonymity) who agreed to be interviewed, there and then. He accepted myself and a good rapport was established with Joleon during the time spent speaking to /
interviewing him. During this interview several other people in the centre enquired about what was happening. Ultimately, in the time spent in the Community Centre and other locations suggested nearby over the course of this initial research 21 black males (between the ages of 18 and 35), who had an interest in sport and lived in Liverpool, were interviewed. These interviews typically lasted 15 to 20 minutes each. Some of the interviewees, as visitors to the Community Centre, knew Joleon who in the initial stages loosely acted as a ‘gatekeeper’, without attempting to influence other respondents’ views. Indeed, opinions obtained certainly appeared to be the individual respondents own thoughts and ideas. Table 2 gives more details of these 21 respondents. Once again, ethnicity is self-defined by the interviewees.
Table 2: Liverpool interviewees (9th & 12th January 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity provided</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nature of Employment</th>
<th>Sporting involvement / Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch football &amp; support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Watch football on television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Self Employed: Plasterer</td>
<td>Watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Self Employed: Taxi Driver</td>
<td>Watch football on television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Youth Worker</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy</td>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Like football, but fairly new to country so not been to a live game yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch football &amp; support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Support Worker</td>
<td>Love football and I support Arsenal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieron</td>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Self Employed: Musician</td>
<td>Like football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mobile Valetter</td>
<td>Watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Shop Assistant</td>
<td>Watch football, support Liverpool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Regeneration Assistant</td>
<td>Watch and play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Watch football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joleon</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Part Time Youth Worker</td>
<td>Watch football &amp; support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jermain</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Security Officer</td>
<td>Watch football &amp; support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Like sport (including football) and body building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bank Official</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football. Support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football (used to play for Everton, but left).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun</td>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Watch football.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the analysis and writing up of the initial findings it became evident that further questions needed to be addressed (for example, in relation to sense of identity and sense of belonging). That being the case a return to the field was made to do further, somewhat more purposive qualitative interviews. As a result another visit (pre-arranged over the phone with Joleon) was made to the Community Centre in Toxteth. The method utilised was similar to the previous visits detailed above, although with these interviews probing deeper each one lasted around 30 minutes. At this time a further 10 young black males (between the ages of 18 and 40), who were interested in sport and lived in Liverpool, were interviewed. Table 3 gives more detail about these respondents.
Table 3: Liverpool interviewees (28th April 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity provided</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nature of Employment</th>
<th>Sporting involvement / Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Support Worker</td>
<td>Play and watch football and athletics. Support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Youth Association Employee</td>
<td>Watch football and support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch football on television and support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Development Officer.</td>
<td>Play football. Support Everton due to the ‘proud’ black Africans (Yobo, Yakubu) who play for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Black African (Father Nigerian)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Play, read about and watch football on television. Support Everton FC due to Yobo / Yakubu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Community Worker</td>
<td>Watch &amp; play football, support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Black (West) African</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Watch football on television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Black African / Black British</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Play football and watch on television. Support Liverpool because my Dad supports them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daley</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Community Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Ex Pro Basketball player. Also like football, watch it on television and support Liverpool FC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>East African</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Watch / read about football.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having conducted fieldwork twice with black members of the minority ethnic community in the City of Liverpool 31 young black males had been interviewed. These had, upon reflection, produced some useful data, but what subsequently became apparent was that less than a handful of these respondents had claimed to have any specific allegiance to Everton Football Club. Since my research focuses in on Everton a further return to the field seemed appropriate to ask similar questions, but specifically to black members of this community who have allegiance, of some sort, to Everton. Consequently, this return to the field was more purposive than the previous fieldwork and while in the first instance involved returning to the field in Toxteth it soon became apparent that the scope needed to be broadening geographically to take in other parts of Liverpool. Indeed, identification of black members of the minority ethnic community who have an allegiance to Everton was somewhat convoluted and the interviewees generally picked up on a one off basis having identified someone who fitted the extended criteria. With 31 respondents from Toxteth interviewed previously and such a small number of that sample having identified themselves as Everton fans this was perhaps not too surprising. Nevertheless in the end 10 respondents expressing a degree of allegiance to Everton were identified and interviewed and these interviews, on average, lasted around 25 minutes. In terms of dates these interviews were, as noted, conducted on an individual basis on a variety of days during November and December 2010. Interviewees were predominantly identified by speaking to a whole host of Everton related contacts including: friends / contacts who support the club, people involved with various supporters clubs, individuals who are employed by Everton (both at Goodison Park and at the club’s Finch Farm training ground), Everton specific
fanzine writers. Otherwise less club specific, but more sport and leisure related contacts also led to identification of a couple of these respondents. These contacts were employees of various settings in Liverpool including: John Moores University, Community Centres and The Belvedere Boxing Club (Toxteth).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity provided</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nature of Employment</th>
<th>Everton involvement / Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>An Everton fan who goes occasionally and during the 2010-2011 season had been to Goodison Park 3 times as a friend of his knows one of the players (Steven Pienaar) and gets complimentary tickets off him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel</td>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Community Centre Manager</td>
<td>Supports Everton mainly via television / newspapers. Through his work had got complimentary tickets off a Nigerian ex Everton player (Daniel Amokachi) so has been to Goodison a couple of times (a few years ago).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Shipbuilder</td>
<td>Lifelong Evertonian who misses very few Everton games home and away. Is a season ticket holder who last missed a competitive game Everton a couple of years ago (due to illness).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Evertonian who tries to get to Goodison at least once every season. Otherwise follows them through television / newspapers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Evertonian and ex Everton youth player (for 2 years as a ‘scholar’ / apprentice). Went to Goodison a few times before his apprenticeship, during his apprenticeship went more often (it was also part of the ‘job’) and since being released has been to a few home games (average 4-5 per season). Has been to one away game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obi</td>
<td>Black British (Nigerian)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Footballer</td>
<td>Due to playing commitments mainly follows Everton by watching them on television. He has been to Goodison a couple of times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Due to the cost mainly follows Everton on the television, although he has been to Goodison about 12 times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ethnicity provided</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Nature of Employment</td>
<td>Everton involvement / Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Black British / Mixed Race</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>His uncle started to take George to games and from the ages of 9 to the age of 18 he attended every Everton home game (season ticket holder) and virtually every away game. At 18 he went to Northumbria University (for a time that covered 3 seasons). During that time, on average, he attended about 10 games per season (mainly 'home' games, at Goodison Park). Having returned to Liverpool in 2010 George got a season ticket again (Bullens Road Upper), but since then had not attended many away games and follows games he misses on the internet and/or television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Black British / Mixed Race</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Usually goes to a couple of games a season at Goodison, typically with friends' these-days. Started supporting Everton due to his family and it was his Uncle who first took him to a live Everton game (when he was still in Primary School). Otherwise tends to keep up with how Everton are doing via television (mainly Sky Sports News channel) or newspaper(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Methods for Crowd Demographics

Bury

Previous studies (Bains & Johal, 1998; Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 1999; Bradbury 2001) lead one to suspect that the proportion of the crowd at Bury Football Club’s home games drawn from members of minority ethnic groups would not reflect their proportion in the Borough as a whole. Rather than assume, visual crowd surveys at Gigg Lane were conducted to ascertain if this was the case. These surveys, without being of the scope of the more in depth aforementioned research, offered a snapshot of the crowd demographic at Bury FC in terms of numbers of minority ethnic supporters and were practical in terms of time and cost.

Using a methodology that involves a degree of guesswork as to the ethnic background of people (conducted without their consent) does raise some ethical issues. Nevertheless, one would note that the police service in England and Wales began ethnic monitoring of anyone stopped, searched, arrested or cautioned during 1995-96. This involved visual assessment of ethnicity by officers using the following 4-point classification: [1] White (White – North European [IC1], White – South European [IC2]); [2] Black (Black [IC3]); [3] Asian (Asian [IC4]); [4] Other (Chinese, Japanese or South East Asian [IC5], Middle Eastern [IC6]); NB, another category ‘Unknown’ [IC0] could also be used. From April 1st 2003 in addition to this visual assessment it became mandatory for police forces to record a suspects’ self-assessed ethnicity using the 16-point classification adopted by the 2001 census. Recently (from January 1st 2009) in response to Recommendation 24 of Sir Ronnie Flanagan’s Review of Policing (www.police.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/police-reform/
Review of policing final report), the visual assessment has been dropped and police officers are only required to record self-identified ethnicity. With these visual crowd surveys taking place in 2005-2006 and those observed not being spoken to it seemed acceptable to use the visual assessment similar to that being used by the police forces in England and Wales. As noted, this is no longer a method they use, in part no doubt due to the aforementioned ethical issues raised using this technique.

Ultimately for the research here the surveys conducted where a small part of the research overall and did act as a basic check of findings from prior research and whether they could be applied to the settings to be subsequently utilised in the main component of the research here (i.e. the qualitative interviews). Specifically, in the first instance a game at Gigg Lane on the 2nd of April 2005 was surveyed. On this date Bury played Rochdale in a Coca Cola Football League Division Two encounter that attracted a crowd of 4,606 (which was Bury’s second highest attendance figure at that point of the 2004-2005 season). At this game a visual assessment was made of the home fans as they entered the ground. To achieve this a position in the corner of the Main Stand was taken up. From there it was possible to observe Bury fans entering the ground through the East Stand turnstiles (which was the home end for Bury fans at this match) and those entering the seated area’s in the Main Stand through the end (entry / exit) gangway leading up to the seats. This position was taken up an hour and a half before kick off and maintained until kick off. During this time 554 fans were observed entering Gigg Lane and the number who appeared to be from a minority ethnic group was recorded. With 554 people observed out of 4,606, 12% of the total crowd had been observed. At this game Rochdale’s
following was 1,500 people (according to journalist Trevor Baxter (2005) in his match report for a local newspaper). Hence, approximately, 17.8% (554 out of 3,106) of the home fans were observed.

A subsequent survey at Gigg Lane was done on the 7th of March 2006 when Bury played Stockport County (again in a Coca Cola Football League Division Two encounter). On a wet, cold night in front of 3,116 people (nearly 1,500 less than at the Rochdale game) taking up the same vantage point as last time was not appropriate due to the Stockport County fans being located in the East Stand. Consequently, a position in the Main Stand towards the West Stand end of Gigg Lane was taken up. From here it was possible to observe Bury fans coming into that end of the ground and those coming into the Main Stand through the two end gangways in the Main Stand towards the West Stand end of Gigg Lane. This position was taken up an hour and a half before kick off and maintained until kick off. As at the previous game a visual assessment of the home fans was made to assess how many appeared to be from a minority ethnic group. This time 302 fans were observed, that being 9.7% (302 out of 3,116) of the total crowd. At this game there were 1,347 Stockport County fans, making Bury’s representation 1,769 (www.buryfc.co.uk crowd figure breakdown taken from the club website). With the smaller total attendance a smaller sample was observed. This time, 17.1% (302 out of 1,769) of Bury fans were observed entering Gigg Lane, that being similar to the proportion observed at the Rochdale game (17.8%).
Everton

Similar to the situation with Bury FC, prior research (Bains & Johal, 1998; Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 1999; Bradbury 2001) would suggest that the proportion of the crowd at Everton Football Club’s home games drawn from members of minority ethnic groups would not reflect their proportion in the City of Liverpool (where Everton are based) as a whole. Using a similar methodology to that adopted at Bury, visual crowd surveys were conducted at Goodison Park (Everton FC’s home ground) to gauge the level of attendance by members of minority ethnic groups and see if they appeared to support the prior research highlighted.

The first survey at Goodison Park was conducted on Saturday 19th of February 2005 when Everton played Manchester United in an FA Cup Fifth Round tie. This game drew a crowd of 38,664, this being Everton’s fifth highest crowd of the 2004-2005 season (and above their final seasonal average of 36,834). Visual assessment of home fans entering the ground was achieved from the top of a flight of stairs inside the stadium. The vantage point taken up meant that the fans observed were those entering the Main Stand side of the ground (on Goodison Road) through turnstiles 7-8 of the South section of this stand. This position was taken up an hour and a half before kick off until just before kick off. On this occasion 500 people were observed, which equated to 1.3% of the total crowd (500 out of 38,664).

A subsequent Goodison Park survey was conducted on Sunday the 6th of March 2005 when Everton played Blackburn Rovers in the Premiership. The attendance for this game was 32,406, well below Everton’s seasonal average. In terms of the method for
the survey this remained largely unchanged, with the same vantage point taken up for a similar amount of time. Once again 500 people were observed entering the stadium. As on the previous occasion a visual assessment of these 500 spectators was made to assess how many appeared to be from a minority ethnic group. This time 1.36% of the total crowd was observed (500 out of 36,834).
Strengths and Weakness of the Research Methods Used

Semi-structured qualitative interviews are the main research method used here, which, as noted previously ‘lend themselves particularly well to a figurational approach’ (Bloyce, 2004: 161). The issue that is central to the work here (desire for inclusion in football amongst members of minority ethnic groups) did not lend itself to observation. Indeed asking people their views on the issue, particularly the members of minority ethnic groups who are excluded, represented the only viable qualitative research strategy available for assessing the research question(s).

Using this method it was possible to build up a detailed picture about peoples’ attitudes, feelings and behaviours. When doing these interviews the aim was to not pre-judge people and to create openness in order to encourage respondents to expand on their responses and in turn open up new topic areas that may not initially have been considered. In other words, this method was used to acquire particular information and using it the interviewer could seize upon opportunities where the interviewee could elaborate on points of interest without being restricted to the rigidity of a more structured interview (Bloyce, 2004: 161-162). Furthermore, as Bryman (2001: 317) maintains, such questioning allowed the researcher to ‘glean the ways in which research participants view(ed) their social world’.

However, one needs to be aware of certain potential pitfalls when using semi-structured qualitative interviews. For example one needs to be careful about taking at face value what respondents say, since, from a figurational point of view, as Bloyce (2004, 162) contends ‘it is important to consider the “we” perspective adopted by
interviewees’. Bryman (2001: 216) writing about interviewing has, similarly, highlighted that bias can be introduced due to memory lapses and distortions.

As well as interviewees there are pitfalls one needs to be aware of as a researcher relying predominantly on this method, which relies heavily on the researcher’s view of what is significant and important (Bryman, 2004). With qualitative research the investigator is the main instrument of data collection. As a consequence what is observed and heard and what the researcher decides to concentrate on is very much a product of the individuals preferences (Bryman, 2004: 284). Also, subsequent interpretation of data can be influenced by a researcher’s subjective leanings. Due to factors such as these true replication of qualitative findings is not easily achieved, which is why the findings of qualitative research, such as the work here, are typically generalised to theory not populations. Another aspect that one has been aware of when doing this research is whether participants’ responses have been affected by the characteristics of the researcher including their personality, age, race and ethnicity. Knowing what affect such factors have had is difficult to gauge although by building up trust and rapport, detailed above, when conducting the interviews one has aimed to minimise them.

While semi-structured interviews account for the bulk of the research herein visual crowd surveys were used to get a snapshot of the crowd demographics at the case study clubs. These were practical in terms of time and cost and did offer club specific detail in relation to findings from prior research into crowd demographics (Bains & Johal, 1998; Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 1999; Bradbury 2001). However,
these surveys were relatively superficial in their scope. They served their purpose, but had limitations since, for example, when defining race visually it may be difficult to be sure one has decided correctly about what race a person is (i.e. an element of guess work may occur) and since such assessments are made without consent ethical issues may be raised. Nevertheless, these surveys offered a snapshot that could corroborate or counter previous research in the area and concentrate specifically on the settings to be used for the rest of the research herein.
Chapter 4 – Bury Case Study: Introduction

This chapter commences with an overview of the Metropolitan Borough of Bury with the emphasis placed on its population breakdown. Research for this case study focuses on the interrelationships between association football (in particular Bury Football Club) and the wider social contexts in which it is organised, watched and played (Dunning, 1999). To locate Bury FC within the professional association football structure in England and to illustrate the sort of institution it is a brief overview of the club is provided. Research here focuses on minority ethnic groups and Bury FC’s use of black and Asian players is subsequently highlighted. Documented instances of racism involving supporters of Bury FC are also identified in this section.

Research into spectating patterns has identified considerable under representation of minority ethnic group members at live football matches in England (Malcolm et al, 1994, 1999; Waddington et al, 1999). Using visual surveys the crowd demographics at two Bury FC home games were observed. Survey findings at Gigg Lane offered support for this under representation identified by previous research.

Available evidence suggests that such under representation is not due to a lack of interest in sport (Maguire, 1988; Verma et al, 1991; Waddington et al, 1999; Garland and Rowe, 1996, 2001). Having conducted interviews with: (i) people who are connected to organisations charged with developing sporting opportunities and whose roles involve consultation with the general public as well as (ii) Asian members of the minority ethnic community in Bury, the degree of interest in sport and more specifically football was ascertained. Findings from these interviews are detailed with the intention of moving
towards answers as to what is behind rejection of spectatorship at Bury FC.

The next section attempts to theorise the themes that emerged from the findings. Seemingly ‘commonsense’ themes to have emerged and which are discussed are: lack of role models, cultural differences, fear of racism, violence and discrimination, cost of attending games, preference for other sports, and support of other clubs. These are considered with reference to the following sociological ideas: the established outsider relation’s model (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994), exciting significance (Maguire, 1991b), space and place (Gaffney and Bale, 2004) and sense of identity (Burdsey, 2007). This aids understanding of the data enabling an overview of findings to be produced as this piece of work moves towards a final conclusion based on a comparison of the two case studies.

The Bury case study suggests that whilst the Asian population may express little interest in attending Bury FC matches, this is not a consequence of disinterest in football. The findings question the importance, which some previous research has placed on role models and the idea that cultural differences are a barrier to sports participation and spectatorship. Furthermore, the evidence suggests that the fear of racism detailed by a number of the Asian respondents was not absolute. Rather the findings indicate that the identities of these Asian respondents are highly complex and that this leads to seemingly contradictory forms of behaviour.
About Bury

Bury Metropolitan Borough is made up of 6 towns (Bury, Ramsbottom, Tottington, Radcliffe, Whitefield and Prestwich) that cover an area of 9,919 hectares (24,511 acres) (www.bury.gov.uk). Industrially Bury was a traditional mill town until the decline of the cotton industry in the 1950s and 1960s. With the mills declining other industries grew in prominence, such as paper manufacturing. In recent years paper manufacture has also decreased although it remains prominent amongst the various industries that constitute Bury’s commercial base.¹

In terms of its population at the 2001 national Census Bury had 180,608 inhabitants most of whom were born in the United Kingdom (94.2 per cent being born in the United Kingdom, 91.4 per cent of the population of Bury being born in England) (www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001). At this time, 93.9 per cent (169,550) of the population of Bury Metropolitan Borough identified themselves as being white and 6.1 per cent (11,058 people) as part of a minority ethnic group. Since the previous national Census, in 1991, the black and minority ethnic community of Bury had almost doubled (from 3.6 per cent to 6.1 per cent, or from 6,455 to 11,058), with the most substantial increase being found amongst the Pakistani community which by 2001 comprised 3 per cent (5,492 people) of the population of Bury MBC.² This means that, using Bradbury’s (2001) categorisation, Bury had, in 2001, a ‘significant’ minority ethnic population the majority of whom were Asian and almost half of whom identified themselves as being Pakistani.

Bury is subdivided into seven area boards (Ramsbottom, Tottington and North Manor,
Bury West, Bury East, Radcliffe, Whitefield and Unsworth and Prestwich) that are then further subdivided into electoral Wards. In terms of location the area board with the largest ethnic population in Bury is Bury East, which the local council state ‘is the area of Bury on the Eastern side of the River Irwell comprising of electoral wards Redvales, Moorside, & East and it has a diverse community made up of people of all ages and from different backgrounds, faiths and cultures’ (www.bury.gov.uk/Area Boards/BuryEast.htm). Supporting this claim, in relation to one of these wards, the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities has stated that the Pakistani population of Redvales is 11 per cent (www.AGMA.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/steam/ asset). In addition, to having the largest minority ethnic population in Bury MBC, Bury East has within its boundaries Bury Football Club’s home ground on Gigg Lane.
Bury Football Club

Bury FC was founded following a public meeting on Friday 24th April 1885 at the White House Hotel, in Bury town centre (Cullen, 1999). From its inception Bury FC has played at Gigg Lane. In 1894-1895 the club joined the Football League (Division Two). That season Bury won promotion to Division One and commenced what could be considered as the most successful period in the club’s history.3 Despite success on the field Bury, with comparatively small crowds, struggled to compete due to financial uncertainty and were eventually relegated from Division One at the end of season 1911-1912 (Cullen, 1999). This state of affairs, with small crowds and periods of struggle financially, encapsulate the situation that has prevailed at Bury FC from the early days of its existence to the present day. On occasion Bury FC has achieved financial stability (for example, in the ‘boom’ times for football countrywide following World Wars I and II (Cullen, 1999)), but the club have never been able to maintain it long term. At times the fluctuating finances at Bury FC have caused grave concern and led to fears that the club may fold. The most recent example of this was in 2002 when a proposed takeover failed to materialise and the club went into administration. At that time extinction seemed a distinct possibility although it was ultimately avoided, in large part due to the efforts of the Bury FC supporters trust, Forever Bury.

On the field, Bury were relegated from Division Three at the end of season 1969-1970 and subsequently played in Division Four for the first time. For a three-season period in the late 1990’s (1996-1997 until relegation at the end of 1998-1999) Bury returned to the second tier of English professional football (Division One or ‘old’ Division
Two). Bury Football Club are currently, following the promotion detailed below, in Division One (the ‘old’ Division Three) and since 1999 have remained in one of the lower two of the four Football League divisions. Overall, it has been an achievement for the club to continue trading, although they seem set for an extended period in the lower division(s). From 2005-2006 to 2007-2008 Bury FC finished nearer to the bottom of Division Two than the top and continued ‘fighting a long-term finance battle’ (Lawrenson, 2005: 40). Although financially little has changed on the pitch, 2008-2009 saw an improvement with Bury finishing fourth in Division Two before missing out on promotion in the play-offs. The following season, 2009-2010, Bury ended up in a respectable 9th place, just 3 points short of a play-off place. Season 2010-2011 was then a particularly successful one for the club as they finished 2nd in Division Two to secure promotion to the third tier of English football for the first time since 2002.
Bury Football Club’s black and Asian players

When Bury played Bradford City, 12th November 1977, Steve Johnson made his debut and ‘became the first black player to appear in Bury’s first team’ (Cullen, 1999: 112). Since then Bury has regularly featured players of colour in its senior team / squad and continues to do so. Additionally, when Andy Preece was player manager (1999 to 2003) Bury FC were one of the few professional English clubs to have a black manager. May 2007 saw Bury create another milestone by appointing Keith Alexander as English football’s ‘first black director of football’ (Lawrenson, 2007: 43).

Bury FC has been at the forefront of the development of opportunities for Asian players in English football. Harris (2003: 146), for example, notes that ‘the first Indian born player with no parental links to Britain to play in the English League did not arrive until Bhutia Baichung signed for Bury of the Second Division’. After joining Bury from East Bengal FC (of Calcutta) in October 1999, the Indian international made over 40 appearances for Bury’s first team without ever establishing himself as a regular in the side. At the end of his three-year contract with Bury he returned to India. Bury have also utilised the services of, British born Asian, Harpal Singh who had two loan spells at Gigg Lane (during the 2001-2002 and 2003-2004 seasons) making over 40 first team appearances in total.

Speculating as to why Bury FC employed two Asian players during this period ex Bury manager Stan Ternent, on the face of it somewhat cynically, stated that:
The club tried everything [to attract more fans on matchdays]. Over 15 per cent of the population [who live] around Gigg Lane are from ethnic minorities, so an Indian lad was signed and we took an English Asian on loan from Leeds. The crowd soared by four – their parents.

(Ternent, 2004: 201)

Whatever their motivation behind doing so Bury FC, appear to have embraced using players of colour.

Bury FC’s fans’, however, appear to have been less willing to embrace their clubs use of players of colour. Reporting on racism aimed at players during the 2002-2003 season one local newspaper claimed that ‘A minority of fans branded “morons” by Andy Preece have thrown disgusting racist abuse at both Bury and opposition players, their families and supporters in recent weeks’ (Iles, 2003: 40). Bury FC issued a statement (12th February 2003) relating to this and outlined their position, as follows:

After recent events being brought to our attention by the management, players and fans of Bury Football Club, we feel it necessary to make everyone aware of the stance Bury FC will take against the perpetrators of racial and abusive language, violence, spitting and other actions that taint the name of Bury Football Club. We’re not just talking towards other teams and their supporters, but unbelievably towards our own players and their families… We need to identify these people and ban them from all Bury matches.

(Iles, 2003: 40)

In another, more recent, incident some Bury fans were again branded as racist (Brereton, 2006). This occurred on the opening day of the 2006-2007 Football League season when Bury travelled to play MK Dons in a League Division Two fixture. During the game a small section of the Bury fans apparently ‘directed “monkey chants” and various [racist] comments towards several black players in the MK Dons team’ (Brererton, 2006: 9). In the same newspaper report of this incident Bury FC director Iain Mills was quoted at length and amongst other things stated:

163
On behalf of Bury Football Club, I have to apologise to the black players within the MK Dons team because of the chanting and racist comments coming from a section of the Bury supporters. We do not need supporters like this. I talked to one or two stewards after the game and they said we are the worst set of fans they have ever seen here, which disappoints me greatly

(Mills, reported by Brereton, 2006: 9)

Mills added that he apologised to the MK Dons chairman and would apologise to their manager. He also claimed there would be an investigation to discover who the culprits were.
Bury Football Club Crowd Demographic /

Racism in Greater Manchester / Racist actions of Bury fans

Having opted to do a couple of visual crowd surveys when to do them was considered. As far as Bury are concerned without classing myself as a Bury FC fan they are the nearest professional football club to my current home address and during a season, on average, one would watch them play at Gigg Lane a couple of times. Having lived in my current home since 1998 it is probable that from then until now that about twenty-five visits to Gigg Lane have been made (to watch Bury FC). Ultimately, these crowd surveys took place during the 2004-2005 and the 2005-2006 season’s, with one carried out each season. From my usual attendance pattern it is clear that these were not the only visits made to Gigg Lane during these seasons, but on the two instances detailed below games were attended ready and prepared to do these surveys (as well as subsequently watching the matches).

Visual surveys of the crowd demographic at two of Bury FC’s home games produced the following results. At the Bury versus Rochdale game (2nd of April 2005) 554 people were observed entering Gigg Lane of whom six appeared to be from a minority ethnic group. Of this six a tracksuit worn by one young black male identified him as a Bury FC youth team player. This sampling suggests that 1.08 per cent (6 out of 554) of the crowd at this Bury FC home game were drawn from minority ethnic groups. These six people were all black males and none of the fans entering the ground during this visual survey appeared to be Asian.

At the Bury versus Stockport County game (7th March 2006) 302 fans were observed
entering the ground, of whom two appeared to be from a minority ethnic group. This sampling suggests that on this occasion 0.7 per cent of the crowd were drawn from minority ethnic groups. Specifically the two fans observed were a young black male and a Chinese male. Overall, the percentages of fans from minority ethnic groups are low and as far as South Asian fans are concerned non-existent.

These survey findings help confirm the under representation, compared to the overall make up of the Bury MBC, of members of minority ethnic groups at Bury FC’s home matches. In particular the findings reveal a striking lack of spectators being drawn from members of the local Asian population. These findings agree with Waddington et al’s (1999: 19) statement that ‘in Britain, sports spectatorship is a sphere of social life in which members of “outsider” ethnic groups participate only to a very limited degree’ and similarly Malcolm et al (1999: 42) who found that there is ‘considerable under-representation of ethnic minority group members as spectators at sports events in England’. Similarly Bradbury, found that over half (55 per cent) of professional football clubs in England ‘agreed that less than one per cent of their usual match-day support was made up of minority ethnic fans, including 17 clubs which admitted to virtually no minority ethnic support at all’ (Bradbury, 2001: 28). This work of Bradbury’s is the most up to date large scale analysis of football crowds make up in relation to ethnicity, and his findings at that time were similar to those of the 2001 Football Association Premier League National Fan Survey which found that the proportion of supporters from minority ethnic groups at matches was slow to change. Waddington et al additionally made a distinction between blacks and Asians and their attendance patterns and these crowd surveys concur with their findings. Specifically,
Waddington et al (1999: 22) stated that ‘fewer Asians than blacks attend English football matches’ despite the fact that the Asian community make up a greater proportion of the population of Britain than the black community.

It is appropriate at this point to pause to consider what evidence there is of racist harassment and abuse in Greater Manchester (where Bury FC are located) as a whole and any evidence of the same specific to Bury Football Club. The town of Bury, in terms of its police force, falls under the jurisdiction of GMP (Greater Manchester Police). As reported by the Ministry of Justice (2009) information in relation to racist incidents is collected annually by HMIC (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary) using as their base a common definition, being, that ‘A racist incident / crime is any incident /crime which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person’ (as recommended by The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry in 1999). For England and Wales as a whole during 2007-08 the police recorded 57,055 racist incidents (a 6.9% decrease from 2006-07 when the figure was 61,262; that being the highest recorded at any time for the last 9 years, i.e. since 1999-2000). Of the 43 police forces recording such data Greater Manchester recorded 4,623 (a slight increase on 2006-07, when 4,502 were recorded, which was a rise on 2005-06 levels when 3,868 were recorded). Whilst not all police forces are of equal size or govern areas of equal size it is nevertheless noticeable that with 4,623 Greater Manchester recorded the 2nd highest figure for such offences across police forces in England and Wales.

Having pinpointed those statistics it is important to highlight a couple of factors. Firstly; not all racist incidents that occur are recorded by the police, but the BCS
(British Crime Survey) records people’s experience and perception of crime, including whether a victim of crime perceived it to be racially motivated. Based on the 2007-08 BCS the number of racially motivated incidents was estimated at 207,000 (in 2006-07 it was estimated at 184,000; in 2005-06 139,000; in 2004-05 179,000) (Jansson et al, 2007). Secondly: obviously, it is not exclusively members of the BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) population against whom racially motivated crimes are committed. However of all crimes recorded by the BCS where the victim was White 1% were thought to be racially motivated, whereas the comparable figure was 10% for BCS crimes where the victim was from a BME group (Jansson et al, 2007).

Research here concentrates on the Asian minority ethnic community. As far as this community, in Manchester, in concerned Catherine Hestletine (of the Muslim Public Affairs Committee) argues that they do not have a good relationship with the police, especially in the post 9/11 and 7/7 climates (discussed previously in Chapter 2). Hestletine maintains that new police powers designed, as she puts it, to ‘track down terrorist threats’ have left relations between GMP and the Asian community at an all time low. This is happening, she claims, because police are targeting Asians, as evidenced by figures for 2008 which show that 43% of all people stop-and-searched by Greater Manchester Police under new anti-terrorist legislation were from an Asian background. Indeed, Hestletine (2008) argues that ‘There is much more Islamophobia among the police now. Young Asians in particular feel they are under suspicion’

Factors such as those detailed above act as evidence of the number of racist incidents in the broad based locality in which Bury FC are located (Greater Manchester) and
suggest that the relationship between Asians in Greater Manchester and GMP is strained. While this offers a contextual backdrop for the work here, of more significance is the situation in and around the football ground (Gigg Lane) and in relation to Bury. Home Office statistics in relation to arrests for racist chanting, for season 2008-09, show that across the 24 League Two clubs (for all competitions they played in that season) the number of arrests for racist chanting was 3 (Home Office, 2009). Indeed, 21 of the 24 League Two clubs, including Bury, during that season had 0 arrests for racist chanting amongst their own fans. Reduction of such overt racism has been evidenced and discussed previously (Chapter 2), although this does not mean that racism has disappeared in connection to football.

Indeed, specific to Bury FC racist incidents involving their fans have been detailed above, one of which relates to season 2006-07, that being the season after the one when the second of the crowd surveys detailed here was conducted. For research herein the experiences of members of the Asian minority ethnic community are of particular interest and in 2004 the newspaper Eastern Eye did research into the experiences of Asian football fans. Although not club specific the findings of this survey, as reported by Kelso and Bhatia (2004), were that nearly a quarter of Asian football fans have experienced or witnessed racial abuse of some sort while attending English football grounds. Hence, whilst the Home Office report that no Bury fans were arrested for racist chanting during season 2008-09 this does not indicate that racism amongst Bury fans is non-existent and / or eradicated.

Having established, above, that few members of minority ethnic groups (and in particular very few Asians) attend live football games at Bury qualitative interviews
were conducted with: (i) People in positions of some authority whose work is related
to racism in football (and specifically Bury FC) and involves consultation with the
general public in the town and (ii) members of the Asian sector of the minority ethnic
population in Bury (specifically young male Asians, who have an interest in sport).
Institutional Perceptions on Minority Ethnic Groups and Football Attendance

Findings From Individuals In Positions of Authority

People interviewed who hold positions of some authority and consult with the general public were all connected to organisations charged with developing sporting opportunities, including the lack of attendance by members of minority ethnic groups at live games. Previously (Research Methods Chapter) organisations involved in developing such opportunities with reference to Bury FC were identified and the views of people who work for them were sought.

**Bury Football Club:** One of two Bury FC employees interviewed was Seb Piper, ‘assistant’ to Bury FC’s Community Officer Stephen Raynor. Piper was unsure whether members of minority ethnic groups in Bury were interested in sport, but cited the existence of Asian football leagues and attendance at training and coaching sessions provided by Bury FC as evidence of a degree of interest in football. When asked why if members of minority ethnic groups in Bury are interested in association football they are significantly under represented at home matches played by Bury FC, Piper speculated that ‘this may be due to religion’. He further argued that the religion of many Asian people does not sit well with the sort of socialising, especially the drinking of alcohol, that has often been associated with football and football fandom. Despite his previous answer re Asian football leagues and attendance at coaching sessions, Piper pondered whether members of minority ethnic groups in Bury decided not to attend live games due to ‘not knowing too much about football or Bury FC’.

Patricia Keppie’s job, as Bury FC Education and Welfare Officer, involves consultation with the town’s community and the issue of racism. Keppie told me that
in her opinion members of minority ethnic groups in Bury are not interested in sport and specifically not interested in football. She also indicated her belief that there is a conscious rejection of sport spectatorship at live football matches in Bury by members of minority ethnic groups. When probed as to what she thought may be behind this rejection, Keppie said the reasons might be: ‘due to feeling unwelcome at the club, fear of discrimination, lack of role models, alternative leisure attractions and cultural influences from different sports’.

Supporters of Bury Football Club: Active Forever Bury member Andy Barlow maintained that minority ethnic groups (and Asians in particular) in Bury were interested in sport, but were not interested in football and that this led to a conscious rejection of spectatorship at live football. Barlow also cited financial reasons as a factor behind this non-attendance since ‘Bury is not a particularly affluent area’. Furthermore, Barlow felt that a lack of tradition helps to explain minority ethnic group members’ rejection of spectatorship at Bury Football Club:

For indigenous families, there is often a tradition within a family to support a particular team, passed on down the generations. Ethnic minorities have less of a family history or tradition in this country and as such “choose” a team to follow as opposed to a long history with the club. As Bury has only had a moderate level of success, and with the number of successful clubs in the North West, I would imagine it is easier to choose and follow a more successful team.

Susan Tunstall felt that minority ethnic groups in Bury were interested in sport generally and were interested in football. She based these opinions on her personal experiences as a member of the local community. Citing one example she said that ‘There are numerous members of minority ethnic groups who attend the same gym as me. Also walking around the local parks I have seen a lot of children and youths from
minority ethnic groups playing sports’. Despite that, Tunstall thought that members of minority ethnic groups in Bury consciously reject spectatorship at Bury Football Clubs matches. In her opinion the cost of attending games is prohibitive for all groups and there is a degree of apathy in the town towards Bury Football Club generally. Expanding on this point Tunstall added that Bury’s average crowd was around 2,500. Furthermore, she explained, you ‘don’t see many youngsters out and about wearing Bury shirts, but you see plenty with Manchester United ones on’.

Specific to members of minority ethnic groups her feeling was that the main, additional, reason for their non-attendance was their ‘preconceived idea that racism is still rife’. Tunstall noted that Forever Bury had previously tried to arrange meetings with representatives of local minority ethnic groups, to discuss this very issue, but to no avail since ‘attending football matches is not seen as a priority issue by the Elders and Faith Leaders’.

Derek Boulton argued that members of minority ethnic groups in Bury were not interested in sport generally and specifically not interested in football. He also believed that there was a conscious rejection of Bury FC’s live games. Explaining why Boulton stated that:

> In my opinion, for many years there has been little support, for sport spectatorship within minority ethnic groups, who themselves have made little effort to gain acceptance. One may argue it is not up to such groups to involve themselves, but one has only to see the way in which the Indian and Pakistani national cricket teams are revered in their own countries.

Consequently, from the Forever Bury members interviewed three different viewpoints emerged. Barlow spoke of tradition in a way that can be aligned to concepts of identity and exciting significance (discussed below) and argued that this is the main
factor in the non-attendance of Asians. Tunstall argued that Asian minority ethnic
groups perceive racism still to be rife and that this is why they do not attend Bury FC.
In conjunction with this she maintained that representatives of such groups do not feel
attending football is a priority. Tunstall’s view in this regard relies on a (false)
preconception of the minority ethnic community being unified and religiously
homogenous, which is an issue returned to later. Finally amongst this group of
respondents, Boulton maintained that members of minority ethnic groups in Bury
were not interested in football and made little effort to gain acceptance and get
involved in football. This diversity illustrates the complex nature of the issue and
suggests that Forever Bury’s stated aims of wanting to benefit all sections of the
community and engender community involvement could prove problematic when
their membership hold such disparate views on what is behind this rejection.

Bury Metropolitan Borough Council: Robin Philp was forthright with his views and
told me that broadly speaking he felt that members of minority ethnic communities in
Bury were not interested in sport and more specifically not interested in football.
Furthermore, he maintained that members of minority ethnic groups do consciously
reject spectatorship at live football matches in Bury. In Philp’s opinion a significant
factor in this rejection is the ‘lack of role models at professional level or even semi-
professional level for members of these groups to identify with’.

When discussing with Philp the specifics of his role as Football Inclusion
Development Officer for Bury Metro Leisure Services he explained that, in his
experience, initiating courses for members of minority ethnic groups in Bury was not
an effective way of developing sports as invariably take up would be low. That being the case, he is predominantly re-active rather than pro-active since he believes that it ‘works best waiting until they [minority ethnic groups] come to us and then we will go and put a course or event on for them’. Whether this is indeed the best way of working is debateable and perhaps this method is adopted because it is easiest for him. Philp added that approaches to put on football courses or events do come in regularly from a wide cross-section of minority ethnic groups in Bury (e.g. Asian, Jewish, Afro-Caribbean, Chinese) and consequently he is kept busy without trying to go ‘uninvited’ into these communities to offer, for example, football coaching.

Philp’s description does, of course, contradict his views about the lack of interest in sport and football amongst the town’s minority ethnic groups. Following further discussion Philp clarified his thoughts and made a distinction between what community and faith leaders request and the level of desire for inclusion, he believes there is, at grassroots level. Overall, Philp felt that desire for inclusion at grassroots level appears to be inconsistent and that as far as desire for inclusion in sports development opportunities in Bury is concerned:

Community leaders want it but I’m not sure they always ask those at grassroots level if they do as sometimes when it comes to it I think, in view of the low attendances we have on occasion for events we put on, that perhaps they don’t.

Since his job involves stimulating demand for football amongst members of minority ethnic groups in Bury this seems to be somewhat defeatist. Of more sociological relevance, however, Philp also outlined his opinion that poor attendance at sports development events may be due to a rejection of football and a lack of desire for inclusion or, alternatively, because pockets of resistance to a white face entering their
community are enough to put others off attending.

Talking of this resistance to a white face(s) entering a minority ethnic community Philp argued that it tended to come consistently from the same few people in a given community. Philp stated that over time he and his team had come to know who these individuals are, and had learnt to manage what they saw as disruptive influences. He relayed the experience of an outside agency that had tried to offer football coaching within a predominantly Asian community in Bury only to have their efforts severely disrupted. This group of white coaches were verbally abused, in part for being white, and felt that those wishing to disrupt the sessions were watching who was attending and then putting peer pressure on them not to attend again. Whilst hard to prove this appeared to be evidenced, Philp told me, by decreasing numbers of Asian participants attending over the course of a weeks programme delivered over one half term. From an established outsider (Elias and Scotson, 1965) point of view Philp’s views are of interest, as he clearly believes the worst about these minority ethnic communities (group disgrace) without questioning the behaviour (group charisma) of the coaches. One way that the established may use to keep outsiders in their place is by ‘gossip’, with ‘blame gossip’ of this nature used to confirm unfavourable beliefs about the outsiders (Elias and Scotson, 1965).

By working in the manner outlined above, Philp’s work for Bury MBC’s Sports Development Department does enable some individuals to benefit from the courses or events they put on. Despite that one may speculate whether these disruptive influences occur because there are problems with the provision offered by Philp’s
department. If that is the case then addressing these issues could make what they offer to minority ethnic groups more all-inclusive.

Two other members of Bury Council’s Sports Development Team were also interviewed to get a broader opinion from members of this department. After reviewing the opinions of Carly Ibbott and Yvonne Hall it appeared that, they had been briefed by Philp. Philp, Ibbott and Hall all told me that; members of minority ethnic groups in Bury are not interested in sport and not interested in football; members of minority ethnic groups in Bury do consciously reject sport spectatorship at live football matches; and that the main reason for this as far as the Asian community is concerned is due to a lack of role models in football. Hall also argued that this rejection of sports spectatorship occurs because ‘games are generally on Saturdays’ which could be problematic on religious grounds. Furthermore Hall maintained that, in her opinion, there is a lack of school-club links with Bury Football Club. Overall, either these three individuals hold similar opinions, or the latter two had spoken to Philp about what he had said to me and then responded in a similar vein. With diverse viewpoints emerging from those interviewed who worked for Bury FC and who represented the supporters group Forever Bury the similarity of views from these Council employees is even more striking and increases the possibility that collusion did occur.

In summary, having interviewed eight respondents who are connected to organisations charged with developing sporting opportunities, some trends were identifiable. Only two suggested that minority ethnic groups were in fact interested in
sport. Similarly only two claimed that minority ethnic groups in Bury are interested in football. Most, however felt that minority ethnic group members do consciously reject spectatorship at live football matches in Bury. Since all of these respondents are connected to organisations that profess a desire to foster inclusion in football amongst minority ethnic groups these findings are somewhat surprising. Furthermore, such opinions run counter to much prior research (Fleming, 1991; Verma et al, 1991; Waddington et al, 1999; Johal, 2001; Eastern Eye, 2004; Bains, 2005; Burdsey, 2006), which suggests that British Asians are interested in football. Before making conclusions in this regard it will be instructive to consider the views of the Asian respondents themselves. It is to this that I now turn.
Findings From Asian Respondents

During initial interviews with 20 young Asian males some common opening questions where asked, prior to developing the interviews depending on individual respondent’s responses. Answers to these questions have been grouped (Table 4) to give an overview of the opinion of these young Asian males.

Table 5: Answers summarised for questions asked to all Asians from Bury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Opinion – YES</th>
<th>Opinion – NO</th>
<th>Opinion - UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do members of minority ethnic groups in Bury have an interest in sport?</td>
<td>(1), (2), (8), (13), (14), (15), (16), (20).</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (9), (10), (12), (17), (18), (19).</td>
<td>(11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total = 8</td>
<td>Total = 11</td>
<td>Total = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do members of minority ethnic groups in Bury (especially male members) have an interest in football?</td>
<td>(1), (2), (6), (7), (8), (11), (12), (13), (14), (16), (17), (20).</td>
<td>(3), (4), (5), (9), (10), (15), (18), (19).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total = 12</td>
<td>Total = 8</td>
<td>Total = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there conscious rejection of spectatorship at live football matches in Bury by minority ethnic group members?</td>
<td>(2), (3), (5), (10), (11), (12), (13), (17), (18), (19).</td>
<td>(1), (6), (7), (9), (14), (15), (16), (20).</td>
<td>(4), (8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total = 10</td>
<td>Total = 8</td>
<td>Total = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is useful for illustrating divisions of the thinking of these young Asian males. A small majority of these respondents felt that members of minority ethnic groups in Bury are not interested in sport. Specific to football, however, a majority felt there is an interest in football amongst such groups in Bury. The twelve respondents who felt that interest in football is present were asked to give an example(s) to support their opinion. Whilst prior research (Malcolm et al, 1998; Bains & Johal, 1998; Waddington et al 1999; Bradbury, 2001) and the crowds surveys detailed above indicate otherwise, some respondents maintained that Asians do go to Bury matches. Ishaq, without claiming to attend regularly, said he had occasionally been to matches at Gigg Lane with an Asian friend of his and that ‘A lot of Asians go to the football ground in Bury. The only reason I do not go more is because of work commitments’. Similarly, Ikram stated that ‘They [Asians] do go to Bury Football Club’ and Raghav maintained that ‘A lot of [Asian] people go to matches in Bury’. Others linked interest in football to attendance, such as Rashid who believed that ‘Asians [who are interested in football] go to football matches’ and Amir who argued that Asians interested in the game ‘do attend football matches’.

Following further discussion of this issue the opinion of these respondents, on this point, seemed to lack foundation. Ishaq had claimed a lot of Asians go to football, but following supplementary questioning admitted ‘I have not seen that many others [Asians] in the ground during my visits to Gigg Lane’. Ikram and Raghav talked about Asians going to watch Bury FC, but upon further enquiry admitted that they themselves do not go. These responses, therefore, are based on hearsay rather than anything concrete. From the start of questioning about attendance Bury was the
focus, but during further investigation Rashid and Amir both admitted that they were
talking of football generally having heard their Asian friends discuss matches they
had been to. When discussing Bury FC specifically, neither, Rashid or Amir could
think of specific examples of their friends saying they had been there. However, one
could contend that these Asian respondents are over emphasising attendance at Bury
FC games by members of minority ethnic groups because it is something they would
like to see happening more and is how they would like things to be. In other words,
these comments would appear to be indicative of a degree of self-blame amongst a
section of these Asian interviewees who think they should attend games. On the other
hand these initial responses may have been due to these interviewees thinking it was
the ‘right’ answer to say such attendance patterns do happen.

Otherwise the main reason given by respondents to illustrate that interest in football is
present amongst members of minority ethnic groups in Bury was, more concretely,
based on their own experiences of playing the game with their friends and peers.
Manjote maintained that although he only played football occasionally his ‘friends are
very interested in football and play once or twice a week’. Noting an ethnic mix
when football was played recreationally Jahinger said that ‘Mixed teams of Asians
and different races play football together in the park [near where I live]’. Said, on the
other hand, tended to play football with other Asians and explained that ‘my [Asian]
friends and I play sometimes at the Soccer Dome’. He claimed that they would play
football more regularly, but where they live there is ‘only one football pitch in the
area’ the demand for which is high. Consequently, when they go there ‘often there is
no place to play’. Zesh, like Said, made reference to having somewhere suitable to
play stating that those who are interested ‘play [football] so long as the facilities are available’. Further, Mohammed explained that ‘my [Asian] friends and I go to the Sports Centre a lot and play football’ with Dalat noting, that Asians who are interested ‘all play football’.

These findings show an interest in the game and support, for example, the research of Fleming (1991) who indicated that sport is important to certain groups of Asian men, Verma et al (1991) who found that young Asian males had amongst the highest rates of participation in football of any ethnic grouping and Burdsey (2006, 143) who argued that his research ‘has shown, the game is hugely popular amongst, and played by large numbers of, British Asians throughout the country’. Playing football shows an interest in sports participation although it does not necessarily follow that this will lead to spectating at live games. Indeed, proving that an interest exists for one manifestation of sport does not necessarily mean that an interest in others is evident. This point, was expressed by one interviewee (Jahinger) who spoke about games he was involved in on the park near to where he lives:

We play eleven a side [football] and it’s mixed [i.e. mixed races: Asians, blacks, whites]. A couple of my [Asian] friends who play in these games play in their Bury tops and support them, but they don’t go to their games. Most people I know support other, more high profile teams such as Man United, Liverpool or Real Madrid who they have access to and watch and support through TV.

This highlights that even those who express an affinity with their local professional club will not necessarily attend their matches. In the above Jahinger mentions watching football on television, this being a factor also mentioned by Krish who felt that members of minority ethnic groups in Bury are interested in football and they
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‘Watch it [football] on TV’.

When interviewees were asked whether members of minority ethnic groups consciously reject spectatorship at live football matches in Bury, ten argued that conscious rejection was apparent. Four respondents mentioned fear of racism and/or fear of violence in their reply to explain this rejection of spectatorship. In terms of racism Rishi was the most vehement when he claimed that, ‘Racism! The Club are racist, Bury supporters are BNP and Bury’s Chairman is BNP’. Javed, whilst less impassioned, also spoke of racism being a factor in non-attendance by members of minority ethnic groups at Bury FC and said ‘I don’t really know why, but people might be frightened of racism’. Speaking of how violence can be an issue Adnan also referred to his perception that a culture of drinking and alcoholism is associated with football spectatorship when he stated ‘too many alcoholics’ made going to games ‘dangerous for fans’. One respondent, Vishal, linked both of these factors when explaining that ‘sometimes there can be violence and racial comments at Bury’.

Existing literature has covered extensively ‘commonsense’ barriers to attendance such as the cost of attending matches being prohibitive and that Asian interest in cricket predominates over interest in association football. Such factors were not cited extensively by this group of respondents although Zesh did argue that Asians consciously reject spectatorship at live football matches in Bury ‘Because it’s too expensive and we can’t get cheap tickets’, while Ikram cited interest in other sports as a factor in such rejection. Ikram said that Asians are ‘not so interested in football, they like cricket more and football is not as famous in Pakistan and India as cricket’.
Other respondents tended to disagree with Ikram about the relative popularity of football and cricket. Manjote and Jahinger, for example, agreed that cricket is popular, but maintained that football is even more popular.

Another explanation given for rejection of spectatorship related to the claim that Asians in Bury feel excluded and unfairly discriminated against by the club and as a knock on effect of this do not attend live games. Highlighting this claim Vijay spoke about funding in terms of Asians in Bury being ‘outsiders’ when it comes to financial support (for example in terms of being able to access subsidised coaching sessions for children put on by the club and local council):

> We [Asians in Bury] feel we do not get all the help and support we should get. We do not get funding on an equal level to that given to the white groups [in Bury] and can’t get on the ladder towards becoming a professional [football] player.

Otherwise, several respondents attributed conscious rejection of spectatorship at Bury to support for other teams. As well as the violence and racial comments, Vishal added that Asians ‘don’t support Bury they support other teams’. Some interviewees mentioned specific clubs with Said stating ‘no one supports Bury they support and go to [Manchester] United instead’ and Mohammed similarly explaining that ‘Bury are not really a good team, people support [Manchester] United, Liverpool or the Gunners [Arsenal]’. Not surprisingly given its geographic location, Manchester United where often mentioned with Amir saying Asians ‘Support other teams, especially Man United’. Akshay similarly noted that ‘No-one supports Bury. It’s Man United people support’. Manjote went into more detail, along similar lines, and argued:
Asians are not into small [football] matches. They are interested in big games and events like the World Cup or Man United that they can watch on TV. When the [2006] World Cup [Finals] was on recently young people from the area where I live [not exclusively Asian people] would get together to watch the big games communally.

These responses illustrate an interest in football teams per se, with playing success rather than proximity being the primary source of identification. One can also see how for these respondents exciting significance (Maguire, 1991b) is derived from supporting a successful team as opposed to their local team. Equally, this suggests that exciting significance does not stem from local / civic identity, a theme returned to below.
Discussion

Across the different groups of interviewees, there was agreement that conscious rejection of spectatorship is occurring amongst minority ethnic group members in Bury. While several Asian interviewees contested this argument, overall the viewpoint that such rejection is happening predominated. Discussion of what is behind this is necessary to explain the complex social processes that lead to the apparently contradictory situation in which people express an interest in playing football, yet little interest in supporting ‘their’ local club. Consequently, this discussion will theorise, with reference to prior research, themes that have emerged from the findings. This process will also enable conclusions to be drawn in relation to the theories, such as Elias and Scotson’s (1994) theory of ‘established outsider’ relations that have guided this research. The discussion will focus on a number of themes; namely, the lack of role models, cultural differences, identity, sense of space, fear of racism, fear of violence, fear of discrimination, the cost of attending games, the concept that cricket is more popular (than football), national identities, support for other clubs (as opposed to Bury FC), exciting significance, and sense of identity.

Lack of Role Models: Findings in relation to this issue challenge the arguments forwarded by some previous researchers (Maguire et al., 2001; Garland and Rowe, 2001; Cashmore, 1982; Bains, 2005; Burdsey, 2007) as far as the importance of role models is concerned. Data from Asian respondents, reviewed below, indicates that for British Asians the importance of role modelling has been overstated, although interestingly those who work trying to foster inclusion still perceive it to be an important issue. Outlining the argument of researchers who have stressed the
significance of role models, Maguire et al (2001: 75) following a survey of young men found that all their respondents ‘felt that lack of role models was a barrier to Asian Heritage males’ progression in the game’. It has been shown that there was an explosion in the number of black British professional footballers in England, commencing in the 1970s and maturing in the 1980s (Vasili, 2000; Garland and Rowe, 2001). Despite the Asian minority ethnic population in Britain being larger than the Afro Caribbean one no explosion in terms of numbers of British Asian professional footballers in England has occurred (Bains and Patel, 1996; King, 2004; Bains, 2005; Burdsey, 2007). Garland and Rowe (2001) maintain that role modelling plays a part in this disparity, as black players have had role models to emulate, whereas Asian players have not.

Following this train of thought, it can be suggested that the high profile attained by some black players was socially significant since they became positive role models that could impact on the self esteem and profile of black people in society in general. Prior to Garland and Rowe, support for this contention can be found in the work of Cashmore (1982), who interviewed leading black athletes who themselves argued that role modelling of black sportsmen by black youths is significant.

Countering the heavy reliance on role modelling evidenced in the above prior research Waddington et al (1999: 21) stated that there is a ‘relative lack of identification by black fans with black players’ and consequently ‘it is possible that claims for the importance of role modelling have been overstated’. Furthermore, Waddington et al (1999) do not believe that having a substantial number of black professional
footballers “legitimises” the presence of other blacks as spectators. Their findings lead them to contend that for “outsider” groups ‘broader social processes are probably more significant’ (Waddington et al., 1999: 22).

Whilst it is not surprising that respondents who work in this field note this lack of role models as a factor, what is perhaps more interesting about these beliefs are the assumptions that lie behind them. For instance, there seems to be an implicit assumption that role models must be like ‘them’ in terms of ‘race’. This argument leads to a homogenising of ‘Asian’ into a single identity. As far as British Asians in Bury are concerned interviewees connected to organisations that aim to foster inclusion in sport implied that a suitable role model must be Asian and hence as far as these, white, respondents are concerned not like ‘us’. Consequently, one may take the view that the respondents who offered up this reason have a strong notion of cultural difference and in turn ‘new racism’ (Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 56; Gilroy, 1987). In other words, respondents who work for the establishment and those connected to fans group Forever Bury tended to group Asians together as a homogenous group of outsiders who need role models from this same grouping to encourage them to become spectators. This in turn emphasises that these interviewees think of Asian minority ethnic groups in Bury as culturally different (Gilroy, 1987).

Conversely no Asian interviewee raised the issue of role models. However, when pressed on the issue Manjote stated ‘No Asian players [are] playing for big teams to act as role models, [Asian] people are not encouraged to get in at the bottom [end of the game]’. He further added, ‘if one or two Asians played in the England [national]
team it would raise interest in the game even further’. Similarly, Jahinger argued that the existence of a high profile Asian role model ‘could raise interest in the game even further’ and that Asians would think ‘if they can do it I can’. This argument saw Jahinger homogenising ‘Asia’ in a similar way to respondents who are connected to organisations charged with developing sporting opportunities although he, and Manjote, identified some differentiation between Asians in relation to Bury.

Manjote, was not convinced about the impact a high profile Asian player would have at local level. Such an argument runs counter to the idea of how important the lack of a British Asian role model is (Bains, 2005; Burdsey, 2007). Indeed, Manjote claimed that an Asian player ‘from the local community’ would be needed to make a difference. If a local Asian did play for Bury FC, Manjote stated, role modelling could then ‘definitely’ have an effect and ‘family, friends, anyone who knows him and the [Asian] community as a whole would show their support for him’. Jahinger also rejected the importance of role modelling, but maintained that the scenario detailed above could make a difference and that in such an instance the local Asian community would show their support for the player. In addition Jahinger thought that if a local British Asian played for Bury FC it could certainly ‘change some people’s minds’ about the club being ‘closed to them’.

This differentiation of Asians from these respondents was evidenced by them maintaining that for role modelling to affect conscious rejection of spectatorship at Bury it would need an Asian from the local community to break through. In other words, in such a scenario the identity of the player as ‘local’ would be more significant than him being
Asian. As noted above Bury FC have previously employed Asian players, although not from the immediate locality (NB: During season 2010-2011 Bury did have British Asian Krishnan Patel, who was born in Bolton and was a product of Bury’s youth team, in their squad, but at the end of that season he was released without having played for their first team). Whilst the club can therefore be considered as being at the forefront of the development of opportunities for Asian players these players’ presence has had little impact in terms of the number of Asians playing for Bury or watching them play. This seems to lend weight to the argument, above, that sense of identity seems to be attached more to the local community than to a broader sense of ‘Asian-ness’.

As identified, above, several respondents who work for institutions charged with developing sporting opportunities in Bury cited lack of role models as a factor in conscious rejection of spectatorship, but conversely none of the Asian respondents raised this issue. This suggests that those who aim to develop sporting opportunities have a limited understanding of these minority ethnic groups and do not understand how their interest in sport manifests itself. Hence, they cite something they have read or heard about previously; i.e. academic research that either grew out of or became folk wisdom. Indeed, for the Asian interviewees, lack of role models would not appear to be a particularly significant factor in determining interest in football. With this disparity in findings between these two groups support for Elias and Scotson’s (1994) theory of ‘established outsider’ relations, which is based on the idea that people come to hold particular subjective views as a consequence of their broader social experiences, is evidenced.
Cultural Differences / Identity / Sense of Space: Prior research has identified various aspects of cultural difference that are perceived to effect members of minority ethnic groups participation in football (Garland and Rowe, 2001; Maguire et al, 2001; Johal, 2001). Such factors relate to different aspects of participation including non-attendance at football matches. Evidence of a number of these cultural differences being perceived as an issue in non-attendance by Asians in Bury emerged. However, respondents who argued that cultural differences are important were exclusively those connected to institutions charged with developing sporting opportunities, whilst none of the Asians interviewed mentioned or perceived them as an issue. Consequently, Asian interviewees contradicted the widely held belief that cultural differences are a barrier to sports participation and spectatorship.

Issues surrounding cultural differences may also be linked to issues of identity and sense of place, and both of these are investigated. As far as identity is concerned it would appear that British Asians possess hybrid identities (Burdsey, 2007: 151). Through football these identities can evidence ‘sameness’ or ‘difference’. As noted the issue of sense of place will be developed further elsewhere, although this section expresses why Gigg Lane may be viewed as a repellent space for the local non-indigenous population.

One Bury FC employee linked non-attendance by Asians at Gigg Lane to them ‘not knowing much about football’ (Piper). Piper based this rationale on the concept that Asian people are not interested in football because it is not ‘in their culture’, an idea that can be used to absolve the club from blame as far as the lack of Asian people
attending games is concerned. In relation to such cultural differences Garland and Rowe (2001: 194) spoke of the absence of British Asians from professional football and noted how the discourses espoused in such communities tend to ‘present them as physically unsuited to the game’ and as being inclined to ‘prioritise their educational and professional ambition’. Such thinking about cultural difference is both a cornerstone of ‘new racism’ and reflects a tendency to project the Asian minority ethnic groups in Bury as a homogenous group of outsiders.

Expanding on this point and the range of cultural differences often highlighted, Burdsey (2007) identifies perceptions of Asians’ diet and religion as being problematic (for football participation) as well as Asian parents being perceived as against Asian youth’s participation. Such stereotypes were evident amongst respondents connected to organisations that try and foster inclusion. Piper spoke of religion being a factor in under representation amongst members of minority ethnic groups at Bury FC. In a similar vein Tunstall implied that minority ethnic groups are unified and religiously homogenous and that going to football matches is low on the list of priorities of their ‘Elders and Faith Leaders’. As far as the Asian respondents themselves are concerned none of them spoke of any of these factors as issues in Asian youth’s participation as players or spectators. That being the case one can see why Burdsey (2007) suggested that such differences and stereotypes are erroneous.

As far as knowledge about the game and spectatorship are concerned both Burdsey’s findings and the research presented here run counter to Piper’s ‘establishment’ view. Burdsey (2007: 81) argues that the British Asian identity is multiple and complex,
which leads to the construction of a specifically British Asian male youth identity. This hybrid identity means, Burdsey (2007: 151-152) maintains, that ‘British Asians live their lives according to both the cultural traditions of the subcontinent and the social practices of Britain and beyond’ and that ‘football is a key site for the construction and emergence of these new identities’ as British Asian as opposed to being Asian in Britain. Indeed, Burdsey found football to be ‘hugely popular amongst, and played by large numbers of, British Asians throughout the country’ (Burdsey, 2007: 143) and noted that through football ‘young British Asians are asserting their right to celebrate both their ‘sameness’ and their ‘difference’ to the game’s dominant sub-cultures and identities’ (Burdsey, 2007: 153). Similarly, many of the Asian respondents from Bury play football, typical of those who did being Mohammed when he said that ‘my [Asian] friends and I go to the Sports Centre a lot and play football’. Several of the Asians interviewed spoke of mixed ethnicities being involved when they play football, evidencing their ‘sameness’. On the other hand, ‘difference’ was evidenced by the fact that while they play football and follow the game on television support for their ‘local’ club (Bury FC) was almost non-existent.

Another Bury FC employee, Patricia Keppie also explicitly identified ‘cultural influences from different sports’. Outlining how this idea can manifest itself Johal (2001: 163) spoke about how he believes indigenous white communities in England view football and the involvement of South Asians:
Football is an English sport that these shores ‘gave’ to the rest of the world. It is seen as part of the nation’s fabric. For foreign groups entering this country it is wrongly assumed that the game has to be an acquired passion not a naturalised hereditary legacy, thus falsely asserting a controlling distance between non-indigenous British groups and football. This quasi-rationale is then used to place South Asians below the indigenous white community in terms of footballing accumulation.

This process may be linked to the thoughts of Barlow, detailed above, when he cited lack of tradition as an explanation for minority ethnic people’s rejection of spectatorship at Bury FC. Barlow claimed that this results in ethnic minorities choosing a team to follow rather than following a family history with a club.

Barlow’s idea of ‘tradition’ or as Johal (2001) terms it ‘naturalised hereditary legacy’ can effect how people identify with a place and as, Gaffney and Bale (2004: 26) state, ‘People are attracted and repelled by certain spaces and places for a myriad of reasons’. Relative to football stadiums a sense of belonging may be fostered due to the sense of shared purpose, historical process, and cultural belonging (Gaffney and Bale, 2004: 35). Vertinsky (2004: 9) maintains that places are made through power relations, which ‘mark belonging and exclusion – who belongs to a place and who may be excluded.’ Counter arguments do exist to these ideas, but following this hypothesis it is evident how a football stadium in England, historically the preserve of white males, may repel minority ethnic groups. Some evidence of this amongst Asians from Bury has been identified with for example, as noted above, Jahinger speaking of Bury FC being out of bounds to them. In a similar vein Burdsey (2007: 3) has highlighted that at professional level in English football:
there are certain patterns of norms, values and attributes that form a cohesive set of dominant structures, activities, behaviours and networks which reflect and promote the interests of some groups, yet marginalize and discriminate against others.

If this is the case one may contend that a historical, traditional site of sport like Gigg Lane football ground may be a particularly repellent space for the local non-indigenous population and that this would be both difficult and slow to change. Further consideration of this issue is offered below when fear of racism and fear of violence are considered, but at this juncture it is worth noting that one Asian respondent, Rishi, maintained that the Chairman and supporters of Bury FC are BNP (i.e. the far right wing group the British National Party) supporters. If this were true, or perceived to be the case by sections of the local Asian community, for British Asians in Bury the club frequented by such racially affiliated individuals would certainly be one they would expect to discriminate against them and one they would consequently not wish to attend. On the face of it one would think that Rishi’s opinion is a gross exaggeration although it does reveal the strength of the perception amongst some people that football clubs are linked to right wing politics. In turn, this could help explain why Asians in Bury may be resistant to white Sports Development workers entering their community.

As already highlighted both Hall and Piper identified religion as a factor in conscious rejection, and this is one of the ‘additional challenges to overcome’ that Maguire et al (2001) identify for those of Asian Heritage compared to Afro-Caribbeans in relation to football involvement in England. This issue of religion is a point often made by sports personnel to shift the emphasis onto members of minority ethnic groups, by implying it is they who need to change to fit in. It also, falsely, assumes homogeneity
amongst British Asians in terms of religion. In their work Maguire et al (2001) were mainly focussing on the possibility of Asians becoming professional footballers in England. As far as Asian Heritage youngsters playing football was concerned they researched the impact of culture and religion, although the following could just as easily be applied to spectatorship when they pointed out that:

Researchers such as Fleming have suggested that many Asians will only consider engaging in sport after religious and cultural commitments have been fulfilled. Indeed, others argue that it is religious and cultural considerations that influence the perceptions that some, though not all, Asian groups have of sport.

(Maguire et al, 2001: 69)

Thus respondents re-affirmed a persistent popular stereotype aimed at British Asians that religion (especially Islam) is problematic for their involvement in sport (Burdsey, 2007). Bains similarly highlighted how misconceptions about the role of religion and culture in the lives of South Asians have influenced the thinking of scouts, coaches and community officers who make remarks such as, ‘You hear about Asians stopping practice to say their prayers’ and ‘they don’t like open changing rooms, their ethics don’t allow it’ (Bains, 1996: 6). Piper also identified ‘Asian people’s’ religious beliefs as a factor in rejection of football. In particular he suggested that their religion means they are opposed to the sort of socialising (and in particular drinking) that is often associated with football and football supporters. Similar to the above, such thinking is based on the false assumption that all Asians share one religion and that all Asians are equally religiously devout.

Ultimately, the views of Piper and Maguire et al (2001: 71) suggest that cultural factors are seen as more significant by those within the professional game than
amongst the minority ethnic groups who are under represented. Piper provides supporting evidence for the view that ‘professional football can only accommodate you if you change certain aspects of your culture’ (Maguire et al, 2001: 72). Although based on research in cricket a similar process is identified by Carrington and McDonald (2001); who identify ‘cultures of exclusion’ on behalf of clubs ‘which produce a strongly insular, ethnocentric and exclusive sense of identity’. Parallels between cricket and football can therefore be made as far as this perception that it is up to the ‘outsider’ to change to be accommodated is concerned. Burdsey (2007: 148) maintains that it should not be up to the British Asians to adapt to the white ‘mainstream’, and, whilst recognising the slow changing nature of football in England, suggests that integration must be two-way and mutual:

At both amateur and professional levels this would require significant structural and attitudinal change, in order to overcome entrenched institutional barriers.

Fear of Racism, Fear of Violence and Fear of Discrimination: As noted, prior research (Bains and Patel, 1996; Back et al, 2001; Garland and Rowe, 2001; Burdsey, 2006, 2007) suggests that the perception of racism is a barrier to minority ethnic attendance at football. Whilst overt racism inside English football grounds appears to have significantly declined since the 1970s (Garland and Rowe, 1996), this has not led to a concomitant significant rise in spectatorship by black and Asian football supporters. An associated issue that should be acknowledged here, although interviewees did not specifically mention it, is the potential impact of the ‘widespread prejudice’ (Burdsey, 2007a: 620) that is Islamophobia, which impacts in particular on the lives of South Asians (and especially Muslims). In the last decade, in the post
9/11 and 7/7 climates and the aftermath of the 2001 disorders in northern England, Fekete (2004: 22) believes that there has been a rolling back of multiculturalism with ‘outsiders’ increasingly seen as a threat to national homogeneity. Against such a backdrop one may consider (as the work of Millward (2008) and the inaugural ‘Faith Summit’, reported on by Butt (2008), may suggest) whether instances of racism, related to football and aimed at South Asians have increasing in frequency. Also, whether such an increase in racism can in turn elevate South Asian communities feelings of vulnerability is of interest.

As far as Bury FC is concerned respondents who would be directly affected by racism tended, on the face of it, to agree that fear of racism is related to rejection of spectatorship. With, as detailed previously, reports highlighting racist incidents involving Bury fans it is indeed conceivable that members of the minority ethnic community could be deterred from attending Gigg Lane. That being the case it may be argued that fear of racism is a factor in non-attendance, thereby seemingly agreeing with the above work, but countering work by Bains and Johal (1998: 93) who spoke of the promotion of grounds as safe, leisure-orientated environments and how this has led to ‘a decrease in the aversion to football grounds that many Asians possessed’. Specifically, Bury Asians Rishi, Javed, Adnan and Vishal offered support for the claim that fear of racism or fear of violence leads to rejection of live football. Consequently, one may contend that for a young Asian male Gigg Lane is out of bounds and represents a repellent space. This argument is one that Burdsey (2007: 46) spoke of when he stated that racism ‘serves to construct professional football (as an occupational sphere) and the stadium (as a space) as out-of-bounds for British
Asian players and supporters’.

However, the degree to which fear is the main driver behind the sentiments expressed by Asian respondents is questionable. Having considered Weber’s concept of clan charisma Elias (1994), following research work with Scotson, stretched this into the more general concept of group charisma and its counterpart group disgrace. An ‘established’ group’s ‘group charisma’ can affirm their power superiority over an ‘outsider’ group who may in turn internalise the view of themselves which the ‘established’ have formed (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994). Hence, the ‘outsiders’ may internalise their own ‘group disgrace’ and, as in the case of these Asian interviewees, recognise and internalise their own ‘racial otherness’ (Andrews, 1996). This may then become more of a barrier to involvement in football spectatorship than any fear they may have and as a consequence what may be happening is that spectating at football is something that these respondents would simply not think of doing as a leisure pursuit. That being the case, as justification for this these respondents may choose to pick up on a negative aspect of (supposed) behaviour of football supporters by way of an explanation for their behaviour. As evidenced by the aforementioned mixed teams the ‘outsiders’ here (Asians in Bury) do not simply accept the group charisma of the ‘established’ and instead could be said to be developing their own ‘we-image’ and denying the one imposed by the established. Therefore, football spectatorship may be rejected through a consciousness of being an outsider / racial other, but fear may be cited as a justification for this behaviour as a way of legitimising their ‘deviant’ or different behaviour.
Cost of Attending Games: Another factor that Asian respondents argued is behind their rejection of spectatorship was the cost of attending games. Ultimately, any significance attributable to this factor was found to be limited.

Zesh spoke of the prohibitive cost of attending live Bury home games and how it was ‘Cheaper to watch [Manchester] United [on television]’. However what appeared to be more significant than the cost of tickets was the degree of interest in attending live games (Garland and Rowe, 1996; Malcolm et al, 1999). Amongst Asian interviewees such interest, in relation to Bury FC, was found to be lacking. Considering the potential effect of Bury FC giving away 20 free tickets to the Asians he plays football with Jahinger maintained that ‘yes I think 20 would try it and some might think about going again, although for most it would be a one off’. Ultimately, therefore, what Jahinger is suggesting is that while his Asian peers are interested enough in football to play for the majority being spectators at Bury FC is low on their list of priorities.

Cricket is More Popular than Football: Despite being stated as a factor, by some Asian respondents, ultimately which sport is most popular amongst minority ethnic groups did not appear to be key to rejection of spectatorship. Support amongst British Asians for cricket teams representing Pakistan, India and Bangladesh has been well documented (Garland and Rowe, 2001). Amongst respondents here Ikram felt that rejection of football spectatorship was due to the fact that minority ethnic groups are ‘not so interested in football, they like cricket more and football is not as famous in Pakistan and India as cricket’. However, countering this, when the issue was discussed further with Manjote and Jahinger this concept of cricket being more popular than
football was contested. Manjote maintained in relation to British Asians and sport that ‘football is the biggest interest, bigger than cricket’ whilst Jahinger simply stated that in his opinion for British Asians in Bury ‘football is more popular than cricket’.

Interest amongst British Asians in both cricket and football has been identified previously (Anwar, 1998; Burdsey, 2006) and such interest was similarly identified amongst Asian respondents in Bury. However, what is more important for the research here is not which sport garners the biggest support amongst British Asians, but how sport is used to ‘affirm and display’ their ‘cultural and sporting identities’ (Garland and Rowe, 2001: 112). As Burdsey (2007: 81) has highlighted, with reference to Lady Amos proposing the “boxing test” to replace Tebbit’s “cricket test” (White, 2004)8:

the diverse sporting allegiances of young British Asians enable them on the one hand to preserve or engage with the cultures and traditions of the subcontinent, and on the other to emphasize the permanency of South Asian settlement in Britain and the status of South Asians as British citizens.

National Identities: From this issue relating to cricket and football’s popularity discussion of national identities (which can be linked to the subsequent section about sense of identity) arose. Emerging from this was evidence of Asian respondents range of sporting allegiances and, further evidence, for how these form part of their complex identities as well as being a site for the emergence of new identities.

Manjote maintained that the British Asians he knows would attend, or would be interested in attending, if the national cricket teams of India or Pakistan played locally. For British Asians, he suggested ‘cricket is the national sport’. This contrasted to the position as far as international football is concerned. When interviews where
conducted, just after the 2006 World Cup Finals, Manjote said he supported England and his Asian friends mainly supported England or Brazil, although Argentina and Holland also garnered some support. Similarly, Jahinger said he had supported England during these Finals although some of his peers wanted Brazil to win.

In relation to these patterns of support Manjote did not feel that they were in any way contradictory. He said that if England played Pakistan at football he would support England, despite the fact that, he thought, ‘most of my [Asian] friends would support Pakistan’. Similarly, Jahinger said if England played Pakistan at football he would support England, although in his case this was simply ‘because they [England] would win’. If England played Pakistan at cricket Manjote said he would still support England, but that he would certainly be in the minority, as he would expect the majority of his friends to support Pakistan. Jahinger, on the other hand, when it came to cricket, admitted that he would support Pakistan, as his family would expect him to.

This contrast between being ‘bound’ to want to watch cricket compared with the degree of support for England’s national football team being mixed to bordering on indifferent illustrates a difference in interest and identity. Also what emerged from these Asian respondents was a diversity of sporting allegiances, including the range of support for national football sides. Those who did express support for England may, as Burdsey (2006: 24) would maintain, be using their support as a symbol to celebrate their British citizenship. In terms of the diverse sporting allegiances in evidence amongst these young British Asians these also align well with the findings of Burdsey (2007: 81), noted previously, by supporting the concepts that identity can be multiple and complex
and that football can be a site for the construction and emergence of new identities.

**Support Other Clubs:** Bury FC are not one of the giants of the English game and with the likes of Manchester United in close proximity it is somewhat inevitable that Bury will lose some members of the local community to their ‘bigger’ neighbours. What is more relevant here than this seemingly common sense argument is what this says about the civic identity of the members of this minority ethnic group. As far as attending Bury games is concerned Manjote emphasised that the British Asians he knows are not interested and tend to follow on television, as opposed to live, big games or events (such as those Manchester United play and the World Cup). As detailed previously other Asian respondents made similar arguments and one can align this with a lack of identification or sense of belonging with the area they live in.

Should this process of losing fans to bigger clubs prevail it would be easy for young Asians in Bury to turn to and support the more successful big club, or clubs in the neighbouring city especially with, for example, so many Manchester United games available to view live on television or via computer. Anyone can choose to follow a big club rather than a less successful local side, but for members of comparatively newly established or ‘outsider’ communities (Elias and Scotson, 1994) the civic identity, that would give them a sense of belonging with the area they live in, could be missing making them more prone to doing so. Alluding to this, with reference to the Football Club and the town, Manjote stated that as far as his Asian peers from Bury are concerned ‘as I say Asians are not into [the] small matches Bury play or even Bury itself’. Indeed, overall, evidence of strength of identification and belonging with Bury,
and in turn Bury Football Club, amongst these respondents was limited.

Such lack of identification with Bury F.C. and more generally Bury itself is likely to be detrimental to the cohesion of the community in the town as a whole. In turn such findings open up a debate as to whether a degree of evidence of communities living separate, ‘parallel lives’ (Cantle, 2001: 9) has been identified in Bury. The Cantle Report (2001) discovered evidence of communities living this way following investigation into the 2001 disorders that involved Asian communities in northern towns in England. From the work here, on the one hand, with virtually no Asians attending Gigg Lane and Said describing how when he plays football it is exclusively with other Asian friends of his, evidence of such separation may be identified. Such behaviour may also be aligned to a process which Burdsey (2007: 153) calls evidencing ‘difference’ especially in relation to football’s dominant sub-cultures and identities. On the other hand, however, evidence that any such separation is far from absolute is located in the interviews with Jahinger who spoke of teams being ethnically mixed in terms of the participants when he plays on his local park and with Manjote noting that people from where he lives watched games together during the 2006 World Cup Finals and these groups were not comprised exclusively of Asian people. That being the case one can suggests that evidence of ‘sameness’ has also been identified (Burdsey, 2007: 153).

Related to support for other teams one can also consider how a sense of space and place may have a part to play. Bury’s Gigg Lane ground is an old historical football ground that is predominantly a ‘white space’ (Long et al, 1997: 21) and, as highlighted
previously, a repellent place for members of the local non-indigenous population. This may be relevant when comparing Gigg Lane with, for example, the seemingly more welcoming ‘multi-functional business facility’ that is the rebuilt Old Trafford football ground, home of Manchester United (Gaffney and Bale, 2004: 27).

Exciting Significance / Sense of Identity: In Chapter 2 Maguire’s (1991b: 28) refinement of work by Elias and Dunning (1986), and in particular the idea that ‘sport involves the quest for exciting significance’ was considered. This framework was then linked to football and how a black or Asian male may play the game because they have a ‘quest for excitement’, but not attend live games because they cannot identify with or do not feel a sense of belonging to a given team (i.e. the ‘exciting significance’ is missing). As indicated previously, there was clear evidence of both a lack of identification and sense of belonging with the area they live in amongst Asian respondents from Bury. Manjote, as above, spoke of this and, in a similar vein, with reference to his desire to leave Bury and lack of identification with the town Jahinger said:

I’m at College part time and work here [on the market] with my family as well. I’ve applied for Uni’ and really hope I get my grades and get in so I can move away from here to a bigger City with more things to do [and] more going on.

One can see therefore how connection to a team that represents the local area is not necessarily going to be strong, as evidenced in the quotes above and the degree of support for other teams. In turn this will detrimentally affect the likelihood of these Asian respondents attending the games played by the local team. Providing further detail in this regard Jahinger spoke of two of his peers who wear Bury shirts to play football in and profess to support them, but that they do not go to watch them play.
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live. He added that these individuals’ are in the minority since most of the Asians he knows support the likes of Manchester United, Liverpool or Real Madrid that they watch on television.

As well as the Asian respondents those who consult with the general public also provided evidence relative to these processes. Piper, for example, claimed that Asians in Bury do not know much about Bury FC, which if true would be a manifestation of a lack of identity with the club. In more general terms, Boulton spoke of a lack of support for sport spectatorship within minority ethnic groups. Tunstall argued that attendance at football matches is not prioritised by Elders or Faith Leaders of minority ethnic groups in Bury, whilst Philp maintained that desire for inclusion in football at grassroots level amongst members of Asian communities in the borough is inconsistent. These opinions allied with those of the Asian respondents mean that a degree of disconnection with Bury FC amongst local Asians has been identified. This research, consequently, offers support for Maguire’s (1991b: 32) work into ‘exciting significance’ and how it effects sports participation and spectator patterns.
Overview

A brief overview of themes to have emerged from the Bury case study shall now be provided by way of a lead in to the concluding chapter. In that chapter the two case studies will be compared and contrasted, which will see these themes revisited and looked at in more depth relative to the theories that have guided the research.

The question this research has aimed to answer was whether members of minority ethnic groups consciously reject spectatorship at association football matches in England (Waddington et al, 1999); that is to say, whether a frustrated demand lay behind the absence of minority ethnic groups at football matches. As far as Bury, and Bury FC, is concerned overall there was agreement that rejection of spectatorship amongst minority ethnic group members is occurring. To what degree this rejection was conscious or not will be considered in due course.

Waddington et al (1999) suggested that rejection of spectatorship could be due to rejection of football as a leisure pursuit. Data showed that (albeit via television / computer) football matches are not rejected as a leisure pursuit, but that such rejection, supporting Waddington et al’s argument, is apparent as far as watching ‘local’ club (Bury FC) play live is concerned. Hence, football is not rejected, but there was a clear rejection of ‘live’ spectatorship amongst Asian interviewees. With a lack of interest and identification in Bury FC, and the town of Bury, evident amongst Asians interviewees this is not surprising. Such findings also support Maguire’s (1991b: 32) concept of ‘exciting significance’ being a key factor in the popularity of watching sport. This lack of interest and identification with Bury was also
investigated in relation to whether the white and Asian communities in the town are living separate ‘parallel lives’ (Cantle, 2001: 9). Ultimately, some evidence to support this process was found, but other data refuted it leading one to a similar conclusion to Burdsey (2007: 151-153) when he argued that British Asians possess hybrid identities and that through football these can evidence ‘sameness’ or ‘difference’.

As far as this research itself is concerned it is a valid topic especially when one considers that Birrell (1999) identified absences in sport as an area requiring further study. This has taken place in Bury with in depth analysis of why the absent Asian ‘outsiders’ are indeed absent (Elias, 1994). Having reviewed factors for their absence, above, it is evident that the ‘established’ white community continue to retain control of Bury FC. This absence was evident despite Gigg Lane being in close proximity to where many of these interviewees live. In other words, the ground as a place is local, but these Asian respondents did not identify with or view it as part of their community, since it is viewed as a ‘white space’ (Gaffney and Bale, 2004).

Views of the Asians interviewed suggest, on the face of it, that fear of racism is still a factor in non-attendance at live games. The associated ‘widespread prejudice’ (Burdsey, 2007a: 620) Islamophobia was not specifically mentioned by respondents, but is also investigated here. With incidents over the last decade seeing South Asians (and especially Muslims) increasingly labelled as a threat to national homogeneity (Fekete, 2004) Islamophobia could be said to have become more prevalent. A knock on effect of this may be an increase in South Asian communities feelings of
vulnerability, which in turn could be reflected in attitudes towards attendance at live football games making this an issue that should be acknowledged. Returning specifically to the data, however, and the fear of racism detailed it was of noticeable that several Asian respondents spoke of teams being ‘mixed’ (made up of various ethnicities) when they play football, suggesting that they do not fear all white people all of the time. That being the case one can look at what is behind this, with one concept being related to group charisma and group disgrace, ideas that Elias (1994) modified when arguing that ‘outsiders’ do not tend to recognise the negative characteristics of more powerful ‘established’ groups. Hence, recognition of their own ‘racial otherness’ (Andrews, 1996) may be more of a barrier than fear and football spectatorship, something simply incompatible with their broader self-image. In turn, as justification for non-attendance the (supposed) behaviour of football spectators may be invoked.

Lack of role models and cultural differences, are often given as factors for rejection of spectatorship by Asian minority ethnic groups and these reasons were mentioned by those who work for the establishment. Amongst the 20 Asian interviewees these factors were never independently mentioned leaving their validity compromised.

In terms of identity a degree of prior work has considered Asian minority ethnic groups’ sense of identity. Specific to football, Bains (2005) and Burdsey (2006, 2007) found evidence of support amongst British Asians for the England national team. A degree of such support was evident amongst the Asian respondents from Bury although as Burdsey (2007) notes this does not mean that British Asians have
unconditionally embraced ‘Englishness’. Indeed speaking to some of the Asians in Bury about this it became clear that, England tend to be supported because it is where they live and they are a ‘good’ team who can be followed in big events (e.g. The World Cup). As noted such support was not universal and some of this group stated that they would follow another country, such as Brazil. In other words as far as the identity of the Asian respondents from Bury was concerned they tended to have complex identities that could change depending on the situation or sport being discussed, meaning for many of them their identities are fluid and still forming / potentially changing over time. With that being the case on a local level it is perhaps more appealing to follow a global phenomena such as Manchester United rather than support the ‘local’ professional club which rarely wins trophies, gets limited media attention, has a predominantly white fan base and who represent a town with whom they have a limited sense of identification.
Chapter 5: The City of Liverpool / Everton Football Club Case Study

Introduction

Initially this chapter will provide a brief overview of the City of Liverpool, including detail of its population breakdown. This case study focuses on the interrelationship between association football (in particular Everton Football Club) and the wider social contexts in which it is organised, watched and played (Dunning, 1999). As the first step of meeting that aim, following the overview of the City of Liverpool, detail will be provided specific to Everton Football Club to locate it within the professional football structure in England. In addition, a review of the black and Asian players to have featured for Everton FC and an overview of racist instances involving the club’s fans will be provided.

As noted previously, prior research, has found considerable under representation of minority ethnic group members at football matches in England (Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 2001). Using visual crowd surveys the crowd demographics at a two of Everton Football Club’s home games were observed and following these surveys it appeared, as detailed below, that this pattern was replicated at Goodison Park.

Such under representation is not thought to be due to feelings of indifference towards football on behalf of male members of minority ethnic groups (Maguire, 1988; Verma et al, 1991; Waddington et al, 1999; Garland and Rowe, 1996, 2001) although what it is due to has not yet been discovered. Having conducted interviews with: (i) people in positions of authority who consult with the general public in Liverpool and whose work is related to racism in football and (ii) black members of the minority ethnic community in
Liverpool, the degree of interest in football was ascertained. Findings from these interviews are provided as one moves towards ascertaining what is behind rejection of spectatorship at Everton FC.

A discussion section then follows that theorises, with reference to prior sociological theory, the themes to have emerged from the findings. This sees themes such as fear of racism and fear of violence considered with reference to the sociological concepts identified previously, those being: the established outsider relation’s model (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994), space and place (Gaffney and Bale, 2004) and sense of identity (Burdsey, 2007). This aids understanding of the data enabling a brief overview of findings to be produced as this piece of work moves towards its conclusion and subsequent comparison of the two case studies.

As far as this case study is concerned the overview highlights, for example, that there was widespread agreement that, as far as Everton FC is concerned, conscious rejection of spectatorship amongst minority ethnic group members is occurring. This rejection, data from black respondents suggests, is not necessarily due to rejection of football as a leisure pursuit. Consequently, other factors behind such rejection are identified. Following on from that it is suggested that further reflection is necessary into notions of ‘outsider’ and ‘established’ communities and also into whether the minority ethnic group central to this case study internalise their group disgrace (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994). In conjunction with the above this process will consider the identities and sense of belonging pinpointed amongst these black respondents.
About Liverpool

The City of Liverpool is, based on figures for population size from the 2001 census, England’s sixth biggest city (www.statistics.gov.uk). In its formative years Liverpool was a small fishing village. Over the course of the last eight hundred years (2007 was the eight hundredth anniversary of the city’s founding charter) Liverpool has developed international trading links (www.liverpool2007.org.uk). Presently the city’s predominant industry is tourism based around, for example, its architecture, football, literature and music. The City of Liverpool also houses three Universities, which as well as attracting students to the city provide numerous jobs.

At the time of the 2001 national Census Liverpool Local Authority had 439,473 inhabitants most of whom were born in the United Kingdom (95.27 per cent being born in the United Kingdom, 92.79 per cent of the population of Liverpool being born in England) (www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination). Of the respondents to this census, 94.32 per cent of people in Liverpool (414,526 people) identified themselves as being white and 5.68 per cent (24,947 people) as part of a minority ethnic group. Of this minority ethnic group, 1.22 per cent identified themselves as Black or Black British (5,377 people\(^1\)) and 1.03 per cent of the Mixed Ethnic Group identified themselves as Mixed, White and Black (4,515 people\(^2\)). Combining the statistics for the Black sections of the community show that they make up 2.25 per cent of the population of Liverpool Local Authority.

Comparing the findings of the 2001 Census with those from the previous Census, in 1991, show that over this ten year period the total population of Liverpool fell by 2.87
per cent (in 1991 Liverpool had 452,450 inhabitants, 12,977 more than in 2001).

Whilst there had been a decline in total population during this ten year period the
minority ethnic population in Liverpool had grown, compared to 1991 when 96.2 per
cent (435,404 people) identified themselves as being white and 3.8 per cent (17,046
people) as part of a minority ethnic group. These figures indicate that between 1991
and 2001, despite a fall in the city’s population overall, the minority ethnic
community in Liverpool increased in percentage terms and in terms of actual numbers
of people. With a minority ethnic population of this size if one uses Bradbury’s
(2001) categorisation, Liverpool had, in 2001 (with 5.68 per cent), a ‘significant’
minority ethnic population.

Liverpool became Europe’s dominant slave port from 1760 onwards. Indeed, the
slave trade, which Liverpool was involved in from 1700 until the abolition of slavery
in 1807, made Liverpool a prosperous city. Consequently, Liverpool has a black
community that is in the main, although not exclusively, (see also Research Methods
Chapter) long established, continuous and relatively stable. Despite, being long
established the black community have not been always found Liverpool welcoming,
as the statement below indicates:

Slavery, racism and Liverpool seem for many to ring together. The past record does not shine favourably on the city. Racist practices are still manifestly evident. The city's black population is largely confined to a ghetto area in the South of the city, known by most as Toxteth. Centuries of racial discrimination and prejudice are deeply ingrained.

www.liverpool2007.org.uk/history/ethnichistory/blackhistory/slavery/slavery.htm
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Everton Football Club

In 1878 St Domingo’s FC was formed by an English Methodist congregation called New Connexion. St Domingo’s quickly became established and with interest in the team growing, in November 1879, it changed its name to Everton Football Club (Corbett, 2003). Everton, one of the leading clubs in England around this time, turned professional in 1885 in the hope of producing higher income and becoming more successful. Subsequently, when the Football League was formed in 1888 Everton FC became one of its 12 founder members.

During the 1890-1891 season Everton won the Division One Championship for the first time. At the time Everton’s home ground was Anfield, but following a disagreement over a rent increase Everton’s committee moved the club. Mere Green Field, a piece of land on the north side of Stanley Park, was leased and turned into ‘the country’s first purpose built football stadium’ that they called Goodison Park⁴ (www.evertonfc.com/history/everton-the-beginning, 1878 – 1930, p3). Everton continue to play at Goodison Park to this day.

During the period from the formation of the Football League until the outbreak of World War I Everton were considered to be one of England’s ‘big clubs’ (www.toffeeweb.com/history/concise/1888-1914.asp, p 4). Everton have had downturns in their team’s fortunes (for example, they have been relegated twice spending season 1930-1931 and 1951-1952 to 1953-1954 in Division Two). Since returning to Division One for season 1954-1955 Everton have remained in the top division in England. In terms of honours won, with nine First Division Championships and
five FA Cups, Everton are the fourth most successful club side of all time in England.

After winning the 1984 FA Cup Everton won the First Division Championship and Cup Winners Cup in 1984-1985. As Champions Everton were due to play in the European Cup the following season, but after the Heysel Tragedy involving Liverpool fans at the 1985 European Cup Final English clubs were banned from European competition (for 7 years). After missing out in 1985-1986 in 1986-1987 Everton won the Championship for the ninth time. Despite that Everton suffered more than most due to the European ban and since then, as the clubs website states, ‘things have not gone quite so well for Everton’ (www.evertonfc.com/history/kendall-s-heroes.html, p2).

In 1995 Everton won the FA Cup, for the fifth time, but in the years since winning the 1987 Championship have never been close to winning Division One or its successor, The Premiership. In fact, on a couple of occasions, 1994-1995 and 1997-1998, Everton narrowly avoided relegation. The European ban was not the only factor in Everton falling out of the select group of ‘big’ clubs in England (currently considered to consist of; Manchester United, Chelsea, Arsenal, Liverpool, and with Manchester City looking set to join this ‘group’). Another factor was Sir John Moores’ demise. His death saw Everton start to suffer financial problems, at just the wrong time, as the Premier League was born (1992-1993). Everton were no longer the ‘Mersey Millionaires’ (Corbett, 2003) of old, once Moores passed away (Autumn 1993) and, on top of rising debt, crowds were falling and money to sign players was restricted.

In June 1994, Peter Johnson became Everton Chairman. During part of his reign it
seemed as though he was investing in the team, but it emerged during 1998-1999, that ‘Instead of coming from Johnson’s pocket, the £20M spent on new players had been drawn straight from the club’s overdraft’ (www.toffeeweb.com/History/Concise/1997-2002.asp, p3). With Everton deep in debt, Johnson relinquished control and in early 2000 was replaced by the True Blue Holdings consortium headed by ‘lifelong Evertonian’ Bill Kenwright (www.evertonfc.com/history/kendall-s-heroes.html). Kenwright appointed David Moyes as manager of Everton in March 2002. Moyes is still in charge and has, considering the (by Premiership standards) financial restrictions placed on him, performed well. So far, under his leadership Everton have finished in the top five three times (2004-2005, 4th; 2007-2008, 5th; 2008-2009, 5th) and reached the 2009 FA Cup Final (losing 2-1 to Chelsea).

With Paul Gregg’s financial backing, Kenwright’s consortium, like Johnson before them, had plans for a new stadium for Everton FC on banks of the Mersey at the Kings Dock site. Ultimately, nothing came of this and during season 2006-2007 Gregg sold his stake in Everton and a new investor, Robert Earl, a ‘US based millionaire’ became a ‘major Everton shareholder’ (www.evertonfc.com/news.archive). Earl’s arrival was not akin to the takeovers of several Premiership clubs around this time (for example, the takeover of Aston Villa by Randy Lerner). Money for players, in Premiership terms, continues to be limited and talk of a new stadium was recently, until this idea also fell through, of relocating to a new stadium in Kirby (Knowsley, outside the City of Liverpool). Nevertheless, Everton are a very different club from Bury FC, being: more glamorous, (almost) always in England’s top league and still able to buy multi-million pound players.
Everton Football Club’s black and Asian players

Anglo-Chinese player ‘Frank’ Soo played for Everton, 16th May 1942, in the War League (during World War Two). However, the first player of colour to play for Everton in a competitive match was on January 1st 1966 when black player Mike Trebilcock, described by some as the ‘coffee-coloured Cornishman’ (Hill, 2001: 116), made his debut. After Trebilcock the next player of colour to feature in Everton’s first team was Cliff Marshall whose debut was on January 11th 1975. Marshall was not the only professional player of colour in England at this time, but as one source states, he was part of a profession ‘which could not be described as in any way multi-cultural’ and one in which players of colour were not ‘given much in the way of a warm welcome by some of their fellow professionals’ (www.le.ac.uk/footballresearch/resources/factsheets/fs4.html).

Following Marshall’s last senior match, 30th August 1975, it was 19 years before another black player (or player of colour of any description) appeared for Everton’s first team in a competitive fixture. This occurred on September 10th 1994 when Nigerian born Daniel Amokachi played for Everton. Due to this gap accusations of institutional racism were aimed at Everton FC. Indeed of Amokachi’s arrival Corbett states:

Everton had been without a black player since the days of Cliff Marshall in the mid-1970s and had at times attracted gibes that the club was institutionally racist. Despite the best efforts of anti-racism campaigns by the club, the local newspapers and fanzines, it was an image they had found hard to shift until Amokachi’s signing.

(Corbett, 2003: 320)

Whether Everton FC was or was not institutionally racist between Marshall being
released and Amokachi signing would be difficult to prove, but as Vasili (2000, 191) indicates what is certain is that the employment practices used by the club during this period ‘led them in the opposite direction to demographic trends in and out of football’. In addition, during this gap, Howard Kendall resigned in December 1993 ‘after the [Everton] board refused to back his purchase of [black] striker Dion Dublin’ (Powter, 2002). This may be coincidental, but instances of this nature added to accusations that Everton was institutionally racist.

Following Amokachi, Everton have employed a number of players of colour. Indeed, Amokachi is fourth on a list that stretched to thirty-four players of colour who have played for Everton’s first team up to the end of 2009. With such developments in relation to Everton’s playing staff, combined with other initiatives (see Research Methods Chapter), accusations of institutional racism aimed at Everton FC have reduced, although the situation with the club’s supporters does not necessarily mirror this state of affairs.

Anecdotal evidence of racism amongst Everton fans going back to the sixties can be found in the comments of Hill (2001). He details how in 1964 when Leeds United played Everton at Goodison Park the home fans racially abused Leeds’ black South African, winger Albert Johanneson. Such racism was seemingly not confined to opposition players as when Trebilcock featured in Everton’s first team Hill (2001, 116) reports that Everton fans, sometimes, sang ‘We’ve got the best nigger in the land’. While Everton, briefly, had Trebilcock Liverpool had no black players and Hill contends that this was reflected in the make up of the crowd at both clubs, around that
time, ‘There weren’t many [black supporters] in the crowd, fewer even than at most
League clubs’ (Hill, 2001: 116). In addition, referring to the treatment of Trebilcock
he feels that ‘It expressed an attitude which sent a clear message to the black citizens
of Liverpool 8 “Keep Out”’ (Hill, 2001: 117). Similar anecdotal evidence of racism
from Everton fans during the 1970s and 1980s has been reported7 (Hill, 2001;
Nicholls, 2002), with the racist abuse Everton fans aimed at John Barnes, 28th October
1987, being particularly well documented.8

This racist abuse, directed at Barnes on this occasion, was particularly extreme
although seemingly not repeated as vehemently since. That is not to say that incidents
(involving Everton fans and racism or racist acts) have not occurred since.
Chronicling these is unnecessary although one source has claimed that ‘the right-wing
tendencies of a minority of Everton’s following have been remarked on for years’
(Tallentine, 2001: 15).

When racist incidents have occurred in recent times they have invariably brought
condemnation from Everton FC. Talking of this issue, in the club’s official
programme, Everton’s Deputy Chairman Bill Kenwright (2002, 9) said that ‘Over the
past decade or so, everyone here at Everton has laboured tirelessly and with collective
purpose to eradicate the evil of racism – I do believe that those efforts have been met
with tangible success.’ Kenwright (2002, 9) also re-iterated the club’s support for the
“Kick It Out” campaign and their desire to win the ‘prolonged war’ against racism.
Whether the ‘tangible success’ Kenwright spoke of has occurred or not is hard to
quantify, although what is certain is that while the club themselves may have seen
accusations of institutional racism diminish, the club’s supporters continue to be associated with racist acts. A recent example of this saw Everton fans accused of racist abuse at a pre-season match, in the build up to season 2006-2007.\textsuperscript{9} One of the Everton supporting black interviewees spoken to detailed having ‘heard [white] people shouting racial abuse when I was at Bury train station before a pre-season game at Bury FC’ (Luke). Such anecdotal evidence increases the likelihood of racist abuse from Everton fans at / in connection to this game. Regardless of whether it did occur or not speculation of such racist behaviour by Everton fans was sufficient to prompt Everton’s Chief Executive at the time (Keith Wyness) to threaten to withdraw the membership from any members of Everton’s Travel Club who were found to be engaging in or associated with racism.\textsuperscript{10}
Everton Football Club Crowd Demographic / 
Racism on Merseyside / Racist actions of Everton fans

Consideration was given in relation to when to do visual crowd surveys at Goodison Park. Having been brought up supporting Everton (it is in the family and my Dad, who is now deceased, played for Everton up to Reserve level so support for another club was unthinkable) whenever they play one endeavours to attend. Whilst unsure of exactly how many times one has watched Everton play live a measure of my support is that since the start of season 1985-86 (26 season’s) the number of competitive games missed by myself is 2 (1 League game; 27th August 2005 versus Fulham away, and 1 League Cup tie; 9th October 1990 versus Wrexham at home). Specific to home games with 1 competitive game missed in 26 years there was always going to be ample opportunity to conduct crowd surveys at Goodison Park. Ultimately, both games used were played at Goodison during the 2004-2005 season. On the two instances detailed below games were attended ready and prepared to do these surveys.

The visual surveys of the crowd demographics at two of Everton FC’s home games produced the following results. At the Everton versus Manchester United game (19th February 2005) 500 people were observed entering Goodison Park of whom 5 appeared to be from a minority ethnic group. These 5 individuals, from their visual appearance, seemed to consist of 3 Chinese (South East Asian) males, an Asian male and a young black female. This sampling suggests that 1 per cent (5 out of 500) of the crowd at this Everton FC home game where drawn from minority ethnic groups. During this survey of fans entering the Main Stand side of Goodison Park no black males were observed.
At the Everton versus Blackburn Rovers game (6th March 2005) 500 fans were again observed entering Goodison Park. On this occasion, the visual inspection suggested that 4 individuals could be considered to be from a minority ethnic group. This consisted of 2 black males (one of whom looked to be a ‘junior’ i.e. under 18 years of age) an Asian male and a Chinese male. This time the sampling suggests that 0.8 per cent of the crowd (4 out of 500) at this Everton FC home game were drawn from minority ethnic groups.

These survey findings help to confirm the under representation compared to the overall make up of Liverpool Local Authority, of members of minority ethnic groups at Everton FC’s home matches. Similar to those conducted at Bury FC these surveys support the prior research in this area (Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 1999; Bradbury, 2001). The findings also appear to confirm the anecdotal thoughts of Nicholls (2001, 154) who claimed that ‘you will still find it hard to spot a black face in the crowd at Goodison. Maybe it’s coincidence or maybe we still have the reputation that prevents black people watching Everton.’

At this juncture it is appropriate to pause to consider what evidence there is of racist harassment and abuse in the City of Liverpool (where Everton are based) and any evidence of the same specific to Everton FC. The City of Liverpool falls under the jurisdiction of Merseyside Police. The Ministry of Justice’s statistics, for 2009, in relation to racist crimes indicate that Merseyside (during 2007-08) recorded 1,458 racist incidents (a decrease on 2006-07, when 1,800 were recorded, meaning figures had returned to 2005-06 levels when 1,455 were recorded). Police forces are not
all of equal size and do not govern areas of equal size. Forces, also, do not record crimes in the same way or devote equal resources to particular crimes, but it is nevertheless noticeable that with 1,458 Merseyside recorded the 10th highest figure for such offences across the 43 police forces in England and Wales.

As noted previously (Chapter 4) these statistics need to be put into context in relation to how many racially motivated incidents actually occur and how many are recorded / reported to the police. Also one should remember that, while they make up the vast majority of incidents, it is not exclusively members of the BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) population against whom racially motivated crimes are committed (see Chapter 4: Jansson et al, 2007).

Having looked specifically at racist incident statistics relative to Merseyside between 2003-04 and 2006-07 (therefore covering the period when the above crowd surveys were conducted) one source (Coleman & Hancock, 2009: 3) noted how ‘“racist incidents” almost doubled’. In addition, they point to the fact that ‘in 2005-06, black and minority ethnic groups were three times more likely to be stopped and searched, than white groups’ (Coleman & Hancock, 2009: 3). Having considered these two sets of statistics they argue that they may effect the impression of the police force held by minority ethnic communities in Liverpool:

Academic studies and evidence from community-based campaigning groups have consistently demonstrated that the combination of under-policing (of racist and violent harassment) and over-policing (the use of stop and search powers, for example) seriously undermines community ‘confidence’.

(Coleman & Hancock, 2009: 3)
Ultimately, the prevalence of recorded racist crimes/incidents and the low level of confidence in the police amongst members of minority ethnic communities will both effect, and should be seen in light of, the number of racist incidents in and around the football ground itself and in relation to Everton fans.

Specific to football the Home Office compile statistics on football-related arrests and banning orders. One of the categories they gather statistics in relation to is arrests’ for racist chanting. What is noticeable in relation to these statistics, for season 2008-09, is that across the 20 Premier League clubs (for all competitions they played in that season, domestic and European) the number of arrests for racist chanting was 20 (Home Office, 2009). Further, over half of the Premier League clubs (including Everton) had 0 arrests for racist chanting amongst their own fans during that season. Reduction of such overt racism has been evidenced and discussed previously (Chapter 2), although it would be false to assume that it has disappeared altogether (as detailed below).

Already in this chapter (and the notes relating to it) the racist abuse of John Barnes by Everton fans has been highlighted, as have other racist incidents from the 1970s and 1980s. As an Everton fan of long standing who was in attendance, and in the Everton section of the Anfield Road End at Anfield, when Barnes was abused on the evening of October 28th 1987 my perspective and recollection of the match that night is that the racist abuse was perpetrated by, as Hill (2001, 183) reports, a ‘substantial section’ of Everton fans, and not just a ‘lunatic fringe’ (Hill, 2001: 189). Furthermore, although recalling specific instances and dates is beyond me, one’s memory of going
to Everton games in the 1970’s and 1980’s is that casual racism, especially racial abuse from quite large sections of the crowd, was fairly commonplace. Specifically, in this regard, the instance noted previously relating to Manchester City goalkeeper Alex Williams is not one witnessed by myself, although one does have a recollection of John Barnes being racially abused subsequently by Everton fans.¹¹

I have also seen and heard more recent racist incidents perpetrated by Everton fans. Amongst these one can recall an Everton fan running on the pitch to try and attack black striker Daniel Amokachi (August 1994) when he was paraded as the club’s new signing.¹² Everton fans also racially abused Leicester City player Muzzy Izzet (8th April 2000, although my recollection of this was that it involved a very small group of people) and shouted racist abuse, again which one heard at the time, at Fulham players / fans (8th December 2001).¹³

Just prior to these last two incidents research by Sean Perkins of the Sir Norman Chester centre for football research at Leicester University concentrated on season 1998-99 and asked fans if they had witnessed racism aimed at players during that season. This survey was conducted with 33,000 fans whose responses were used to rank offenders teams. Everton topped their ‘league of shame’ with 38% of those surveyed having heard racist abuse from the club’s fans (found in Brown & Chaudhary, 2000). This research also argued that overall racist abuse of players did not appear to have diminished, but was changing. Specifically, the research argued that overt abuse such as throwing bananas on to the pitch and group chanting of abuse was now rare, with most examples at this time involving ‘individual bigots’ (Perkins, 226).
found in Brown & Chaudhary, 2000). This trend towards individuals, or from my perspective and recollection one would say individuals or small groups, being involved in racist abuse rather than large groups does seem to have occurred, and what is behind the change is of interest.

In this regard, as noted previously (Chapter 2), anti-racist campaigns such as Kick It Out may have raised awareness, but otherwise the evidence suggests that their impact has been relatively superficial and ineffective. That being the case one may speculate whether the widespread introduction of all-seated stadiums, post Hillsborough and the subsequent Taylor report, have combined with the increased use of CCTV (closed-circuit television) in most major grounds, and the broadening of the scope of legislation (such as the amendment to the Football (Offences) Act in 1999) to reduce racism in stadiums (Garland and Rowe, 2001). In conjunction with undercover activity (for example, using ‘professional witnesses’) and confidential telephone ‘hotlines’ it would appear that an impact has been made (Garland and Rowe, 2001: 100), although it has been suggested that these measures are just displacing the racism away from stadiums into other fields (for example, the streets or town centre’s) (Garland and Rowe, 2001: 110). In turn it has been argued that by using such ‘zero tolerance’ techniques racist behaviour may not occur so often within grounds, enabling ‘football clubs and the industries that share a stake in the game’s success to congratulate themselves on their efforts and forget about the problem’ (Garland and Rowe, 2001: 110). Garland and Rowe (2001, 110), however, argue that little is gained from this strategy and that adopting ‘a more fundamental approach to challenging racism on social, political and economic levels is preferable’.
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It is evident therefore that while for season 2008-09 the Home Office noted that no Everton fans were arrested for racist chanting, this does not mean racism amongst Everton fans has been eradicated. As an example to support this, as noted above, is the anecdotal evidence, which strongly suggests that Everton fans were involved in racist abuse around Bury’s ground prior to a pre-season game in the build up to season 2006-07.

Further evidence of racist abuse from Everton fans was also recently witnessed by myself when travelling on a train from Manchester to Horwich Parkway to watch Everton play at Bolton Wanderers (Sunday 13th February 2011, for a Premier League fixture). Several Everton fans, including myself, got on the train at Manchester Piccadilly station, but a lot more boarded at Manchester Oxford Road station. During the short journey, on a train which was now very packed with a few Bolton fans and a lot of Everton fans and a few ‘regular’ passengers, a group of what appeared to be 5 young (approximately 18 years of age) Everton fans ran through a repertoire of songs including singing / shouting ‘trigger, trigger, trigger, shoot’. They did not fill in the last 2 words of this highly racist terrace chat, but to most in the carriage it was well known and the racist inference clear. Indeed, on a personal level, one does not recall hearing this chant since the 1980’s. No one challenged this group (who were stood up drinking cans of lager in the same carriage as myself and a friend) and they repeated this racist chant several times.

Having, with the crowd survey findings detailed above, established that few members of minority ethnic groups, including black males, attend live football games at
Everton interviews were conducted with: (i) People in positions of authority whose work is related to racism in football (and specifically Everton FC) and involves consultation with the general public and (ii) members of the black minority ethnic community in Liverpool (specifically young black males).
Institutional Perceptions on Minority Ethnic Groups and Football Attendance

Findings From Individuals In Positions of Authority

People interviewed who hold positions of some authority and consult with the general public were connected to organisations charged with developing sporting opportunities, including lack of attendance at games by members of minority ethnic groups. Organisations involved in developing such opportunities, at far as Everton FC are concerned, include the club themselves and Football In The Community (see also Research Methods Chapter).

Everton Football Club: Prominent in Everton’s anti-racist initiatives is Race and Diversity Manager Alan Johnson. In addition, Mike Dickinson, Head of Education and Welfare at Everton’s Youth Academy, and Chris Clarke, an Everton Football In The Community Coach, were interviewed.

Johnson told me that he felt that members of minority ethnic groups in Liverpool are interested in sport and in football. Dickinson was of a similar opinion whereas Clarke was unsure whether interest in sport is evident and specific to football his perception was that such groups are not interested. Respondents who thought that interest in football is present were asked to provide evidence to support their opinion. Johnson maintained that maximum take up of match tickets for a free ticketing scheme, aimed at minority ethnic groups, and the positive response and high level of interest in the club’s outreach work indicate interest in football amongst Liverpool’s black community.

In relation to tickets Johnson explained how, through him, Everton give away 60 free to every home game to members of minority ethnic groups and that these tickets are
always fully used. It was discussed whether take up of free tickets and interest in the club’s outreach work are good indicators of interest in subsequently attending live matches, when one has to pay, and of football support overall (distinct from, for example, an interest in playing recreationally in one’s own locality). After due consideration Johnson reiterated his opinion that there is an interest in football, and attending games, amongst members of black minority ethnic groups in Liverpool.

Dickinson insisted that ‘interest in football from black and white people is the same.’ To back this opinion up he referred to figures in relation to the playing staff at Everton’s Academy. During this interview a discussion was had about Liverpool’s black population being between 2 and 3 percent of the City’s total population. With reference to this Dickson implied that there is evidence of numerical equality in terms of the clubs young players. Specifically he noted that of 20 scholars (apprentices) 2 (or 10%) are black, and that amongst the schoolboy players the make up was similar, with around 3% being black.15

Interviewees were asked about conscious rejection of spectatorship at Everton amongst minority ethnic group members. Johnson said, ‘In my opinion, there is no conscious rejection of sport spectatorship at live football matches from black minority ethnic groups’. Dickinson having observed the small numbers of minority ethnic group members at matches said that he was unsure why this might be, but in light of this argued that, ‘yes conscious rejection of spectatorship at live Everton matches is occurring’. Clarke similarly felt that such rejection of spectatorship is occurring.
Alan Johnson argued that schemes targeted at encouraging members of minority ethnic groups to attend Everton games ‘have contributed to a slight increase in their attendance’ and that this increase is a trend that is mirrored nationally.\textsuperscript{16} Despite claiming that conscious rejection of spectatorship is not happening, Johnson agreed that comparatively small numbers of minority ethnic group members attend Everton matches. Nevertheless, he argued that ‘Racism is not deterring members of ethnic minority groups from attending live football matches at Everton’ and that their ‘Non-attendance at live games can be attributed to a number of factors, some social, some economic. It [getting them to attend] is about the Club finding the right balance and creating an atmosphere that is welcoming, accessible and affordable’. Indeed, Johnson was insistent that racism is not a deterrent and also outlined his belief that ‘younger members of the black and Asian communities in Liverpool are not deterred by racism or the threat of potential racism and neither are older members of the black community although they may not attend due to other issues’. Johnson claimed that these ‘other issues’ included financial considerations (often due to their employment status) and family commitments such as helping to look after their children.

Johnson argued that age was important as, in his opinion the average age of black fans that support Everton is about 45 years of age, which is different to Liverpool FC who he believes have a substantial number of young black fans. This is important he maintained since it is older fans that are effected most by the other issues he spoke of when it comes to non-attendance. Hence, Johnson was using this concept to help explain the low level of attendance by members of minority ethnic groups at Everton games. For this, largely speculative, idea of Johnson’s to hold true, it would have to
be shown that these factors - family and financial commitments - disproportionately effected black and minority ethnic supporters.

As far as the image and perception of Everton is concerned Johnson thought there is ‘a need for change because some minority ethnic group members see Everton as a racist club’. Despite the work he and the Club have done Johnson has seen evidence of this perception, based on Everton’s history, being maintained. Making this point Johnson compared Everton FC and Liverpool FC, noting that at Liverpool the influence of John Barnes (and Howard Gayle before him) has seen any racist tag they might have had being eroded years ago. As a consequence he argued that Liverpool FC ‘are not considered racist now or historically’.17 This is helped, he argued, by the fact that Barnes and Gayle continue to do a lot of work in Liverpool and L8 particularly.

When discussing this issue with Dickinson he referred to his work with the young adult black males who attend Everton’s Academy. Focusing on this group, Dickinson argued that racism would not be a factor in non attendance at Everton games because they are totally integrated and ‘Do not have any perception of Everton being a racist club, not in any way, it just would not have occurred to them, unless their parents had passed that idea onto them’. The idea that racism is not an issue for young black males was reiterated by Dickinson, who said that this would only change ‘if skewed ideas [i.e. racist ideology] were passed down to them by their parents’. Clarke, however, was of the opinion that minority ethnic group members do consciously reject spectatorship at live Everton games ‘Because of the racist reception that they have received at live football matches in the past’.
Findings From Black Respondents

Members of Ethnic Minority Groups: During the first set of interviews with 21 young black males in Liverpool some common questions where asked, prior to developing the interviews based on individual respondents responses. Answers to these questions have been grouped (Table 5) to give an overview of the opinion of these young black males.

Table 6: Answers summarised for questions asked to all black males from Liverpool (from initial 21 interviews conducted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Opinion – YES</th>
<th>Opinion – NO</th>
<th>Opinion – UNSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do members of minority ethnic groups in Liverpool have an interest in sport?</td>
<td>(1), (3), (5), (6), (7), (9), (10), (12), (16), (17), (20). Total = 11 52.4%</td>
<td>(2), (8), (11), (13), (14), (15), (19), (21). Total = 8 38.1%</td>
<td>(4), (18). Total = 2 9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do members of minority ethnic groups in Liverpool (especially male members) have an interest in football?</td>
<td>(1), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (10), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (20). Total = 14 66.7%</td>
<td>(2), (8), (9), (19), (21). Total = 5 23.8%</td>
<td>(17), (18). Total = 2 9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there conscious rejection of sport spectatorship at live Everton FC matches (played in Liverpool) by members of minority ethnic groups?</td>
<td>(2), (3), (8), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (18), (20), (21). Total = 12 57.14%</td>
<td>(1), (5), (6), (7), (9), (17), (19). Total = 7 33.33%</td>
<td>(4), (10). Total = 2 9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is useful for illustrating the divisions in the thinking of these young black males. A small majority of these respondents felt that interest in sport does exist amongst members of minority ethnic groups in Liverpool. Specific to football, interestingly, a larger majority felt that there is an interest amongst such groups. The 14 respondents who felt interest in football is present were asked to provide examples to support their opinion. From the examples provided two factors dominated as evidence of interest in football amongst members of minority ethnic groups in Liverpool, these being that it is watched/followed on television or through attendance at live games.

Those who argued that blacks in Liverpool do attend live games predominantly made this claim in relation to watching Liverpool FC. Some respondent’s answers were not club specific, but none of these black respondents stated that they, or their peers, go to watch Everton FC live (a point investigated further with a subsequent group of respondents, see below). Crowd surveys at Goodison Park similarly indicated that members of minority ethnic groups only attend Everton matches in very small numbers. Investigating whether there is a difference between the numbers of members of minority ethnic groups attending Liverpool FC compared to Everton FC is beyond the scope of the work here, although one would note that no previous research has shown numbers at Liverpool to be high. However, if such a claim was substantiated it could add weight to the idea that members of minority ethnic groups are put off attending Goodison by the clubs racist image.

Specifically, of the nine respondents who said that minority ethnic groups in
Liverpool are interested in football and that this is evidenced by attendance at live games four did not mention a club, but five claimed to attend Liverpool matches. Along similar lines, these respondents said: ‘I go to football matches, Liverpool FC, no problem’ (Joleon); ‘I go to football matches, Liverpool FC and I don’t have a problem’ (Desmond); ‘I go to Liverpool Football matches’ (Daniel); ‘I go to football matches to see Liverpool FC and have no problem’ (William); ‘Go to see Liverpool FC’ (Jermain). As indicated previously prior research (Malcolm et al, 1998; Bains and Johal, 1998; Waddington et al, 1999) suggests that members of minority ethnic groups are considerably under represented at live football matches. Hence this runs counter to the claims of these respondents and this is an issue that is returned to, below, when the additional respondents’ viewpoints are considered.

Another reason cited as evidence for interest in football amongst members of minority ethnic groups was that it is watched and followed on television. Respondents who cited this factor made similar statements with Leon saying ‘just watch it on TV’, Benedict ‘I watch it on the TV’; John ‘I watch football on television’. More expansively Derek claimed that ‘I used to play for Everton [as a youngster] but left, and now follow football on TV’. Otherwise, of the fourteen respondents who felt interest in football is present amongst minority ethnic group members in Liverpool one respondent, Floyd, kept his answer personal stating ‘I love football and support Arsenal’. He explained that his interest in Arsenal was spurred by his father’s support for the team.

When these young black males were asked whether members of minority ethnic
groups consciously reject spectatorship at Everton games, twelve argued that such rejection was apparent. Eleven respondents mentioned fear of racism and/or fear of violence to explain this rejection. Desmond, a 35 year old youth worker, recalled taking a group of predominantly black youngsters to Goodison Park for a game and said of the experience:

> Everton are trying to encourage minorities by giving free tickets, but Everton Football Club’s supporters are racist. We took some of the kids to a football match there and Everton supporters told them they should not be there. Some of them could not wait till the end of the match and we had to take children of ten years old home early.

Other black respondent’s also argued that fear of racism is behind non-attendance at Everton games. Joseph stated that ‘When I have been to Everton games I have had racist remarks shouted at me’. Derek also spoke of having attended Goodison and claimed ‘All racist at Everton, I have been to a match there and feel there is racism.’ As indicated above Derek had played for Everton in his youth and while he did not speak directly of any racist incidents he did not view his period with the club as a particularly happy time. When combined with his feelings following attendance at a game at Goodison his claim that ‘I probably wouldn’t go [to a game at Goodison Park] again’ is perhaps not that surprising. Another respondent, John, along similar lines spoke of ‘Racist abuse, they [Everton fans] start shouting their mouths off and go round in gangs’. Rio compared the two clubs in the City and argued ‘I think Liverpool are more involved with all races. Everton are not as supportive of other supporters and are still talked about as being racist’. This perception of Everton was also mentioned by Kieron when he said that the ‘Main reputation is that Everton seem to have an exclusion to ethnic minorities. [I] Don’t know if it is the truth, but this reputation of exclusion and racism is linked to them’. Relating this issue to his
football allegiance Aaron noted that ‘I don’t like to go to Everton, too much racism there, but I support Liverpool anyway’. Jermain linked his view to the demographic make up of the area around Goodison and stated that ‘I think there is racism at Everton, not many black people live in that area’.

Some respondents linked the issues of fear of racism and fear of violence. Typical of this was Kevin who said:

I was born and grew up in Liverpool and at the time when I wanted to go to games there was too much racism so I didn’t go because being black I thought I might get jumped upon after a game.

Victor, along similar lines, made the point that ‘Black people are scared of the reputation of racism at Everton and of possibly having racist remarks aimed at them or even being picked on’.

Alluding to the idea that football grounds can be predominantly white spaces and issues surrounding identity, both of which are investigated below, Andrew argued that:

White people are frightened of change. Supporters at football matches and people on the street are frightened of more black people. There should be more integration in different parts of Liverpool, not only in one area.

This respondent felt that there is integration in Toxteth where he lives, which has the highest concentration of black people in the City of Liverpool. Such an argument can again be linked to issues of space and while on the one hand it may be considered to be evidence of integration, on the other hand it could be seen as evidence to support the contention that Liverpool 8 is a black ghetto.
These issues of racism / racist violence were developed with the second group of black male respondents who were interviewed. A majority of this supplementary group felt that conscious rejection of spectatorship at Everton games by members of minority ethnic groups does occur. Specifically, eight respondents maintained that this rejection does occur with two being unsure. Fear of racism and fear of violence were, once again, the reasons cited most often for such rejection. One of these respondents, Glen a 38 year-old Somali youth worker, spoke at some length about a trip to Goodison he had made with two young black Somalis. He recited two incidents of racism during this visit, one of which occurred during the game:

When Oldham scored the crowd around us where unhappy and we had M&M’s [sweets] and Ribena thrown at and towards us by a couple of youths sat a couple of rows behind [us]. They also shouted ‘don’t fucking come back here again’ at us.

In the second incident, after the game in the street outside the ground, Glen and the black youths were ‘racially abused by a group of three young Liverpudlian “scallies”’. These episodes were predominantly verbal, but sufficiently threatening and one can see how they may act as the foundation for Glen’s overall opinion that conscious rejection of spectatorship at Everton is occurring ‘because Somali’s are scared of being attacked at games’.

Two other black Somali males were of a similar opinion to him. Both of these interviewees seemed to be aware of Everton’s reputation for racism, which they linked to violence or the potential for violence. Michael said there is conscious rejection of matches in Liverpool due to ‘fear of rejection and abuse. Violence was common[place] in my home nation and I don’t want to go to places where violence may occur’. Daley was of the opinion that ‘having come from a war zone we
[Somali’s] don’t want to go to places where there might be trouble. Many Somali’s think there is hooliganism, fighting and racism [at football] and don’t go because they are scared’.

Other respondents made similar arguments in relation to spectating with Ian, for example, stating:

There is a fear of hooliganism, racism and fear of being hurt. Despite this I might go to a game, although I’ve not been to one yet, but if I do go I’d be scared of taking my little brother to watch a game.

Echoing the concerns cited above Frank spoke of ‘fear of racism, verbal and physical, fear of being hurt in particular after games when fans may be in a bad mood about the result’, whilst Jerome simply put it down to minority ethnic group members ‘concerns about their safety’. Benjamin spoke of ‘fears about racism and feelings of rejection with other [white] fans likely to make racist remarks’, whilst David thought that black people are ‘worried about their safety and fear they might get hit and abused if they go to watch’.

Amongst this group of interviewees Terence offered up a different reason than the fear of racism or fear of violence. Specifically, Terence identified that it is expensive to watch Premiership football and consequently ‘money may be an issue’. Discussed previously in relation to the Bury case study it has been argued that while fans from minority ethnic groups may be somewhat disproportionately affected by the high cost of tickets (Garland and Rowe, 1996) if going to live football is important enough to an individual they will find the money somehow in order to attend (Malcolm et al, 2000).
Having confirmed that the majority of black respondents believe that conscious rejection of spectatorship at live Everton games is predominantly due to concerns about racism and/or violence, issues centred around whether they feel represented by and accepted in the City of Liverpool (which are linked to the issue of sense of belonging) were investigated. If these young black males do not identify with the city they live in, then their connection with, and support for, one of the teams that represents the area is unlikely to be strong and this would be detrimental to the chances of them attending their games. Of the respondents from this group who argued that they do feel represented by the City of Liverpool, it was noticeable that reference to Toxteth was often made. Frank, like all of the black males interviewed a Liverpool 8 resident, stated that:

"I was born in Somalia and where I live there are a group of us [Somalians] and I feel we are accepted here [in Toxteth]. Also, we can go into the Town Centre [Liverpool City Centre] and I feel safe there as in the town many different minority groups are seen."

A couple of the older respondents amongst this group spoke in similar terms and made reference to how the situation has changed over time. Benjamin, with reference to the 1981 race riots in Toxteth, said ‘After the riots here the black community was accepted more in Liverpool’. Two other long-standing Toxteth residents were Ian who spoke of how ‘having lived here for a while I do now feel part of the city and think it represents me. Also, I feel very safe in my local community’ and Daley who maintained that ‘I have lived in Liverpool for fifteen years now and yes I do think that we [members of the black minority ethnic community] are accepted here now’. Along similar lines Michael stated that ‘Many Cultures are accepted. The City Centre is not racist anymore as minority groups are expanding’. Another respondent, Jack, as
far as the City of Liverpool is concerned argued that ‘yes it represents me and I feel very at home in Toxteth’, whilst Terence spoke of his ‘sense of belonging’ as far as Liverpool is concerned and also noted ‘I have never had any trouble in the six years I have lived in Liverpool’.

On the other hand several respondents did not feel accepted or represented by the City of Liverpool, making, in turn, their sense of belonging appear compromised. One such respondent was Glen who felt belonging as far as Toxteth is concerned, but not to the City of Liverpool. He outlined how in his opinion:

Toxteth is fine, but I would be scared to leave the area and live in another part of the City. Other parts of Liverpool don’t accept [minority] ethnic groups.

Along similar lines Jerome stated ‘I feel a sense of belonging to Toxteth, but not to the city as a whole’ whilst another interviewee explained how:

I feel represented in Toxteth where I live. There are lots of black African’s here and it is a safe place to live. Toxteth is safer than the City Centre [of Liverpool] where there are many troublemakers and racists. (David)

Discussions in relation to sense of belonging to the country they live in were also carried out with these 10 respondents. Specifically, whether they felt a sense of belonging to England was considered, regardless of what they felt on a local level in relation to Toxteth or Liverpool. A couple of this group were unsure about how they felt in this regard, but most did offer a viewpoint. Several argued that they do feel a sense of belonging to the country. Those who held this view included Frank who said ‘Yes I feel a sense of belonging to England, because I live here and I follow the English culture’. Similarly, Ian explained that ‘In the last seven to eight years since I moved to England racism has become much less and having lived here for that time I
do feel part of the country’ whilst Daley stated that ‘I feel I belong here, because if I need anything I ask’.

Other interviewees who spoke of their perspective in relation to the country included Benjamin, who took a long-term view related to the rise in the minority ethnic population in England as a whole, and argued that ‘as numbers of people [from minority ethnic groups] increase and become naturalised racism is becoming less of an issue’. David said that he felt he belonged in England, but referred back to the local situation and was critical of Liverpool stating ‘Liverpool is not so good, but in other English cities, like London and Birmingham, inclusion and integration are better’. As noted above Glen had mixed feelings about Liverpool, but he did say he had a sense of belonging to the country as a whole and that ‘I travel a lot around the country with work, on youth trips, and have never noticed any funny looks or encountered any trouble anywhere else in the country’.

A minority, however, did not feel a sense of belonging to England. Particularly vehement in this regard was Terence who, while professing a sense of belonging to Liverpool, took a political stance on behalf of black minority ethnic groups when stating that he did not feel he belonged in England because ‘the government, locally and nationally, are against my race’. Jerome did not wish to expand on why, but also maintained that he did not feel a sense of belonging to the country. Despite that, during discussion of this issue he spoke of England being good because ‘it provides members of minority ethnic groups with rights, safety and health care’.
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Amongst the initial group of black respondents who professed support for a football club the majority cited Liverpool FC. This issue of support for a club side was returned to and investigated further with this subsequent group of respondents. Again support for Liverpool was evident, for example, from Frank who felt that Liverpool FC represented him. This view, he maintained, was supported by the multi-cultural nature of their squad, because they have ‘a number of black players and also players from many other different countries in their squad’. Terence, who supports Liverpool FC and has attended a couple of their live games, stated that they represent him and that ‘they are the best team in Liverpool whose players are very proud to play for the club’. Two other Liverpool fans were David who said ‘I support them because my Dad does’ whilst Daley supported them ‘because they are successful’. Similar to the respondents above both of these interviewees professed that they did feel represented by Liverpool FC. On the other hand, another Liverpool supporter, Jerome did not feel that the club represents him, but he followed them ‘because they have good players’.

A small number of these interviewees claimed to be football fans first and foremost and consequently offered their support to both Everton and Liverpool. Although neither had been to see Everton or Liverpool play live, Benjamin and Ian professed support for both teams with the later adding that ‘I like the way both teams play’. Glen on the other hand had been to live games at both Liverpool and Everton’s grounds and supported both since ‘both play good football’. Furthermore, Glen explained that he felt both clubs represented him ‘Everton through the African players who play for them and Liverpool because they are a multi-racial team’.
A couple of the respondents from this group did support Everton FC, solely. Upon investigation the support from these respondents illustrated a strong sense of African identity. Jack, for example, based his support on the nationality of his father and a link this gave him to Everton’s current team. He explained that he felt represented by Everton and that he supports them because:

Joseph Yobo is an idol and a role model. Like my father I support Nigeria although I have never seen them play live. My father was born in Nigeria and I support them because they are a black team that play for their country because they are proud, not for the money. Because of Yobo and because they are ‘The People’s Club’ I started to support Everton. Everton also have a proud history and I’ve been to and enjoyed a couple of their games.

Michael, also an Everton supporter, had a similar rationale to the above for his support. Michael, who had been to ‘a few live games’ at Goodison Park, claimed to feel represented by Everton of whom he said ‘I started supporting them because they have proud Black Africans who play for them such as Yobo and Yakubu’.

Other than the club(s) they support, discussions were had with these respondents in relation to which national teams they support. Of those who expressed support the majority cited England. One reason given for this was simply, as Terence said, ‘because I live here’. Similarly, Benjamin explained that ‘I support England because I am a resident here’ adding that ‘it [England] is my home so I feel represented by the players who play for England’. Jerome follows England ‘because I grew up here’ and in terms of representation ‘England have good players and I feel the team do represent me’. With this identification with England these respondents offered an alternative view to those, such as Jack and Michael, in whom a strong component of African identity was found. What may be behind these differences is one of the issues that
Several respondents spoke about how black players featuring in the English national side was a consideration. Frank, discussed how following Somalia (the country of his birth) was problematic and that ‘I live here and support them [England] because they have the best players’. Frank added that he felt that the England team represented him since they have ‘more black players in the team now than years ago’. This argument was forwarded by Daley who supports England ‘because I live here’ and believes they represent him and this is evidenced by the ‘increased number of black people who play for England now, which means they represent me more than in the past’. Also in this vein Ian outlined how ‘I support England because they have the best players and it is where I live’ and that ‘yes they represent me’ as shown by the fact that a ‘high number of black players play for England’. Such references linking support to the high number of black players in the England team and the idea that England has the ‘best players’ are of interest since they suggest that amongst these respondents there was a conditional element to the support of the England team.

Despite the level of support for England detailed above watching them live was something only a couple of this group of respondents had done to date. Glen described himself an England supporter. He had been to an England game in London of which he said ‘going to the match was a good experience. In London there are many black people and therefore no discrimination and at the game we didn’t experience any. I feel the England team represents me and black players representing the country is a good thing’. David supported England ‘because I live here’; and had
been to see England play Jamaica at Old Trafford (3rd of June 2006). Commenting on this he said ‘the experience was OK. My seat was near to where the away fans where and I didn’t see or hear about any trouble or racism at the game’. David also explained that he felt represented by the England team ‘because they play for the whole country’.

The minority were those, like Jack and Michael, who more closely identified with African teams. Michael a ‘proud African’ did not express support for one national team and explained how, for example, in the World Cup he follows the fortunes of the African teams who qualify. He was born in Somalia and would support them, though their failure to qualify for a World Cup or African Nations Cup finals limited such opportunities.

Ultimately, whilst the data discussed above was relevant and useful (for example, offering insights into perceptions of racism in and around football) it was noticeable that of these 31 black respondents only a handful had mentioned having some sort of allegiance to Everton FC. That being the case insights into the potentially hostile atmosphere at Everton matches for members of minority ethnic groups, detailed by some respondents above, was limited since few of these 31 interviewees had experience of attending a game at Goodison Park. Consequently a return to the field was made to interview members of Liverpool’s black community who have an allegiance to Everton and who had been to watch a live game, or games, at Goodison Park. Finding black male respondents who fitted the criteria was something of a challenge, but in the end 10 interviewees who did were spoken to (see also Chapter
To find this number of respondents meant expanding the geographical scope to other areas of the City of Liverpool. Hence, while the previously interviewed thirty-one black respondents were all residents of Toxteth of this group 3 live in Toxteth, 3 in Old Swan and 1 each in; Walton, Liverpool City Centre, Garston and Edge Hill respectively.

When interviewing this group of 10 black male respondents the research question was not changed although informed by previous ventures into the field questions could be framed slightly differently. Chapter 3 includes detail of the nature of support for Everton FC amongst these respondents, which ranges from hardly missing an Everton game to only having been to a couple. Ultimately, all 10 have been to see Everton play at Goodison and 4 have been to see Everton play away from home. With these respondents it was discussed as to whether they consider Goodison Park as an unwelcoming and / or out of bounds place for members of minority ethnic groups. Of this group of respondents 5 felt that this was the case, while the other 5 did not.

Further investigation of the unwelcoming atmosphere at Goodison was conducted and, with Jeff, led to the recollection of 3 racist incidents. These involved Everton fans, took place at Goodison, and in 2 of these cases the racism was directed at him personally. Specifically Jeff recalled how: (i) On one occasion I was ‘threatened and abused, verbally, in one of the home [Everton] sections of the ground [Goodison Park] by white [Everton] supporters. During this I had no contact or help from any of the other [white] support[ers] around me in the ground’; (ii) In another instance, ‘Coming out of the ground [Goodison] one time I was pushed and shoved and ended
up running away from the ground. I’m not sure whether I was chased [by these white assailants] but ran off and took sanctuary in one of the pubs [by the ground] just in case’; (iii) He also remembered that once when going into Goodison he had ‘heard people shouting racial abuse at another [black] fan’.

Although they had not personally been subjected to racist abuse on their visits to Goodison Park Nathan, Luke and Karl all agreed that Goodison is an unwelcoming place for members of minority ethnic groups. Specifically, in this regard Nathan felt that Everton were similar to other clubs and argued that ‘a minority of [Everton] fans may be racist, but I think that is probably the case at most clubs, isn’t it?’ Developing this theme Nathan pointed out that on occasion he has heard some of his black friends and family members discussing the idea that ‘certain members of the Everton crowd may reject people from the black community as spectators at Goodison Park and make remarks to try and make them feel like they shouldn’t be there or make them feel uncomfortable’. Luke for his part thought that the atmosphere he had encountered on occasion at the ground may be a factor since, ‘I have never been subject to racial abuse personally, but when I have sat in a certain part of the ground [Gwlady’s Street] there have been some racist shouts’. Speaking in a similar vein, Karl stated that during visits to Goodison he has heard ‘certain racist shouts from certain parts of the ground, not directed at me or specific black people, but just shouted out generally’. Furthermore, he argued that Goodison is unwelcoming since, ‘It is hard for black people to be accepted in Goodison, I feel, because Everton are known as a white club’.
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Amongst respondents from this group who did not believe that Goodison Park is an unwelcoming place for members of minority ethnic groups reasoning to support this point of view was again generally based on their own experiences. Nigel for example (who got tickets off a player during his visits to games at Goodison) stated that he did not feel this was the case, but that ‘when I’ve been I’ve had a seat in the Directors Box and don’t really encounter “normal” fans’.

Others who argued that Goodison is not unwelcoming included George who stated that ‘I have never felt uncomfortable or been racially abused when I’ve been at Goodison’ and Jacob who maintained that ‘The times I have been to watch the match [at Goodison] I haven’t felt this [that it is an unwelcoming place]’. In a similar vein Yannik said that ‘I’ve only been to Goodison a couple of times, but my experiences of the stadium have been very good. I’ve not heard or had aimed at me any racist abuse and one of the games I attended was the Merseyside “Derby” when the atmosphere was great’.

As above Jeff cited some personal experiences of racism from Everton fans and whether they had personally seen or heard racist abuse from the club’s fans was discussed with these respondents. Others did have some personal experiences that they relayed in this regard with Luke detailing an instance before a friendly match against Bury away in the build up to season 2006-07. He went to this game with friends from school (he was 15 at the time) and ‘heard [white] people shouting racial abuse when I was at Bury train station before a pre-season game at Bury FC’. Fred a lifelong Everton fan who rarely misses a match, home or away, was somewhat
defensive about anything to do with Everton Football Club and seemed intent on not saying anything that might damage the club’s reputation. Initially when asked if he had heard much racism from Everton fans he said ‘no not really’, but when pressed further on the matter he did say ‘I have heard [racist] comments [from Everton fans] aimed towards Pakistani’s on a couple of occasions’. George has similarly been a regular attendee at Everton games, at times, and also maintained that he could not recall racial abuse from Everton fans at Goodison Park, although he did recall an instance at an away game. Specifically, George spoke of Everton fans racially abusing Liverpool fans at the 2009-2010 Merseyside “Derby” at Anfield. On this occasion he heard racist abuse ‘aimed at [black and Asian] Liverpool fans sitting in the Main Stand, on our right, as we were in the Anfield Road End’.

The related issues of whether members of Liverpool’s black community are significantly under-represented at games played by Everton at Goodison Park and if so whether such rejection is conscious were also discussed with these respondents. Ultimately all 10 of them answered that such under-representation is occurring, with 9 feeling it is conscious. Of more significance is what reasons they thought might be behind this state of affairs. Jeff in the first instance stated that ‘very few black people go [to Goodison] compared with the percentage of the black community in Liverpool’. He also felt that this rejection was conscious and occurs because black people are ‘apprehensive of going to Goodison Park having heard through word of mouth of racist incidents there. This means they do not feel comfortable there and think that the club lacks contact with minority ethnic people’. Jeff put much of the responsibility for this down to the club themselves and made reference to where in the
City of Liverpool Everton are geographically based when he argued that due to ‘the policies they put in place and some of their actions some of my [black] friends do consider it [Everton Football Club] to be a racist institution that is not inclusive and basically a north end white club’. Nigel, along similar lines, thought conscious rejection of spectatorship is in evidence amongst Liverpool’s black community and speculated as to whether the demographic make up of the population in the immediate vicinity around Goodison plays a part in their under-representation. He argued that as far as Everton are concerned ‘80% of their fan base comes from the areas [immediately] around Goodison Park and since there are not many young black males [who live] around Goodison Park this may possibly be a reason why they don’t attend’. This was not the only factor Nigel discussed as he also spoke about the image of the club some members of the minority ethnic community hold when he said that ‘there was a time when Everton was known as a racist club. I’m unsure whether some [black] people still see it that way, but if so it could be a possible factor for this lack of inclusion’. Along similar lines he added how ‘Everton have been “branded” a racist club and this has stuck with them. Then even if the club changes it may be that someone may never change their opinion about them’. In relation to this change he did suggest that, in his opinion, the club’s image has changed as they employ ‘more black players now’, but that ‘depending on how “robust” someone is, their opinion may never change’. George was another of the respondents from this group who argued that the demographic of the area has a role to play in this under-representation. Adding to this as far as the conscious rejection is concerned he offered his view that support of another club may play a part arguing that ‘it [under-representation] is possibly due to the local demographics since not many black people live in the area
[around Goodison] and mostly people from minority ethnic communities seem to follow Liverpool’.

Fred for his part agreed under-representation of members of Liverpool’s black community is in evidence at Goodison, but did not offer an explanation for why this may be. Nathan on the other hand felt under-representation was evidenced because, ‘the times I have been to watch Everton there have been very few people from the black community at the match’. He argued that rejection of spectatorship, at Goodison, was conscious and black people are put off going because ‘through word of mouth people say Everton fans are racist although I’m not so sure and believe that every club has a certain minority of fans who are racist and let their club down’.

Similarly Luke agreed that some black people consciously reject spectatorship and while emphasising that he is not one of them, stated that ‘I have no hesitation in going to Goodison Park even though I have heard some racist chants. I can understand if black people don’t want to go to Goodison Park though especially if they have been subject to racial abuse’. Furthermore, Luke identified under-representation of members of Liverpool’s black community at Goodison arguing that ‘I see that this is happening because for the times I have been to Goodison Park there has been very few black Everton fans in the stadium, if any at all. I think this is because people talk about experiences were Everton fans have been racist and then this puts other black Everton fans off going to the match’. Taking a slightly different angle on the matter Obi spoke of how the perception of family members can influence black people to reject spectatorship at Goodison and in turn be under-represented at games. Making a parallel with his own experience from playing football Obi also touched on the
concept that, for some people, Everton retain the reputation of being institutionally racist when he relayed detail of how ‘when I was young, about 14, I had trials at Everton and was asked to go back again, but because of the reputation of the club my Grandfather wouldn’t allow it’.

As was the general consensus amongst this group of respondents Karl felt that members of Liverpool’s black community consciously reject spectatorship and are under-represented at Goodison. He spoke of this under-representation being apparent when he has been to Goodison and also noted that ‘even when you watch it [Everton playing at Goodison] on the TV you don’t see black fans in the crowd’. Karl also spoke about the perception that Everton are a racist club and how he felt that is no longer the case, but that, in his opinion, they do little to attract members of minority ethnic groups to attend games. Specifically, he argued that ‘although times have changed there still seems to be little done about the amount of black people who go to the Everton games’. Considering what may be behind the conscious rejection of spectatorship Karl maintained that ‘black people are frowned upon at the game, I feel if a black person was to shout out during the game [at Goodison] people would frown upon it and they would be made to feel like outcasts by the other [white] members of the crowd’. Like Karl, Jacob picked up on the make up of the crowd at Goodison when watching games on television and speculated about the support the club draw and the cost of attending games when he said that ‘If you look at the crowd [at Goodison Park] when [Everton] games are shown on TV you don’t see many black people. I don’t really know why this is, but perhaps not many black people are Everton supporters or don’t like football enough to pay the amount of money it costs.
to watch a game live?’ Having only been to a couple of games at Goodison Yannik had limited experience to draw upon, but did think that members of the black community are under-represented at games and that this could well be conscious. Drawing on what he had heard from friends he argued that this conscious rejection could be due to ‘maybe being in fear of racism or racist abuse. From what I have heard from my friends they tell me some Everton supporters are racist and sing racist songs and I could see this might put some people off [going to Goodison].’

With this group of respondents all having an allegiance to Everton FC, it was perhaps not surprising that most of them felt Everton do represent them. Typical of those arguing this case was Jeff who said that this was due to Everton having ‘black players in the team such as Steven Pienaar.’ Nathan similarly stated that ‘Everton has a lot of black players now, even more so than some other clubs so I feel this shows equality in terms of opportunities which as a member of the black community means I feel part of the club myself even though I don’t attend as many games as I’d like to’, and Obi who put his view succinctly as being that ‘yes [they represent me], because there are more black players at the football club nowadays’. Others answered in terms of representation without reference to being a member of a minority ethnic group. For example, George felt Everton represent him because the club mirrors his own characteristics since they are ‘a hardworking club, not always the best, but always up there striving to be better’, and Jacob argued that ‘I feel represented the same as any other fan’. On the other hand one of this group of 10 respondents did not feel represented by Everton. Returning to a point he had made previously Karl explained that Everton, in his opinion, are doing little to increase the level of support from the
black community at games and this in turn is why he does not necessarily feel the club represent him.

While the main focus with these additional interviews was to probe the nature of Everton FC, the sense of belonging they have with the City of Liverpool was also established. The majority of these respondents (8 of the 10) maintained that they do feel a sense of belonging to the city. Since they support one of the 2 professional football teams that represent the city this was somewhat to be expected and Jacob’s viewpoint was typical of this majority when he argued that ‘I feel a sense of belonging the same as any other person in the City’. None of this group said they did not have this sense of belonging to the city, although a couple were unsure whether they did or not. Jeff seemed intent on making a political point when he explained why he was unsure as follows:

Not when it comes to opportunities [for black members of the community] in terms of: politics, business, job opportunities etc. Qualified black people are not taken on. Other cities such as London, Birmingham even Nottingham and Leeds have more ethnic cohesion than Liverpool and are more focussed on catering for black people. Indeed Liverpool is one of the worst at providing equal opportunities for black members of the community.

The other respondent who professed to be unsure about whether he feels a sense of belonging with the City of Liverpool was Nathan who similarly, but more succinctly, said ‘I don’t know whether there is equality of opportunities for the black community [in the city].’

Also considered was whether these respondents have a sense of belonging in relation to the country. The majority (8 out of 10) argued that they do feel a sense of
belonging to England. Of those who felt otherwise Obi argued that he does not feel a sense of belonging to the country and that ‘I think it is hard for a black person to be accepted as being English even if they are born and raised here’. George on the other hand was unsure as to whether England represents him and stated that in his opinion ‘I have many similar feelings and passions as my fellow countrymen, but I’m not sure the Government’s ideals match my own’.
Discussion

Across the different groups of interviewees, there was agreement that conscious rejection of spectatorship at Everton FC is apparent amongst minority ethnic groups in Liverpool. Discussion of what lies behind this is necessary to explain the complex social processes that lead to the apparently contradictory situation in which people express an interest in playing football and watching it on television, but show little interest in supporting one of ‘their’ local clubs. To achieve this, themes that emerged above will be theorised in relation to prior research. This will in turn enable conclusions to be made in relation to the theories, such as Elias and Scotson’s (1994) theory of ‘established outsider’ relations that has loosely guided this research.

Fear of Racism / Fear of Violence: As indicated previously, prior research (Back et al, 2001; Garland and Rowe, 2001) has shown that racism is perceived as a barrier to minority ethnic attendance at live football matches. Of the 41 black interviewees more than half cited fear of racism and fear of violence as the key factor in non-attendance at live Everton games. Emergence of this reasoning as the predominant factor in conscious rejection of spectatorship at Everton supports the idea that despite a decline in overt racism certain members of minority ethnic groups still perceive football matches as threatening environments. As noted above other researchers have made this link including, for example, Holland (1995) who identified fear of racist attack or abuse as one of the main reasons for non-attendance by minority ethnic group members.

As far as Goodison Park is concerned several respondents spoke of their personal
experience of racism whilst attending games. Back et al (2001) having done research at Goodison identified racism from Everton fans. In their case the abuse was aimed at a player, but parallels may still be drawn. Specifically, they recorded repeated incidents of crude racial abuse from Everton fans aimed at Chelsea player Ruud Gullit. As far as the black interviewees here are concerned when they spoke of racism aimed at them it was generally perpetrated by individuals or small groups. At no time did anyone else in the crowd challenge the abuse black interviewees detailed and consequently tacit support from other supporters may be inferred. Hence, while the racist abuse detailed by Back et al (2001) when they visited Goodison Park included mass chanting aimed at a player nevertheless the abuse in both cases has some similarities. Specifically, one black respondent spoke of being told ‘don’t fucking come back here again’ and another recalled being ‘threatened and abused, verbally’, whilst racism aimed at Gullit included ‘fuck off ya black cunt’ (Back et al, 2001: 132). In all of these cases there is evidence to suggest that the white fans carrying out this abuse were doing so in an attempt to assert that Goodison Park is a white space of which they have ownership.

Abuse aimed at Gullit was due to a complex package of elements (such as the identities and behaviour patterns of the fans, individual player biographies, externally constructed profiles and events on the pitch) and because he was perceived as the principal threat to Everton’s chances of winning the game. On the other hand racism aimed at black respondents had a more specific focus being aimed at individuals to intimidate, seemingly, with the intention to stop them from attending in future. With these actions is would appear that the ‘established’ white fans hoped to ensure the
ground was an unwelcome place for ‘outsiders’ (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994) in this case black fans and ultimately they would hope to preserve the ‘largely white working-class audience’ (Back et al, 2001: 129) found at Goodison Park.

Other than fear of being racially abused several black respondents spoke in terms of the football club being a racist institution. Amongst those to make this link were: Rio who said Everton are ‘still talked about as being racist’; Kieron who maintained that ‘Everton seem to have an exclusion to ethnic minorities’; Karl who argued that ‘Everton are known as a white club’; Nigel who stated that ‘Everton have been “branded” a racist club’ and Jeff who stated that some of his black friends consider Everton to be a ‘racist institution that is not inclusive’. Johnson, who is charged with trying to foster inclusion at Goodison, denied that fear of racism is an issue in rejection of spectatorship, but did state that some members of minority ethnic groups ‘see Everton as a racist club’. Similarly, Back et al (2001, 7) argued following their research that Everton are one of a number of racist clubs and discussing Everton and Millwall claimed that ‘it is true that racism is evident in both these clubs, both historically and today’. Ultimately, despite the anti-racist work done of which some of these black respondents spoke, this concept of racism amongst Everton fans and even the club being institutionally racist is widely held. That being the case it is evident why attending Goodison could be something that many black respondents simply do not consider doing.

A football fan interviewed by Back et al (2001, 95) explained how ‘It was never an option for me to support the “local” team because I knew it was a place that black
people weren’t welcome’. With the evidence gathered from interviewees and crowd surveys a similar situation could be said to be happening at Everton and consequently that Goodison Park is a racially exclusive place and an almost exclusively white space. Furthermore, the area the ground is situated in could be included in this concept since it too is also almost exclusively white. Back et al (2001: 53) with reference to the 1991 Census figures highlighted this issue stating that:

Today Liverpool shows high levels of racial segregation with its black communities focused around the Toxteth area. While the overall population of Liverpool in 1991 was 96% white, the county ward of the city in which Goodison Park is located was 99.2% white.

Discussing this issue of how the black community in Liverpool mainly live in one area (Liverpool 8) Jermain and George, independently, noted that not many black people live in the area around the ground. Along similar lines Nigel argued that 80% of Everton’s fan base comes from the areas in close proximity to their ground and that since ‘not many young black males [live] around Goodison Park’ this may be why they do not attend. Views such as these were succinctly encapsulated by Jeff, who made reference to the part of the City of Liverpool were the club are based, when he called Everton ‘a North End white club’. Connected to these views Andrew expressed his opinion that it would be advantageous if there were more integration in different parts of the city rather than just one area. Indeed, with a number of black respondents speaking about how some areas of Liverpool are more welcoming than others one can argue that not only is Goodison Park unwelcoming to black people, but that the area it is situated in is a relatively unwelcoming area for members of minority ethnic groups.
As this and previous research showed Liverpool FC drew greater support than Everton from the city’s minority ethnic communities. With the idea still predominating, as detailed above, that Everton are institutionally racist combined with the general fear of racism associated with the club this greater level of support for Liverpool amongst the black community is perhaps not too surprising. However, what may be behind this indication that Liverpool FC have been more effective in attracting minority ethnic spectators is of interest and shall now be considered.

Considering the roots of Liverpool’s black community, Hill (2001, 14) detailed how it was ‘established in the south of the city at least a century ago’. He adds that the founders of the black community were ‘West African sailors who disembarked in Liverpool and decided to stay’ and notes how ‘Post-war immigration from the Caribbean simply boosted the black population [in Liverpool]’ (Hill, 2001: 114). Making a link to football Hill (2001, 114) argues that, historically, for the young males of the black community in Liverpool football was an interest of theirs and that the game was ‘played on the streets and in the parks and playgrounds’. Hill goes on to claim, however, that members of the black community in Liverpool did not feel that they belonged and felt discriminated against in relation to housing, employment, and in all facets of social mobility and social life. He believes that discrimination was also in evidence in relation to the city’s two professional football clubs:

Nowhere did this exclusion become more glaring than on the hallowed turf and teeming terraces of Anfield and Goodison Park, the arenas of Merseyside self-esteem. Black Liverpool was conspicuous by its absence, not just a numerical incongruity but a symbol of a diminished way of life.

(Hill, 2001: 114)
Previously in this Chapter Hill’s (2001, 116) contention, specific to the 1960’s, about the lack of black people in attendance at Everton or Liverpool home games, which he argues was ‘fewer even than at most League clubs’ has been detailed.

From a position characterised by the crowds at both Anfield and Goodison Park confusing ‘working-class Liverpudlian staying power with ignorant, lumpen white power’ (Hill, 2001: 121) and excluding black Liverpool from these football grounds something must have changed for Liverpool FC in particular. Essentially it is claimed that the change in the face of football on Merseyside can be traced back to June 1987 when Liverpool signed John Barnes from Watford. Barnes was accepted by the Liverpool fans and their signing of a ‘star’ black player seems to have done a great deal to change attitudes and behaviours at that club. Signifying the impact of this for Liverpool FC compared to Everton FC Rogan Taylor, a Liverpool supporting academic, has argued that ‘I’m quite sure if Everton had bought Barnes the situation would have been mirrored because the potential for that behaviour existed at both clubs’ (cited in Hill, 2001, 193). Similarly, Liverpool fan Stephen Kelly, who Hill notes was a Main Stand season ticket holder, said:

> It was so funny. In the previous season they were all talking about “black bastards”. Then as soon as Everton supporters start screaming this kind of filth, everyone’s going on about what a shower of scum they are over there…. short memories.  
> (Kelly, cited in Hill, 2001: 193)

From my interviewees Alan Johnson (Everton’s Race and Diversity Manager) also felt that the influence of Barnes (and to a lesser extent Howard Gayle, the first black player to play for Liverpool) has been significant in this regard. Johnson claimed that due to Barnes any racist tag that may have been associated with Liverpool Football
Club was eroded many years ago and consequently they are not considered to be racist now or historically. More recently, as detailed previously, Everton have employed the services of a number of black players, but despite that the implication is that attitudes in relation to Everton FC have been slower to change. Making reference to this Johnson gave the example of black forward Kevin Campbell to support this contention. Campbell was with Everton from 1998 to 2005 (during which time he started 139 games, additionally making 24 appearances as a substitute, scoring 52 goals; www.toffeeweb.com/players/past/Campbell.asp) and during 2001 he became the ‘first black player to captain Everton’ (www.evertonfc.com/player-profile/kevin-campbell). Of Campbell, Johnson argued he ‘did well at Everton and captained the club, briefly’ but maintained that ‘his success was not at the same level of John Barnes for Liverpool’.

Ultimately, therefore, while both clubs could be, and have been, labelled racist in the past this changed quicker at Liverpool than at Everton and this has left Everton, due to instances from their recent past, struggling to alter perceptions. With Liverpool’s image shift established years ago and Everton still trying to change the idea amongst the black community that they are a racist club the perception of one respondent who claimed that ‘mostly people from minority ethnic communities [in Liverpool] seem to follow Liverpool’ (George) would appear to have some foundation to it.

_Sense of Identity / Sense of Belonging / National Identity:_ As previous research (Gaffney and Bale, 2004) shows, identity can be closely linked to place. In relation to sense of identity with the place where they live this was an issue investigated in some
depth with the later groups of black interviewees. Linked to this, and as detailed previously, football is a sphere where identities can be forged (Burdsey, 2007) and ‘sport provides a context in which images of national identity can be expressed and debated’ (Back et al, 2001: 254). Back et al (2001: 7-8) have also referenced Bromberger in this regard and note that central to his approach is the concept that football provides a means through which ‘public’ identities can be performed and embodied. In addition, they pinpoint, how football can be said to provide a means to express collective emblems of belonging that are lived rather than stated explicitly (Back et al, 2001).

A sense of belonging to the nation (England) was evidenced amongst most, although once again not all, of the black respondents interviewed during the second and third visits into the field in Liverpool. During the second batch of fieldwork in Liverpool this was specifically linked to football and support for the England national side was widespread, as was the feeling that the team represent them. For some this support was unreserved and linked to respondents’ longevity of association with the country. However, for a number of black respondents their support was due to living in the country, because they have the best players and due to the number of black players who play for England. Hence, while evidence of attachment to the English national team was found it appeared to be somewhat conditional in its nature for some and less so for others, bringing one to reflect on notions of ‘outsider’ and ‘established’ communities (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994; see Chapter 6 also).

This finding was of interest especially when one considers that some researchers have
expressed the opinion that the identities of being black and English are rarely compatible. In terms of support, counter to the research here, Back et al (2001, 253) found that ‘few black fans actively support the [English] national team’. Gilroy (1993) however maintains that when black people identify with Englishness it can make a difference and establish new possible vectors of social inclusion. An example of this, and by way of explaining this idea further, relates to the 1998 World Cup finals tournament when England lost to Argentina and injured black forward Ian Wright was pictured on television wrapped in a Cross of St George flag. Commenting on this the black fan, musician and sociologist Lez Henry (10th July 1998, in personal communication with Back et al) said ‘I looked at him [Wright] on the screen and I thought “What the fuck is he doing – has he lost his mind completely!” I mean the St George Cross! That’s the worst thing for a black person because according to them people you can’t be black and English. Maybe Britishness would be something else because you can be “black British” but English never’ (cited in Back et al, 2001: 255). Henry, with these thoughts argues that the notion of being ‘British’ is less racially or culturally exclusive than ‘English’.

In relation to the research here it is interesting that none of the black respondents from Liverpool made any such distinction between Britishness and Englishness. This may be due to a variety of factors such as that the example above, involving Ian Wright, now dates from over 10 years ago. Since football is a sphere where identities can be forged (Burdsey, 2007) one may speculate whether the notion of being English is now less culturally exclusive than it was, and amongst interviewees rejection of Englishness was not in evidence. Furthermore, it could be argued that since sport is a
context where images of national identity can be debated (Back et al., 2001: 254) then an image of this nature, in this case the cross of St George, may no longer carry the same connotations for black people as it did to Henry (1998). By supporting the England team these black interviewees could also be said to be adding to the development of their own ‘we-image’ and showing that they reject the ‘disgrace’ the established (white) groups ascribe to them (Elias and Scotson, 1994).

Following the interviews with black respondents, from the second batch of fieldwork, a strong sense of belonging was identified with their immediate locality (Toxteth). These black respondents also expressed a sense of belonging and identification with the City of Liverpool. Similarly, sense of belonging and identification with the City of Liverpool was evidenced amongst the black males interviewed during the third batch of fieldwork. Whilst this identification was evidenced amongst both these groups of respondents it appeared that the third group had a stronger sense of identification with the City of Liverpool compared to the second group who first and foremost identified with Toxteth more so than the city per se. Furthermore, whilst not universal, with either of these two groups, the perception that predominated was that, over time, the black community has become increasingly accepted in the city and that with increased numbers of members of minority ethnic groups in Liverpool the City Centre is now more welcoming.

From the second group of black respondents a couple (Jack and Michael) did support Everton, had been to see them play live and felt represented by the team. This support occurred due to these respondents’ strong sense of African identity giving them an
identifiable link to some of the team’s players. Such a finding offers support for the concept that identities, which often develop in such ad-hoc ways, can be multiple and complex (Burdsey, 2007). In addition, it illustrates how football can be a key site for constructing identities. With the third group of black respondents all having an allegiance to Everton, and all having been to a live game(s), as expected the majority of this group (9 out of 10) argued that they feel represented by Everton FC. Typically, this feeling was linked to the fact that ‘there are more black players at the football club nowadays’ (Obi) or the argument that ‘I feel represented the same as any other fan’ (Jacob). Ultimately, such data suggests that when links to a football club are made for the individual concerned their sense of civic and/or national identity can actually be strengthened.
Overview

An overview of the themes to have emerged from this case study is now provided as a link to the subsequent, concluding, chapter when the two case studies will be compared and contrasted. Consequently a more in depth critique of the theories that have guided this research will follow.

This research set out to ascertain whether, as Waddington et al (1999) suggested, members of minority ethnic groups consciously reject spectatorship at association football matches in England. As far as the City of Liverpool, and Everton FC, is concerned there was, despite a couple of dissenting voices, widespread agreement that conscious rejection of spectatorship (which will be investigated further subsequently) amongst minority ethnic group members is happening.

Waddington et al (1999) also argued that this conscious rejection could be due to rejection of football as a leisure pursuit per se. Evidence obtained from black respondents in Liverpool led to this contention being questioned. These respondents had an interest in playing and watching matches on television. As far as being a spectator at live games at Goodison Park is concerned a fair number of those from the first two groups of black respondents had tried it, but their experiences often resulted in being racially abused. Similarly amongst the third group of black respondents, who have an allegiance to Everton, several relayed detail of racism they had seen and heard first hand when at Goodison Park and spoke in terms of the ground being an unwelcoming place for members of minority ethnic groups. Hence for these black respondents it would appear that other factors rather than disinterest in football have
led to rejection of spectatorship. Associated to such spectatorship Everton FC have been trying to encourage members of minority ethnic groups to attend Goodison Park, but their efforts in this regard seem to be being undermined somewhat by the racist and violent acts of some of their fans and the lingering perception of the club as racist.

Absences in sport, as noted previously, is an area that requires further study and examination (Birrell, 1999) as has been carried out here with an in depth analysis into why black ‘outsiders’ are absent (Elias, 1994). One of the main factors found to be behind this (in relation to Everton FC) was that, according to many black respondents, fear of racism and fear of violence remain factors in non-attendance. Such a finding runs counter to the concept that since overt racism at football grounds has diminished then fear of racism is no longer an issue for minority ethnic group members. Also, despite recognition of the anti-racist work the club have done, the idea persists amongst a number of black interviewees that Everton fans are racist and even that the club itself is institutionally racist. That being the case it is evident why attending Goodison could be something that a number of these respondents have simply not considered doing.

Linked to the above it was evident that the ‘established’ white community are in a position of control at Everton FC (Elias and Scotson, 1994). Indeed the evidence suggests that Goodison Park is a ‘white space’ (Vertinsky, 2004; Gaffney and Bale, 2004) and a place white fans have ownership of. By their actions, as detailed by a number of black respondents, the ‘established’ white fans seem intent on ensuring that Goodison is an unwelcome place for ‘outsiders’ (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994).
Ultimately, therefore, despite the black community’s longevity (Fryer, 1985) and continuity (Costello, 2001) in the City of Liverpool as far as Everton FC is concerned the idea that they are ‘outsiders’ persists (Elias and Scotson, 1994).

Amongst the black respondents interviewed, on a national level, the trend identified was that a sense of belonging in relation to England was, although not universal, widespread. Support of the England national team was unreserved from some, but conditional in nature for others. This state of affairs, when related to respondents’ longevity of association, has led to reflection upon Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) notions of ‘outsider’ and ‘established’ communities (see Conclusion). Such findings also ran counter to the previous work of, for example, Back et al (2001) who maintained that being black and English are often seen as not being compatible.

Furthermore, these findings suggest that the notion of being black and English may be less culturally exclusive than it used to be and that with their support of England these black respondents appear to be developing their ‘we-image’ and illustrating that they reject the ‘disgrace’ the established groups ascribe to them (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994).

On a local level amongst the second group of black respondents’ there was evidence of a strong sense of belonging with where they live (Toxteth). On a wider scale (across all groups of black respondents) the trend identified was that there was a sense of belonging and identification with the City of Liverpool. As far as support for the ‘local’ professional football teams was concerned, amongst the second group of respondents especially, Liverpool FC garnered a greater degree of support than
Everton FC. As detailed above any racist tag that may have been associated with Liverpool FC would appear to have been eroded many years ago and consequently they appear to not be considered racist now or historically. On the other hand Everton are still struggling to shake off the tag of being an institutionally racist club and due to the fear of racism associated with them this is not too surprising. Nevertheless, black respondents who do support Everton have been located providing further evidence of the multiple and complex nature of identities and how football can act as a key site for forging identities (Burdsey, 2007).
Conclusion

This critical analysis of race relations and sport has involved investigation of absences in sport and in particular why some racial groups are present and others are absent (Birrell, 1999; Dunning, 1999). To achieve this the interrelationships between association football and the wider social contexts in which it is organised, watched and played has been scrutinised (Dunning, 1999). Rather than being a bi-polar study, as with much prior research, the work here scrutinises Asian and black minority ethnic groups and their relationship with association football. An advantage to studying two minority ethnic groups is that areas of commonality and difference are identifiable.

This conclusion looks at whether there was evidence of rejection of spectatorship amongst members of minority ethnic groups (Waddington et al., 1999) and if so whether or not it was conscious rejection. Reasons thought to be behind rejection of spectatorship are developed and discussed. This has led to seemingly ‘commonsense’ themes emerging, which are investigated including: fear of racism and fear of violence, lack of role models and cultural differences. These are considered using sociological ideas, such as: the theory of established outsider relations (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994), research relating to exciting significance (Maguire, 1991b), as well as work into space and place (Gaffney and Bale, 2004) and sense of identity / belonging (Burdsey, 2007). Ultimately this section draws conclusions in relation to the factors discussed and in particular the theories utilised, which see, for example, the part length of association has to play being reviewed, and in turn whether notions of two groups, ‘established’ and ‘outsider’ (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994) can be satisfactorily applied to these case studies.
Evidence of rejection of football spectatorship has been identified amongst members of minority ethnic groups in England (Waddington et al, 1999; Malcolm et al, 2001). Although not universal, support for the idea that such rejection is occurring was widespread amongst interviewees. This was true of Asians in Bury, with reference to Bury FC, and members of the black minority ethnic community in Liverpool in relation to Everton FC. On the face of it such findings seem to support Waddington et al’s (1999: 20) suggestion that under-representation of blacks and Asians in ‘football crowds in England may be associated with a more or less conscious rejection of spectatorship’. Having scrutinised the research conclusions can be drawn in relation to the degree of consciousness involved in such rejection.

Amongst Asian interviewees from Bury identification and civic pride in the town where they live was almost non-existent. Furthermore, whilst interest in football was apparent, interest in Bury FC was almost universally absent amongst this group. This was evidenced despite the fact that many of these Asian respondents live in close proximity to Bury FC’s Gigg Lane ground. These findings may be thought of as evidencing ‘difference’ (Burdsey, 2007: 153) and suggest that communities in Bury are living separate ‘parallel lives’ (Cantle, 2001: 9). Whilst the spectator patterns at Gigg Lane may support this, on the other hand, such separation is not absolute and some evidence of ‘sameness’ (Burdsey, 2007: 153) was identified with the data identifying ethnically mixed teams playing the game and ethnically mixed groups watching big games on television together. Ultimately, however, in relation to Gigg Lane one may conclude that Bury FC simply do not register with many of these Asian interviewees and that the rejection of spectatorship there is indeed a predominantly unconscious rejection.
The findings differ in relation to the black minority ethnic community in Liverpool and the case study club Everton FC. Amongst these black respondents identification with the City of Liverpool and interest in association football were often, although not universally, identified. Despite that the data indicate that, amongst the first two groups of black interviewees, the majority reject spectatorship at live Everton games. Reasons behind this are discussed elsewhere, but a number of these black respondents had been to Goodison Park and awareness of Everton FC was widespread. With the City of Liverpool being home to two of the most successful club sides in England, in the form of Everton FC and Liverpool FC, this awareness was not surprising. Consequently, amongst this minority ethnic group, conscious rejection of spectatorship and of one of the city’s institutions (i.e. Everton FC) was identified, as per Waddington et al’s suggestion, whereas amongst Asian respondents from Bury rejection of the town / place as a whole was evidenced.

Waddington et al (1999, 20) also maintained that it appears that black and Asian under representation in football crowds may be due to ‘rejection of spectatorship at football matches as a leisure pursuit’. In relation to this concept, data from members of minority ethnic groups were mixed across the settings. Many of the young Asian male respondents from Bury played football and watched matches (albeit via television / computer). Therefore these respondents did not necessarily reject football as a leisure activity. However, supporting Waddington et al’s argument, such rejection was apparent as far as watching their ‘local’ club (Bury FC) play live was concerned. In other words, whilst not rejecting football per se, there was a clear rejection of ‘live’ spectatorship amongst these Asian interviewees. As far as the black
community in the City of Liverpool was concerned respondents similarly evidenced widespread interest in playing football and watching it on television. Furthermore, a number of black respondents, from the first two groups interviewed in Liverpool, had been to a live game(s) at Goodison Park and/or Anfield, although evidence of regular attendance at Goodison amongst the individual members of these groups was virtually non-existent. Overall, for the black respondents from the first two groups of interviewees in Liverpool, rather than rejection of football spectatorship as a leisure pursuit it is other factors (see below) that have led to a lack of identification with Everton and rejection of spectatorship at Goodison Park.

What minority ethnic group members believe is behind rejection of football spectatorship has been ascertained. Having assessed the data compiled from such groups it was evident that fear of racism and fear of violence continue to be identified as factors in rejection of spectatorship. Asian respondents from Bury and members of the black community in Liverpool both indicated that fear had played a part. Amongst black respondents in Liverpool this issue was often raised, with over half of these interviewees citing fear as a key factor in non-attendance at live Everton games. This illustrates that whilst, by most ‘objective’ measures, football grounds are less dangerous places to visit nowadays, perceptions are more difficult and slower to change.

Findings from ethnic minority group members relate to the respective clubs grounds’ Gigg Lane and Goodison Park. Although different in physical size both are old style football grounds and evidence pointed to them being almost exclusively white spaces (Vertinsky, 2004; Gaffney and Bale, 2004) that are unwelcoming places which remain
out of bounds to members of minority ethnic groups (Gaffney and Bale, 2004; Burdsey, 2007). Hence, such grounds are not necessarily the safe, leisure-orientated environments that Bains and Johal (1998: 93) argued have led to a decrease in Asian aversion to football spectatorship. In this regard the fact that football grounds are physical structures of major symbolic significance is relevant. Indeed, with that being the case one can see how grounds and stadiums can generate topophilia amongst those who feel the club belongs to them and on the other hand are likely to generate equivalent levels of topophobia amongst those who don’t. Furthermore, whilst physically such buildings may change, the meanings that individuals may attach to them may not.

These findings, in relation to space and place were particularly striking in Bury’s case since Gigg Lane is situated in an area where many of the Asians in the borough live, but it is a physical structure which few Asians view as part of their community. Bury FC have, since 1977, regularly featured black players in their team, employed a black manager and a black director of football as well as being at the forefront of the development of opportunities for Asian players. Off the field, however, there have been a number of incidents of racist behaviour recorded involving the clubs fans. With such racist incidents one can see how for the ‘outsiders’ (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994) the thought of attending the white space that is Gigg Lane may be associated with fears about racism. Taking a broader view the last decade could actually have increased such fear amongst Asians in Bury. In the post 9/11 and 7/7 climates and the aftermath of the 2001 disorders in Northern England it is argued that Islamophobia is more prevalent, multiculturalism has been rolled back and ‘outsiders’
are increasingly viewed as a threat (Fekete, 2004; Burdsey, 2007a). In turn it has been suggested that football related instances of racism aimed at South Asians have increased in frequency (Millward, 2008; Butt, 2008). Although not specifically referred to by Asian respondents in Bury one can see how such processes may serve to increase feelings of vulnerability and fear of being racially abused at a white space like Gigg Lane.

Whilst Asian attendance at Gigg Lane is rare one may speculate, as evidenced when these Asian respondents told of the mixed ethnicity (white, black and Asian) teams they play in, whether fear is the key driver it seems to be. These playing patterns show that any such fear is not absolute, bringing the concept of group disgrace and Elias and Scotson’s (1994) argument that ‘outsiders’ do not tend to recognise the negative characteristics of more powerful ‘established’ groups to the fore. If that was the case and these interviewees recognised and internalised their own ‘racial otherness’ (Andrews, 1996) this could become more of a barrier than the fear itself. Elias and Scotson’s (1994) work suggests that overcoming group disgrace may be difficult. With the nature and popularity of football one may contend that for a substantial proportion of members of the ‘established’ (white) group in England football spectatorship is part of their ‘group charisma’ (Elias and Scotson, 1994). However, evidencing the complex, multifunctional and context specific nature of minority ethnic group member’s identity, respondents from Bury appear to be choosing which elements of their locality, and the country they live in, they wish to identify with. Specific to these Asians from Bury, playing football is embraced but identification with and watching Bury FC is not. By playing football in mixed teams
these ‘outsiders’ are illustrating that they do not simply accept the group charisma of the ‘established’ and instead of internalising their own ‘group disgrace’ could be said to be active in developing their own ‘we-image’ and resisting the one imposed by the established. As far as football spectatorship at live Bury games is concerned, the data suggest that this is something these respondents would simply not think of doing as a leisure pursuit. With that being the case, as justification for this, these respondents may choose to pick up on a negative aspect of (supposed) behaviour of football supporters (i.e. racism and violence) by way of an explanation for their behaviour.

Black members of the minority ethnic community in Liverpool cited fear of racism and fear of violence as factors in the conscious rejection of spectatorship evidenced amongst the cities black community. For Everton the image of the club remains dominated by the high profile racist incidents of its past. Although accused in some quarters (Vasili, 2000) of institutional racism, more recently Everton FC have employed numerous players of colour and actively implemented anti-racist initiatives, including initiatives aimed at encouraging members of minority ethnic groups to attend Goodison Park. Despite that, when one considers the volume of data detailing racism aimed at some of the black respondents, the idea that ‘Everton are White’ (Hill, 2001: 184; Nicholls, 2002: 149) and that the city’s black community are ‘outsiders’ (Elias and Scotson, 1994) apparently persists amongst some of Everton’s followers. Consequently, Everton’s efforts to encourage minority ethnic groups’ attendance at Goodison Park are being undermined by the racist and violent acts of some of their fans and the fact that the perception of the club as racist persists amongst some members of minority ethnic groups. This, however, does not mean that
the club can be totally exonerated in this regard. Indeed (see below) the fact that club officials do not understand the minority ethnic groups that they are trying to attract is a significant barrier to further change.

Identification and sense of belonging were also identified as factors in conscious rejection. As far as the black interviewees were concerned this was investigated on a local and a national level. On a local level, the trends identified were that sense of belonging and identification with the City of Liverpool predominated (see below also), whereas a sense of belonging with and support for Everton FC were limited (amongst black respondents from the first two groups of interviewees). With Goodison Park being a predominantly white space and in light of the data evidencing that racism has been aimed at a number of black interviewees, some of Everton’s white supporters are asserting that the ground is their place. This finding supports Back et al.’s, (2001: 129) argument that these white fans’ aim is to preserve the ‘white working class audience’ who make up the majority of the crowd at Goodison. On the face of it this would seem to clash with the data from black respondents, from the second and third groups of black interviewees, who identified with and expressed a sense of belonging with the City of Liverpool. Having examined the data from the second group of black respondents it becomes clear that the trend of identification and sense of belonging amongst these interviewees is mainly with Liverpool 8 (Toxteth), where they live and which has a significant black population, more so than with the City as a whole. This, therefore, supports the idea that identity is multifaceted and can be closely linked to place, rather than being fixed or structured due to membership of a minority ethnic group.
Amongst the third group of black respondents from Liverpool, who all have an allegiance to Everton FC, there was an almost universal feeling that the club represents them and for the most part (8 out of 10 respondents) a sense of belonging to the city. Such data in relation to sense of belonging would need further investigation, but may suggest that when links to a football club are made for the individual concerned their sense of civic identity can actually be strengthened.

While they felt represented by the club, amongst the third group of respondents, anecdotal evidence of racism in and around the ground was often detailed and several of these black male Everton supporting interviewees felt that Goodison Park is indeed an unwelcoming place for members of minority ethnic groups. Expanding this idea beyond the stadium a number of respondents amongst this group also argued that the majority of Everton’s fan base comes from the areas immediately around the ground and since these are areas where not many black people live the perception is that Everton are a ‘north end white club’ (Jeff). As far as the City of Liverpool is concerned, as detailed in Chapter 5, the city’s black population is predominantly located in the south of the city in and around the area known by most as Toxteth.

With data identifying Goodison as a predominantly ‘white space’ (Vertinsky, 2004; Gaffney and Bale, 2004) one can see how the fact that it is physically located in a largely white area of the city could increase the feeling amongst members of minority ethnic groups that it is out of bounds to them.

With the city’s two professional football clubs, Everton and Liverpool, both located in the north end of the city (being in very close proximity and just separated from one
another by Stanley Park) the implication that ‘mostly people from minority ethnic communities [in Liverpool] follow Liverpool’ (George) was of interest. This supported the findings from the second group of black respondents, which suggest that Liverpool FC may have been more effective in attracting minority ethnic spectators than Everton. Following further investigation it is evident that while both clubs have in the past been labelled racist perceptions changed quicker at Liverpool than at Everton. Consequently, despite recognition of their recent anti-racist work, the idea persisted amongst a number of black interviewees that ‘Everton are known as a white club’ (Karl), in other words that they are institutionally racist and have racist fans. On the other hand any racist tag that was associated with Liverpool FC was eroded in the late 1980’s, as detailed in Chapter 5, and ‘consequently they are not considered to be racist now or historically’ (Johnson). Against such a backdrop it is perhaps not surprising that Liverpool FC may be attracting more minority ethnic support than Everton.

On a national level, countering previous research (Back et al, 2001), evidence of support for the English national team was widespread amongst black respondents from Liverpool (who formed the second group of interviewees). Having reviewed the data relative to this support the issue of length of association arose. These respondents, as far as their ethnicity is concerned, broadly speaking classed themselves in one of two groups: (i) black British / black Caribbean and (ii) East African. The black British / black Caribbeans interviewed tended to be second, or even third, generation citizens of the City, while the East Africans (predominantly Somalis) tended to be more recent arrivals. Looking at the trends identified in the
data, in relation to support of the English national team, it was evident that black British / black Caribbean respondents were those more likely to have a sense of belonging and identification with the nation. In addition, the black British / black Caribbeans who spoke of supporting England tended to do so unreservedly with their support often linked to their longevity of association with the country. For the East Africans such support appeared to be more transient, being linked to their residency in the country and because England are perceived to have the ‘best’ players, but also due to Somalia not being represented, to date, at major international tournaments. This would suggest that further reflection on the notion of ‘outsider’ and ‘established’ communities is required. Indeed it may be argued that within this ‘outsider’ group, due to their longevity and continuity of association, the attitudes of some of the minority ethnic group members are converging with those of the ‘established’, albeit in relation to the nation if not the locality. In turn this means a case may be made to suggest that the terms ‘outsider’ and ‘established’ need to be reconceived. Ultimately, from the research in Liverpool, the notion of two groups, the ‘established’ (whites) and the ‘outsiders’ (blacks), is too simplistic and seemingly in need of revision.

With the data showing support for England amongst minority ethnic groups the concept that football is a sphere where identities can be forged is enhanced (Burdsey, 2007), as is the idea that ‘sport provides a context in which images of national identity can be expressed and debated’ (Back et al, 2001: 254). Although findings from Liverpool do not suggest that these black respondents have unconditionally embraced Englishness the idea that being black and being English are not compatible does not predominate their thoughts as previous research has suggested (Gilroy, 1987; Back et
Indeed, such findings have led to the suggestion that the notion of being black and English is less culturally exclusive than it used to be. Returning to the group charisma and group disgrace (Elias and Scotson, 1994) concepts this is relevant and further evidence of how the identity of minority ethnic groups is multi-faceted, complex and context specific in nature. Data from the second group of black respondents from Liverpool, predominantly, indicated on the one hand rejection of spectatorship at Everton FC, but on the other widespread evidence of playing football recreationally and on a national level support for the England national team. With support of England these black respondents are effectively making choices that challenge the simplistic notions of identity formation. Hence, one can contend that these respondents are adding to the development of their own ‘we-image’ and in turn that they reject the ‘disgrace’ the established (white) groups attribute to them.

As far as Bury is concerned the concept of there being ‘established’ (white’s) and ‘outsider’ (predominantly Asian) groups was a better fit. Disparity of length of association identified in the black minority ethnic community in Liverpool was not evident in the Asian community in Bury. In terms of identity the idea of British Asians in Bury being ‘outsiders’ is supported by the data, which show that these respondents do not identify with the town or Bury FC and as far as football is concerned have an interest, but choose to support ‘bigger’, more successful, clubs (for example, Manchester United). Relative to football, on a national level, some evidence of support for the English national team was found, but this was certainly not universal with Brazil, Argentina and Holland also cited as teams who have supporters amongst this minority ethnic group. In a similar vein previous research (Bains, 2005;
Burdsey, 2006, 2007) has also evidenced a degree of support for England amongst Asians, although the degree of such support was insufficient to suggest that British Asians have unconditionally embraced ‘Englishness’ (Burdsey, 2007). Overall, therefore, as far as the identity of the Asian respondents from Bury was concerned they tended to have complex identities that are still forming and liable to change, over time, depending on the situation or sport being discussed. This also evidences how people can carve out their own identity and do not necessarily need to be bound by either the place they live, or to which they have family ties.

As well as data compiled from members of minority ethnic groups, findings from interviewees who are involved in inclusion work have been assessed. One of a number of factors to emerge came from several respondents in Bury who were connected to organisations whose work involves fostering inclusion in sport. They maintained that lack of role models is an important issue for British Asians in relation to rejection of football spectatorship. However, data from Asians in Bury indicates that the importance of role modelling has been overstated. Specifically, this finding contradicts the widely held beliefs of some previous research that depends heavily on the importance of role models (Maguire et al, 2001; Garland and Rowe, 2001; Cashmore, 1982; Bains, 2005; Burdsey, 2007). Hence, although role modelling is located in prior research and was cited by a number of interviewees involved in inclusion work, the findings from the minority ethnic interviewees show that in fact rejection of spectatorship is a much more complicated issue than this simple explanation may suggest.
Furthermore, when respondents who work in the field of fostering sporting inclusion stated that role models are a factor in non-attendance there was an implicit assumption that the role models must be like ‘them’ in terms of ‘race’. An example of this came from Philp who claimed that a reason for Asian’s rejection of spectatorship is the ‘lack of role models at professional level or even semi-professional level for members of these groups to identify with’. In other words, with this argument, false, homogenisation of ‘Asian’ into a single identity was evidenced. Also, respondents who argued that Asians need role models from the same grouping to encourage them to become spectators could be said to have strong notions of cultural difference and in turn ‘new racism’ (Carrington and McDonald, 2001: 56; Gilroy, 1987). With such thinking the multiple and complex nature of British Asian identity (Burdsey, 2007; 81), evidence of which was found amongst Asian respondents, is ignored. Ultimately, Asian respondents did not mention lack of role models as an issue in relation to their rejection of spectatorship and even when it was raised with them there was evidence that in terms of the identity of a player who may potentially act as a role model, being a ‘local’ Asian would be more significant than simply being Asian.

Another factor to emerge from those interviewed who work for institutions charged with developing sporting opportunities in Bury was cultural differences. Some prior research supports the contention that cultural differences affect minority ethnic groups’ participation in football (Garland and Rowe, 2001; Maguire et al, 2001; Johal, 2001). Such work has been linked to British Asians by, for example, Maguire et al (2001: 68-69) who identified ‘additional challenges’ that those of Asian Heritage have to overcome, compared to Afro-Caribbeans. By using such ideas a football club
may implicitly seek to absolve themselves from ‘blame’ in relation to the absence of Asian people at their games. Amongst those who consult with the general public in Bury respondents who raised this issue assumed that there is homogeneity amongst British Asians, for example in terms of religion, and having done so put the emphasis on the ‘outsiders’ to change. As far as the Asian interviewees themselves were concerned none of them ascribed to the idea that cultural differences are a factor in non-attendance. It is clear, therefore, that the views of those involved in inclusion work in relation to cultural differences are based on stereotyping and false assumptions of homogeneity.

Ultimately, as far as club ‘officials’ and those who are trying to foster inclusion were concerned, it was shown that there was a lack of understanding of how members of minority ethnic groups interest in football is manifest. Such disparity was evident both in Bury and Liverpool. Various examples of this occurred with one being the categorical denial by Johnson that fear of racism is an issue in conscious rejection of spectatorship despite the data from black respondents indicating that for them is was the ‘dominant’ issue. With the misunderstandings detailed it is clear that those involved in fostering inclusion misconceive this section of their potential ‘clients’ and in turn the nature of the ‘problem’ of non-attendance at live games by members of such groups. That being the case, due to this failure to understand the perspective of minority ethnic groups, it is perhaps not surprising that rejection of spectatorship is still in evidence.
In relation to the theoretical models used during this research Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) theory of established outsider relations has been applied. This appeared to be an appropriate model to use with Mennell (1989: 27), for example, pointing out that Elias has previously indicated how it can ‘be applied to a whole range of social inequalities’ including those between ethnic groups. Indeed, for this work applying the theory of established outsider relations has ultimately, as Bloyce and Murphy (2007: 16) suggest it can be, been ‘illuminating’. One practical example of this concerns the disparity in findings between members of minority ethnic groups and those involved in inclusion work as far as what is perceived to be behind rejection of spectatorship at football grounds is concerned. Data such as this offers support to this ‘established outsider’ theory since it is a concept based on the idea that people come to hold particular subjective views as a consequence of their broader social experiences (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994).

However, as has been argued previously to use this theory effectively one needs to be ‘aware of its limitations’ (Bloyce and Murphy, 2007: 18). This was evidenced with the findings here, which do lead one to question elements of the theory of established outsider relations. One such instance centres on length of association and whether the notion of two distinct groups is too simplistic to cover all situations. In Bury although direct evidence of ‘otherness’ amongst the Asian minority ethnic community was limited one can still see how this group fit the concept of being ‘other’ and predominantly remain ‘outsiders’. However, for the black minority ethnic community in Liverpool the situation was different. As highlighted above, in Liverpool, the notion of two groups was too simplistic. A white (‘established’) group are
identifiable, but the black respondents interviewed are not necessarily ‘outsiders’ and can effectively be subdivided into two groups. As far as the longstanding, continuous black British / black Caribbean community is concerned the evidence points to them moving towards being ‘established’ themselves, whilst the more recently arrived East African (often Somali) members of the black community are still effectively ‘outsiders’. This, therefore, suggests that longevity of association is important.

Having said that one should point out that it is important because it led to different kinds of relational bonds, which in turn fostered a group’s relative power. Ultimately, with evidence of three groups in Liverpool one can suggest that a more fluid conceptualisation is necessary than just subdividing communities into ‘established’ and ‘outsider’ and using racial categories to do so. Consequently, such findings support Mennell’s (1989: 124-5) argument that ‘established’ and ‘outsiders’ lack the dynamism, which Elias sought to develop through his sociological perspective.

Maguire’s (1991b: 32) research into ‘exciting significance’ has also been utilised. Offering, support for this contention the Asians interviewed appear to derive enjoyment and excitement from playing football, but not from watching Bury FC as their inability to identify with the team would not provide them with ‘exciting significance’ (Maguire, 1991b: 32). With lack of interest in Bury FC and the town of Bury, and nothing to suggest that this group of respondents feel represented by the team, it is understandable how this could occur. As far as Liverpool was concerned the situation was somewhat different. Members of the black minority ethnic community derive enjoyment and excitement from playing football. Black respondents from the second group of interviewees had a strong identification with
Toxteth (Liverpool 8) as well as, in most cases, the City of Liverpool. As far as the city’s football clubs were concerned, amongst this group, Liverpool FC drew greater support amongst this group of respondents than Everton FC, although for the small number who do support the later one may suggest that ‘exciting significance’ is in evidence when watching their live games. Subsequently the third group of black respondents from Liverpool, who all had an allegiance to Everton, add weight to this as for them watching Everton did provide them with ‘exciting significance’. However, data from black respondents from Liverpool generally evidenced that spectatorship at Goodison Park was often rejected by members of minority ethnic groups, due to other factors discussed above.

Finally, one can summarise that for Asians in Bury rejection of spectatorship at Bury FC appeared predominantly unconscious. Amongst blacks in Liverpool on the other hand rejection of spectatorship at Goodison Park was conscious. As to whether ethnic minority group members reject football as a leisure activity data was mixed and overall these findings suggest that whilst the work of Waddington et al (1999) was a useful start point it is not necessarily accurate across all settings. Of the factors to emerge as explanations for rejection of spectatorship it was evident that the case study clubs grounds are unwelcoming places and largely white spaces (Vertinsky, 2004; Gaffney and Bale, 2004). Fear of racism and / or violence, were often cited by respondents, but on investigation whether fear is the key driver it seemed to be is questionable. Further investigation showed the ‘outsiders’ to be developing their own ‘we-image’ and attempting to deny the one imposed on them by the ‘established’ (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994). This finding evidenced the complex, multifunctional
and context specific nature of ethnic identities.

Whilst Asians in Bury do not identify with the town, blacks in Liverpool exhibit relatively more identification with the city and sense of belonging. On a national level some evidence of support for the English national team was found amongst Asian ‘outsiders’ (Elias and Scotson, 1965, 1994) although insufficient to suggest that British Asians have unconditionally embraced ‘Englishness’ (Burdsey, 2007). Evidence of support for England was also found amongst blacks from Liverpool. Such support was unconditional from some, but more conditional amongst others, but regardless of its nature suggests that the idea that being black and being English are not compatible does not predominate (Gilroy, 1987; Back et al, 2001).

Respondents whose work involves fostering sporting inclusion spoke of the importance of role models and cultural differences. However, interviews with members of minority ethnic groups contradicted arguments that depend heavily on role models (Maguire et al, 2001; Garland and Rowe, 2001; Cashmore, 1982; Bains, 2005; Burdsey, 2007) and those which suggest that cultural differences are a factor in non-attendance (Garland and Rowe, 2001; Maguire et al, 2001; Johal, 2001). With this disparity in thinking it was evident that the establishment figures did not understand how minority ethnic group members’ interest in football manifests itself.

Usage of Elias and Scotson’s (1965, 1994) theory of established outsider relations was appropriate and illuminating, although the theory has its limitations (Bloyce and Murphy, 2007). This is evidenced, for example, having found that a more fluid
conceptualisation is necessary than the simplistic idea of subdividing communities into ‘established’ and ‘outsider’ and using racial categories to do so. As far as ‘exciting significance’ (Maguire, 1991b) is concerned, as above, findings from Asians in Bury offer support for Maguire’s work. However, data from blacks that support Everton FC seemingly contradict Maguire. Thus we can see that the creation of social identities, and the interrelationship between these identities and football spectatorship are highly context specific. Findings of this nature also provide evidence of the fractured nature of identity. Overall it is possible to conclude, therefore, that a number of factors have played a part as to why (despite significant changes in supporter behaviour in recent years) British minority ethnic groups remain largely absent from the grounds of professional football clubs.
Notes

Notes; For Chapter 1 – Theories of Race and Their Applicability to Sport

1 Banton (1987) categorised theories of race (i.e. attempts to divide human beings into different biological or racial groups) into three main groups: (i) race as lineage, (ii) race as type and (iii) race as a subspecies. (i) Based on biblical teaching race as lineage implies that Biblical events led to human dispersal around the globe and people becoming different due to their migration to different environments. This concept in itself is not racist, but some people felt that if God made people different in order to make them suited to particular areas of the earth (e.g. it was implied that only Africans could work in extreme heat) then they should remain in those areas. From this base, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, some writers began to suggest that certain races were superior to others. Banton, for example, cites English philosopher David Hume (1748) who suggested that the ‘Negroes’ as a race had never developed a major civilisation and were therefore ‘naturally inferior to whites’. (ii) Race as type is based upon the belief that all humans do not share common origin and that humanity is divided into distinct groups. This theory gained in popularity as people of European origin came into closer contact with other groups and saw several writers (Banton picks out, for example, Nott, J.C., Gliddon, G.R. (1854) Types of Mankind) assert that there were distinct biologically different races some of which (i.e. the white races) were superior to others (an idea that Arthur de Gobineau extended to claim superiority of the Aryan race, racial thinking which the Nazi’s subsequently subscribed to), (iii) Combining elements of the two aforementioned theories race as subspecies has its conception in the work of the British biologist Charles Darwin. From his work with animals it was theorised that whilst humans had a common origin they could evolve to form different races.

2 Considering this re-classification of race Garland and Rowe (2001: 51) said it showed that there is a ‘need to theorise the complexity and diversity of the concept of racism and to recognise its contradictory character’. Personally they expressed a preference for the term racialisation and summing up their belief that it is necessary to appreciate the nature and dynamic of heterogeneous racisms state that ‘Writers such as Hall (1992), Small (1994) and Solomons and Back (1996) have stressed the importance of moving away from singular conceptions of racism, which seek to explain it as though it were a unitary coherent phenomenon, and towards an understanding which recognises the plurality of racisms’ (Garland and Rowe, 2001: 51-52). NB: In this Garland and Rowe refer to: (i) Hall, S. (1992) New Ethnicities, In J. Donald and A. Rattansi (eds) ’Race’, Culture and Difference, London: Sage, pp.253-259, (ii) Small, S. (1994) Racialised Barriers: The Black Experience in the United States and England in the 1980s. London: Routledge, and (iii) Solomos, J. and Back, L. (1996) Racism and Society, London: Macmillan.
Wilson & Herrnstein’s (1985) research included consideration of racial variations in violent crime rates and borrowed from W.H. Sheldon et al’s (1940) classification of somatotypes. Sheldon et al (1940) described three basic body types, which are the extremes of their group, in the following way; (i) Endomorph – the obese individual whose most conspicuous feature is body fat, (ii) Mesomorph – the muscular athletic type who has a predominance of bone, muscle and connective tissue, and (iii) Ectomorph – the tall lean individual whose body surface area predominates over the body mass. Sheldon et al also provided a, debateable, linkage that identified the athletic, predominantly muscular mesomorph as the body type with a greater propensity for aggressive violent, criminal behaviour. For their part Wilson & Herrnstein (1985) racialised this linkage by implying that there is a correlation between the African American male and the mesomorph somatotype, to stigmatise the African American male as being pathologically aggressive, violent and criminal. In brief, Wilson and Herrnstein’s theory hinged on a relationship between biological characteristics and violent behaviour and led them to identify people of colour as being significantly more likely to commit violent acts than white people.


Reagan came to signify the ‘hard body’ ideology of the hypermasculine, assertive, decisive, and aggressive cultural politics to which he gave his name. This political identity was strategically formulated in contrast to the passive, weak and indecisive ‘soft body’ politics embodied by Jimmy Carter, whose regime was deemed responsible for plunging America into political, economic, military, and moral decline. Adopting this train of thought (that is marked by race and gender) the soft body invariably belonged to a female and / or person of colour, whereas the hard body was, like Reagan’s own, male and white (Jeffords, 1994: 24-25, Andrews, 1996: 130).

This being based on the concept that whilst different ethnic groups or races may not exist in hierarchical biological relationships, they are culturally distinct, and therefore have incompatible lifestyles, customs and ways of seeing the world. If that is the case Carrington and McDonald (2001: 1) citing Enoch Powell (1968) maintain, then mixing cultures would ‘inevitably’ lead to ‘race riots’ and ‘rivers of blood’.

Developing this train of thought Andrews (1996) points to the fact that those who champion black civil rights (such as Reverend Al Sharpton, Minister Louis Farrakhan and Reverend Jesses Jackson) are often said to have ‘chips on their shoulders’. If a list of black male sports stars with ‘chips on their shoulders’ was made (as far as the perception of the general public is concerned) it would probably include: Muhammad Ali, John Carlos and possibly Linford Christie. Similarly, Hill (2001) identified a less celebrated black sportsman (namely, footballer Howard Gayle, who in 1977 became the first black player to sign professional forms with Liverpool FC) who admitted that he resolved to confront hostility. Hill reports that as a consequence of this Gayle was said, by a number of ex-players and onlookers to have ‘had a chip on his shoulder’ and ‘He was a bit, you know, black power’ (Hill, 2001: 130).
7 Park laid down in principle the following cycle of ethnic relations: contact, conflict, accommodation and assimilation.

8 To come to this conclusion in relation to materialist theories Birrell considered the research of: Acuna (1981), Almaguer (1975), Barrera (1979), Miles (1984) and Staples (1973).

9 Birrell gives as examples the research done by Hoch (1972) and Edwards (1969).

10 Although terming this subordination as ‘total’ is perhaps somewhat extreme ultimately it does not detract from the point that Birrell makes.

11 Birrell (1999) speculates whether sport was constructed in a way that meant it could not serve resistant ends? Or whether sporting activities of slaves were not comprehended as sport within dominant definitions? Another possibility, that Birrell does not mention, is that this has occurred due to a bias against sport as an area for serious sociological study?

12 Other researchers (for example: Carrington and McDonald) have been somewhat critical of Dunning for not drawing empirical evidence from the United Kingdom to supplement his findings in relation to the United States.

13 This type of bonding being close to an ideal type of mechanical bonding.

14 This theory is linked in particular to Elias’s (1978) concept of power as a figurationally generated property of social interdependencies and his theory of ‘functional democratisation’ (Dunning, 1999).

15 While similarities exist between Dunning and Bourdieu in this respect ultimately Dunning would contend that Bourdieu; cannot escape the pitfalls of economic determinism.

16 In order to move towards a more complete explanation of why this desegregation has occurred, in America, Dunning believes that one needs to ‘contextualise the growing desegregation of top-level American sports in relation to the wider development of race relations’ (Dunning, 1999: 212).

Notes; For Chapter 2 – Prior Research into and applicable to - Race and Association Football:

1 For example: The 1991 Census indicates the following ethnic breakdown of population of Britain: 94.5 per cent white; 1.6 per cent black; 2.7 per cent Asian, and 1.2 per cent Chinese and ‘other’ (Garland and Rowe, 1999). Results from the 2001 census indicate an increase in the minority ethnic population of the United Kingdom since the 1991 census. In 2001, 92.1 per cent of the population identified themselves as being white. Consequently the minority ethnic population in 2001 was 7.9 per cent (approximately 4.6 million people). This census was more extensive in terms of answer categories in the ethnicity section (compared to 1991) and in terms of the breakdown of the minority ethnic population results were as follows: (i) Asian or Asian British: Indian 1.8 per cent, Pakistani 1.3 per cent, Bangladeshi 0.5 per cent, Other Asian 0.4 per cent, (ii) Black or Black British: Black Caribbean 1.0 per cent, Black African 0.8 per cent, Black Other 0.2 per cent, (iii) Chinese 0.4 per cent, (iv) Other 0.4 per cent (www.statistics.gov.uk/cci)

2 Specifically, Maguire (1991a) identified black players: ‘over’ representation in forward positions and ‘under’ representation in defensive and ‘central’ positions in British football.

3 Fulham Ladies became the first professional women’s team in Europe at the start of season 2000-2001. At / around that time other teams in the women’s National Division, such as Arsenal Ladies, had a number of semi-professional players. In May 2006 Fulham FC withdrew funding from Fulham Ladies, who after a struggle did continue, but are no longer professional and are now called Fulham Women FC. This (withdrawal of financial support from the professional men’s team for the women’s team who play under their name) occurred at several women’s teams and led to a downturn in professional female players in England.
Burdsey claims that Baichung Bhutia (see also Bury Case Study Chapter) may be an exception as young British Asians may have heard of Bhutia, with him having played in England. However, he adds that the young British Asians he encountered in his research ‘had little knowledge about, or interest in, football in South Asia, and although there was a degree of curiosity about the Bangladesh, India and Pakistan teams, there was no evidence of actual support’ (Burdsey, 2006: 21-22). Adding to this Burdsey notes that this may help explain the indifference shown by many British Asians to visits to Britain by the national teams of India, Bangladesh and Pakistan. In support of this contention Burdsey (2006: 26) details the attendances of most of the games these countries have played in recent years in England. These do not need detailing here although with reference to a subsequent Chapter it is interesting that he notes that 1292 fans saw Bury play Pakistan at Gigg Lane in 2000. Specifically he claims that, the number of British Asians attending most of these matches were very low, especially considering that most of these games were held at clubs based in areas with high British Asian populations. Consequently, these visits to England by the aforementioned national teams do not appear to have forged any significant footballing links between subcontinental and diasporic South Asians.

NB: Having attended the aforementioned Bury versus Pakistan game personally, one would agree with Burdsey’s suggestion that the number of British Asians at this game was very low.

Explaining this more fully Burdsey (2006: 23) says that for young British Asians, cricket involves images of their own or their ancestors’ homes and their lives before migration, and thus supporting a sub-continental nation in the global sport arena facilitates an imagined connection with ‘the old country’. In contrast football is equated with their own residence in England and, in this regard, supporting the national team acts as an arena where the permanency of settlement, and the associated implications for the construction of identity, can be emphasised. These differing affiliations have seen questions raised about the cultures of British Asians. Anwar (1998) however, maintains that the fact that their interests, affiliations and identities differ in relation to football and cricket should not be seen as verification of what he believes to be an erroneous popular belief that young British Asians are ‘caught between two cultures’

Burdsey (2006, 25) specifically notes that ‘the fact that increasing numbers of British Asians are affirming their support for the England national football team does not mean that notions of ‘Englishness’ are no longer problematic or offensive, or that they are necessarily granted inclusion in ‘mainstream’ (predominantly white) fan collectsives’.

Providing examples; Burdsey (2006) points to the Union flag and its appropriation by far right extremists; songs and chants such as Rule Britannia and No Surrender to the IRA, which celebrate / support British imperialism (past and present); and the iterative I’d rather be a Paki than a Turk chant.
From his survey of clubs other factors that emerged as possible reasons for non-attendance by black and Asian fans at matches included (with the percentage of clubs who agreed to this view given in brackets): cost of attending live football matches (33 per cent), they are not interested in this club (27 per cent), they like other sports (24 per cent), they have concerns over hooliganism (15 per cent), they prefer to watch football on television (10 per cent). Of the rest 7 per cent had no idea why they did not come and 24 per cent had no local minorities. N.B. In relation to the cost of attending live football matches. When the Premier League started (season 1992-1993) clubs wanted to attract a wider (more affluent) audience. Garland and Rowe (1996: 125) have speculated as to whether this disadvantages fans from minority ethnic groups because ‘Supporters from minority ethnic groups who experience broader socio-economic disadvantages may be marginalized by commercialisation (and increasing ticket prices) and actually be less likely to attend games. Thus football may find itself with a relatively minor problem of racism but still attract an overwhelmingly white audience.’

Indeed, Garland and Rowe (1996: 112) provide evidence to suggest that ‘the level of overt racism in football has declined in recent years’. By overt racism they mean: racist chanting, throwing objects at black players and campaigning by far right groups. Findings of the 1993-1994 ‘Carling Premiership Fans Survey’ found evidence of reduced levels of racist abuse, thereby supporting this contention. Other than anti-racist campaigns several factors are claimed to have had an influence in this apparent decline including: the influence of almost exclusively anti-racist fanzines, legislation making prosecuting people for racist acts in stadiums easier, physical changes in grounds (especially since the 1989 Hillsborough disaster and subsequent Taylor report) having changed the atmosphere inside stadiums making it ‘more civilised’ (Carter, 2005: 9), a decline in racism in society and the increase in the number of black professional players.

NB: At Hillsborough stadium on (15th April 1989) Liverpool played Nottingham Forest in an FA Cup Semi-Final. Ninety-six fans situated at the Leppings Lane End of the ground (occupied predominantly by Liverpool fans) died as a result of a crush in that end. An investigation followed and the Taylor Report was produced. When recommendations made in the report were subsequently implemented many Football Stadiums changed beyond recognition, whilst numerous other clubs gave up their old stadiums to move into new purpose built ones that are predominantly all-seater.

For example, after England’s black players were racially abused by large sections of the crowd during a friendly against Spain, in Madrid, 17th November 2004.
‘Let’s Kick Racism out of Football’ was taken over by the multi-agency body AGARI (Advisory Group Against Racism and Intimidation, made up of all of the game’s main official bodies as well as supporters’ groups and local authority representatives) (Garland and Rowe, 1996). They identified racism alongside broader concerns with ‘intimidatory’ behaviour and under the campaign banner ‘Respect All Fans and Let’s Kick Racism’ held a launch on the 28th September 1995 (Back et al., 2001: 194). Reflecting criticisms of this campaign, when KIO took over (1997) they involved all of the game’s key agencies and aimed to: do development work with professional clubs, particularly those in the lower leagues; address the marginalisation of Asians; develop grassroots initiatives; produce educational materials; increase the involvement of minority ethnic communities in their local clubs; and highlight racism in European football (KIO, 1998).

In London on July 7th 2005 Muslim suicide bombers detonated 4 explosives on public transport vehicles, and a further 4 were thwarted. These incidents killed 52 civilians and injured a further 770 people (www.news.bbc.co.uk).

As evidenced by the growth of the EFL (English Defence League), a far right grouping aimed at combating the “Islamification” of British cities. Of the EDL Jon Crudas (Labour MP for Dagenham) has stated; ‘The EDL is much bigger than the BNP. Its provocative marches, “flash demos” and pickets are designed to whip up divisions between communities and provoke a violent reaction from young British Muslims. Followers of the EDL genuinely believe they are “defending” their Britain against the threat of Islam. What makes the EDL much more dangerous [than the BNP] is how it reflects a wider political and cultural war. Across western Europe right-wing populist parties are achieving huge electoral success on the same anti-Islam platform’ (cited in Townsend, 2010: 15).

At which the Football Association met with delegates from the Metropolitan police, the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the National Association of Muslim Police.

Gaffney and Bale (2004) consider the traditional five senses (sight, smell, sound, touch and taste), but have expanded beyond these as they believe that the way we experience, interpret and react to the world necessitate much more. That being the case they also, for example, consider the senses of humour, timing, rhythm, place and space, etc that they believe are all part of the stadium experience.

Gaffney and Bale (2004: 35) additionally state that; ‘To a large extent the collective energies, dreams, and aspirations of large segments of the population are posited and deposited in the stadium’ and that ‘It is the collected history of the place that implies a much deeper and specific meaning for thousands upon thousands of individuals’.
Notes; For Chapter 3 – Research Methods and Issues

1 Half of the total minority ethnic population were Asians of Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or other Asian origin. A quarter of minority ethnic people described themselves as Black (i.e. Black Caribbean, Black African or Other Black). Fifteen per cent of the minority ethnic population described their ethnic group as Mixed (with about a third of this group from White and Black Caribbean backgrounds). The remaining minority ethnic groups each accounted for less than 0.5 per cent of the population (i.e. Other Asian 0.4 per cent, Black Other 0.2, Chinese 0.4, Other 0.4) although combined these represent 1.4 per cent of the UK population (www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001).

2 Figures from the 2001 census suggest that there were 43,000 Somalis in the UK. Doubt has been thrown on the accuracy of this figure with ‘other experts suggesting at least 95,000 and as many as 250,000 [Somalis may be living in the UK]’. While their exact numbers seem to be in doubt it appears that they do now ‘represent one of the largest ethnicities’ in Britain (Casciani, D (2006) Somalis’ struggle in the UK, BBC News community affairs, www.news.bbc.co.uk 30th May 2006).

3 Figures from the 2001 census (www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001) indicate that 1.3 per cent of the population of the City of Liverpool are Asian, which is broken down as follows: Asian or Asian British: Indian (1,909 people) 0.4 per cent; Asian or Asian British: Pakistani (1,050 people) 0.2 per cent; Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi (557 people) 0.1 per cent; Asian or Asian British: Other Asian (1,303 people) 0.3 per cent; Mixed: White and Asian (1,352 people) 0.3 per cent – Total (6,171 people) 1.3 per cent of total population of Liverpool. (NB: The Black minority ethnic community is the biggest in Liverpool (2.2 per cent), with the second largest being the Chinese community (6,844 people; 1.6 per cent of total population) then the Asian community (1.3 per cent), with the rest being made up of Mixed: Other Mixed (2,040 people, 0.5 per cent)).

4 Other parts of England do have larger (in terms of percentages and numbers of people) Asian communities than the North West. For example, as Bradbury (2001) indicates (although he refers to the 1991 census for these figures not the 2001 census): Fifty four per cent of Britain’s Bangladeshi population live in Greater London and another twelve per cent in the West Midlands; Pakistanis are concentrated in the West Midlands (twenty one per cent of the British Pakistani population) and Yorkshire and Humberside (twenty per cent); whilst Indians have settled mainly in the South of England, including London (fifty three per cent), and the Midlands (thirty per cent). Despite these figures the North West has a number of locations with significant Asian minority ethnic communities and concentrating on one part of the country contributes to the continuity of my research.

5 B.M.F.D.G. have as the first aim on their list: ‘To provide access to football to all, irrespective of age, gender, religion, race or disability’. Robin Philp is Chairman of this group with Stephen Raynor being Vice Chairman. Philp spoke to Raynor to encourage him to get involved in this research.
Forever Bury was formed when, due to a ‘cash crisis’, Bury Football Club went into administration during March 2002 and their initial aim was to raise funds to help save the football club (www.foreverbury.org/society/background). Ultimately Forever Bury’s ‘Save Our Shakers’ campaign was a success and the club did get out of administration. As a consequence of this chain of events, Forever Bury became one of Bury FC’s major shareholders and secured a seat on the club’s board. Sixty four year old Margaret Ladkin is presently the supporters trust representative on the Bury FC board (www.foreverbury.org as of June 2006), although her influence and that of Forever Bury is debateable. Forever Bury currently have 486 members that own 305,281 Bury FC shares (www.foreverbury.org/latestnews as of March 2007).

Johnson remains involved in such schemes (free ticket distribution), but also has a remit to try and get businesses, from minority ethnic groups in the city, involved with Everton FC. This work takes up a lot of his time and is aimed at changing the image of the club to business people from local minority ethnic groups. For example, Johnson tries to get businesses / business people to have adverts on pitch-side hoardings at Goodison Park in an effort to show a more diverse / inclusive image of the club.

Everton Football in the Community (EFITC) have (since 1st June 2004) operated as a financially independent, registered charitable company. In others words, EFITC is completely financially independent of Everton Football Club. However, Everton FC are EFITC’s main sponsor and provide them with substantial non-financial support. In terms of it’s make up EFITC is governed by a board of trustees that is made up of a balance between Everton FC officials and local independent non-Everton staff. Everton Football in the Community state that their vision is ‘To motivate, educate and inspire by harnessing the power of football and sport, improving the quality of the lives of all within our community, locally and regionally.’ In terms of staff EFITC run a number of partnership schemes and projects in conjunction with other organisations and consequently do not directly employ a large number of staff (www.evertonfc.com/community).
Notes; For Chapter 4 – Bury Case Study:

1 Apart from paper manufacture, other industries in Bury include: tourism (centred around Bury’s three times a week ‘World famous market’), heavy and light engineering, woollen and worsted manufacture, chemicals, spinning, textile finishing, luggage making, carpet manufacture, rubber, plastics, confectionary and greetings cards (www.bury.gov.uk).

2 This growth reflected the national situation. Nationally the statistics show that the minority ethnic population in 2001 was 7.9 per cent (4,635,296 people) of the total population (58,789,194) of the United Kingdom. In size order, of the minority ethnic groups: Indians were the largest (1,053,411, 1.8 per cent of the total population), followed by Pakistanis (747,285, 1.3 per cent), those of mixed ethnic backgrounds (677,117, 1.2 per cent), Black Caribbean’s (565,876, 1.0 per cent), Black Africans (485,277, 0.8 per cent) and Bangladeshhi’s (283,063, 0.5 per cent). Remaining minority ethnic groups (Chinese, Other Asian, Black Other, Other) each accounted for less than 0.5 per cent of the population, although combined did account for 1.4 per cent of the UK population. In Great Britain the minority ethnic population grew by 53 per cent between 1991 and 2001 (from 3.0 million to 4.6 million in 2001). Half of the total minority ethnic population were Asians of Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or other Asian origin, whilst a quarter of minority ethnic people described themselves as Black (i.e. Black Caribbean, Black African or Other black) (www.statistics.gov.uk).

3 Bury FC spent seventeen consecutive seasons in the top Division in England (before relegation at the end of season 1911-1912). During their time playing in Division One Bury’s highest placing was 5th (1900-1901), but in both 1900 and 1903 the club secured what remains its greatest achievement by winning the FA Cup twice within the space of three years. NB: In season 1925-1926, Bury FC finished 4th in Division One (their highest League placing ever). Cullen (1999: 52) claims that ‘the 1925-26 season remains the pinnacle of Bury Football Club’s success’.

4 Cullen (1999) in his Official History of Bury FC provides team pictures for just about every season from the club’s inception until season 1998-1999 (from 1977 up to and including season 1998-1999 a squad picture is included for every season). Following a visual inspection of these team pictures from 1977 onwards one has been able to identify the following black players who have played for Bury Football Club since Steve Johnson (who scored more than fifty League goals for Bury in excess of one hundred and fifty League games): Winnie White, Tony Cunningham, Roger Stanislaus, Ronnie Mauge, Paul Robertson, Dave Jones, Lennie Johnrose, David Adekola, Tony Kelly, David Johnson, Andy Gray, Laurent D’Jaffo, Andy Preece, Paul Williams, Chris Billy, Adrian Littlejohn, Lutel James. From 1977 to season 1998-1999 Bury may have used other black players (especially since the club has utilised a number of loan players), but the above list is, as highlighted, from visual assessment of the team photographs in Cullen (1999) for the period stated. Since then Bury have used other black players including: Colin Kazim-Richards, Simon Whaley, Ricky Shakes, Dwayne Mattis, Jake Speight, Ricky Anane, Domaine Rouse, Efetobore Sodje, Lenell John-Lewis, Kyle Bennett, Damien Mozika, Andrai Jones,
Continued: Nicholas Ajose and loan signings including Lewis Gobern, Tony Bedeau and Elliot Bennett. As far as Asian players to have played for Bury are concerned there has been Baichung Bhutia (Signed in October 1999, but not on the team picture in Cullen (1999) as it was no doubt taken at the start of 1998-1999 season, before he joined) and Harpal Singh (2 loan spells). In addition local young (originally from Bolton, born 17th December 1991) British Asian Krishnan Patel was offered a (year long) professional contract with Bury FC that commenced at the start of season 2009-2010. Patel was subsequently retained for season 2010-2011, but released at the end of that season without having made an appearance Bury’s first team.

Alexander was appointed director of football with Chris Casper retained as first team manager of Bury. NB: Alexander and Casper after a run of poor results were sacked by Bury on January 14th 2008. Chris Brass took charge in a caretaker capacity, until Alan Knill was appointed (4th February 2008). Knill took charge until resigning (31st March 2011) to become manger of Scunthorpe United). Assistant manager Chris Brass moved, to Scunthorpe, with Knill so on 1st April 2011 Richie Baker was promoted from Youth Team Manager to Caretaker Manager of Bury’s first team. Subsequently, after helping Bury secure promotion Baker was appointed first team manager on a permanent basis on 1st June 2011.

In brief the ‘additional challenges’ Maguire et al (2001: 68-69) identified (from reviewing literature / prior research) that they believe those of Asian Heritage have to overcome, compared to Afro-Caribbean's, if they are going to break into professional football are: (i) Lack of role models, (ii) Asian Heritage players being perceived as lacking the talent (e.g. compared to Afro-Caribbean's) and being physically and culturally unsuited (stereotyped as frail, lacking in stamina), (iii) Little encouragement from school (especially re football), (iv) Asian families effectively discourage their children to participate in sport, (v) Cultural and religious differences.

Specifically, Maguire et al (2001) spoke to club youth and community development officers 71 per cent of whom believed cultural factors, particularly parental attitudes and influences, are a barrier to Asian players breaking through. Of the Asian heritage males they surveyed 45 per cent agreed and 12.5 per cent strongly agreed, that certain cultural constraints and restrictions might hold back their progress (i.e. less in percentage terms than the club employees).
Senior black politician Lady Amos (White, 2004) said ‘It depresses me that people still give credit to the Tebbit test, not least because it’s an incredibly un-British test to make. Un-British because it can’t get past the colour of someone’s skin’. Amos argued that ‘Amir’s boxing test’ would be a more positive model, based on the Olympic silver medallists argument that ‘I’m Asian, but I’m British – I was born here, I went to school here, all my mates are British, and I am proud to represent my country’.

Norman Tebbit’s ‘cricket test’ related to support amongst British Asians for the cricket teams of Pakistan, India and Bangladesh rather than England. On this issue Tebbit, April 1990, stated ‘Which side do they cheer for? It is an interesting test. Are you still harking back to where you came from or where you are? I think we have got real problems in this regard’. Garland and Rowe (2001) note that many of the British Asians supporting these countries cricket teams at that time were quoted (for example in Read, T. (1999) ‘English Cricket Fans Have Team to Support’, The Times, 5 June 1999, p7) as being only to happy to fail Tebbit’s ‘test’. Hence, Garland and Rowe (2001: 112) maintain, ‘for Tebbit and others not just of the political right, to be English is to identify with, and assimilate into, the dominant white culture’, whilst for many British Asians Cricket ‘offered the opportunity to affirm and display their own cultural and sporting identities’.

---

8 Senior black politician Lady Amos (White, 2004) said ‘It depresses me that people still give credit to the Tebbit test, not least because it’s an incredibly un-British test to make. Un-British because it can’t get past the colour of someone’s skin’. Amos argued that ‘Amir’s boxing test’ would be a more positive model, based on the Olympic silver medallists argument that ‘I’m Asian, but I’m British – I was born here, I went to school here, all my mates are British, and I am proud to represent my country’.

Norman Tebbit’s ‘cricket test’ related to support amongst British Asians for the cricket teams of Pakistan, India and Bangladesh rather than England. On this issue Tebbit, April 1990, stated ‘Which side do they cheer for? It is an interesting test. Are you still harking back to where you came from or where you are? I think we have got real problems in this regard’. Garland and Rowe (2001) note that many of the British Asians supporting these countries cricket teams at that time were quoted (for example in Read, T. (1999) ‘English Cricket Fans Have Team to Support’, The Times, 5 June 1999, p7) as being only to happy to fail Tebbit’s ‘test’. Hence, Garland and Rowe (2001: 112) maintain, ‘for Tebbit and others not just of the political right, to be English is to identify with, and assimilate into, the dominant white culture’, whilst for many British Asians Cricket ‘offered the opportunity to affirm and display their own cultural and sporting identities’.

---
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Notes; For Chapter 5 – The City of Liverpool / Everton Football Club Case Study:

1 Comprising: 1,083 Black or Black British – Caribbean people; 3,071 Black or Black British – African people and 1,223 Black or Black British – Other Black people.

2 Comprising; 2,308 Mixed, White and Black Caribbean and 2,207 Mixed, White and Black African. NB: This Mixed Group in its entirety accounted for 1.80 per cent of the population of Liverpool, 7,907 people.

3 Due to an increase in the number of groupings for ethnicity figures between the 1991 and 2001 Census care must be taken when comparing results. In 1991 the Census gave data relating to ten different ethnic groups whilst the 2001 Census provided 16 different black minority ethnic groups. This increase in groupings is largely due to the introduction of the mixed race categories in 2001. As a result any comparison between the 1991 and 2001 census’ ethnicity figures should bear this difference in mind.

4 When this move to Goodison Park occurred (during which Everton became a limited company) a remnant of the club stayed at Anfield. At first it looked like two Everton’s would exist, but the Football Association ordered that the majority who had moved to Goodison should be allowed to keep the name Everton. Those who remained at Anfield formed Liverpool Football Club.

5 Trebilcock’s Everton career was short (14 appearances) but did include the 1966 FA Cup Final in which he scored twice to help Everton win the cup. Marshall’s Everton career was also short (7 starts) before being released in September 1976. Marshall failed to make a major impact and speculating as to why this was the case Hill (2001, 149) notes: ‘Some say that Marshall had all the skill but lacked competitive will. Others say that his spirit was so sapped by intimidation from crowds and opposing players that he was emptied of the desire to play’.

6 Amokachi was the next player of colour to play for Everton after Marshall, making him the fourth on a list that by December 2009 had extended to 34. Since, Amokachi there has been: Earl Barrett, Terry Phelan, Danny Cadamarteri, John O’Kane, Ibrahima Bakayoko, Kevin Campbell, Olivier Dacourt, Abel Xavier, Alex Nyarko, Li Tie, Li Wei Feng, Joseph Yobo, Marcus Bent, Tim Cahill, James Vaughan, Matteo Ferrari, Victor Anichebe, Tim Howard, Joleon Lescott, Aiyegbeni Yakubu, Anderson Da Silva, Manuel Fernandes, Steven Pienaar, Marouanne Fellaini, Segundo Castillo, Jack Rodwell, Louis Saha, Jo Alves, Sylvain Distin and Kieran Agard.
For example; during the 1980’s Alex Williams (one of the first black goalkeepers to play in the English top division he played for Manchester City between 1981 and 1985) was playing for Manchester City at Goodison Park and was making his way towards his goal when an Everton fan climbed the, pitch-side, barrier with a Ku Klux Klan type of burning cross made from rolled up programmes (Hill, 2001; Nicholls, 2002). Of this Williams states ‘I can laugh about in now but at the time I was pretty shocked’ (Williams, 2006 in This Life part of Extra Time article in Observer Sport section 12th November 2006). This was perpetrated by one individual, but in general terms, talking about racism one Everton fan / hooligan states, ‘In the Seventies and Eighties, if you were anything other than white you could be in for a rough ride when you came to Goodison. It didn’t matter if you were a player or fan, you got shit, and plenty of it’ (Nicholls, 2002, 147).

Howard Gayle was the first black player to play for Liverpool (his debut came during October 1980), although he only featured in 5 first team games for them. In June 1987, the face of football on Merseyside changed when Liverpool signed, black forward, John Barnes from Watford. Barnes played for Liverpool in his first Merseyside ‘derby’, against Everton, on the evening of 28th October 1987 in a League Cup tie at Anfield. During the game Barnes, it seems, was; ‘vehemently booed’ (Hill, 2001: 183) whenever he touched the ball, was spat at (Hill, 2001), had bananas thrown at him (Hill, 2001: 184) and Everton fans also reportedly chanted ‘Everton are White’ and ‘Niggerpool’ (Hill, 2001: 183-184; Nicholls, 2002: 149). Barnes was racially abused by Everton fans on subsequent occasions although his first appearance in a Merseyside ‘derby’ would seem to have been the most extreme in terms of the abuse he received. Numbers actually involved in this abuse are the subject of some debate ranging from it being an anti-social minority a ‘lunatic fringe’ (as claimed by the club’s Chairmen at the time - Philip Carter of Everton and Peter Robinson of Liverpool - and reported by Hill, 2001: 189) or a much more significant number of Everton’s fans (Nicholls, 2002; Hill, 2001). Specifically, Hill (2001, 183) claims it was perpetrated by a ‘substantial section’ of Everton fans, whilst Nicholls (2002, 149) says ‘Minority, bollocks, about ninety percent of Evertonians were at it [racially abusing Barnes] that night’.

This speculation, of racist abuse from Everton fans, related to a pre-season friendly (Saturday 15th July 2006) at Gigg Lane. An internet site’s (www.y3kshakers.co.uk) message board carried postings relating to two incidents of racial abuse by Everton fans. In the first of these it was claimed that a group of Everton fans had surrounded a black person and shouted racist chants at him. The second incident apparently involved twenty Everton fans surrounding a car that had three black people in it and aiming racist chants at them.
As part of an open ‘Travel Club message’ in Everton’s official match-day programme for the first competitive home game of the 2006-2007 season (19th August 2006) Keith Wyness (the club’s Chief Executive) said that in relation to racism: ‘Recent events have made us re-dedicate our efforts in this area and I write to confirm that should any official Travel Club member engage in or become associated with racism of any nature then their membership of the Travel Club will be withdrawn and further action will be taken including possible exclusion from Goodison Park’ (Wyness, 2006: 53).

Four days after the League Cup tie (at Anfield on 28th October 1987) Everton returned to Anfield (1st November 1987) for a League game. Barnes treatment by the Everton fans in the League Cup game drew widespread condemnation and led Everton Chairman Philip Carter to call the behaviour of those Everton fan’s involved (who he called a few hundred senseless people) ‘deplorable’ and he hoped that it would not be repeated at this League game (Hill, 2001, 186). At the League game Barnes did apparently get more of the same treatment from the Everton fans (Nicholls, 2002), although Hill (2001, 188) claims that this time ‘The racist chanting petered out’. In a, unconvincing, attempt to pass off the racial abuse of Barnes by Everton fans as the behaviour of a minority Hill (2001, 190) indicates that another approach was to try and defuse the racial offence of what had occurred by putting it down to Mersey wit, a particularly corrosive sense of comedy. 

NB: These two games (the League Cup tie and the League game four days later) seem to be when the racism aimed at Barnes by Everton fans was at its zenith. Barnes did have racist abuse aimed at him in subsequent encounters, but over time it appears to have diminished. Hill (2001) claims there was much fall-out from the first two meetings between two sides. By this he means, the production and sale of ‘Everton Are White’ and ‘Everton Are White – Defend the Race’ button badges and various rumours / stories. An example of this is the claim that before the second game (at Anfield, 1st November 1987) Everton fans tried to smuggle a live monkey into the ground (Hill, 2001) a story about which I tend to agree with Nicholls (2002) who thinks it is a myth.

With the signing of Daniel Amokachi, as mentioned elsewhere, Everton were employing their first player of colour for nineteen years. Publicly the club passed this off as though it was not a problem, although they did apparently have some complaints and even season tickets returned (the exact number of these is impossible to establish). Whilst waiting for clearance to play Amokachi was paraded before the crowd at Goodison Park prior to a game (30th August 1994) at which point a fan got onto the pitch and was heading for Amokachi. Nicholls (2002, 151) maintains that this was because he was protesting against a black player joining Everton and states that ‘one of the lads ran onto the pitch to try and attack him when he was paraded to the fans on the day he signed’. In relation to this incident my memory is similar to that of Nicholls’ about it and the intentions of the individual involved. Indeed, at the time the signing of Amokachi brought the issue of Everton FC being a racist club to the fore. In response to this accusation Peter Johnson (Everton chairman at that time) said ‘I do not think colour matters, as long as he can play football’ (in Gibson, 31st August 1994, p34). Similarly, the Everton manager, who at the time was,
Mike Walker (picking up on Everton’s local rivalry with Liverpool Football Club who traditionally wear red) stated ‘at this club we don’t care what colour players are. They can be blue, green or red as far as I’m concerned…. Well, perhaps we might draw the line at red!’ (in Prentice, 3rd September 1994, p17). Journalist Dave Prentice (3rd September 1994, p17) claimed that with Amokachi’s signing Everton were ‘laying to rest the myth about racism at the club’. Prentice may have been of the opinion that racism at the club was a myth, but not everyone was. In relation to the signing of Amokachi, John Fashanu (in Prentice, 30th August 1994b, p42) was reported as having ‘applauded Mike Walker for ending what he believed was a colour bar at Everton – and suggested former boss Howard Kendall perpetuated the problem’. Indeed, Fashanu spoke of the ‘racist reputation a certain element had given the club [Everton]’ and claimed ‘Kendall and his predecessors did very little to nip the racist problem in the bud’ (in Prentice, 30th August 1994b, p42). On the face of it this appears harsh on Kendall who, as highlighted elsewhere, quit as Everton manager (during the second of his three spells as manager) in December 1993 ‘after the board refused to back his purchase of [black] striker Dion Dublin’ (Powter, 2002: 71).

NB: At the end of season 1994-1995 (despite having Amokachi in the squad) incidents of racism involving Everton fans occurred which prompted the club to issue a leaflet (a copy of which, received by myself at the time, is in my programme / memorabilia collection) to them in the build up to the 1995 Cup Final. This urged people to report incidents of racism to Stewards or Police to assist in stamping out ‘this antisocial behaviour’ and to help ‘uphold the good name of Everton Football Club’. On this leaflet Everton state: ‘We have had several complaints from you regarding the increase in obscene chanting and racial chanting from our own supporters. This is clearly not acceptable to you and certainly not to Everton Football Club or Merseyside Police’.

Racist incidents involving Everton fans which were reported around this time, and as noted some of which one can recall hearing personally, included the following: (i) 8th of April 2000; Everton played Leicester City away (at Filbert Street) and some Everton fans racially abused Leicester’s Muzzy Izzet (who was born in London, but had recently confirmed his intention to play for Turkey at international level). By chance this game came shortly after the death of two Leeds United fans in Turkey leaving tempers, in some quarters, running high against Turks in England. As part of his match report for this game journalist David Prentice noted this abuse and felt that such instances meant that ‘accusations of racism still linger like a stale smell around Goodison’ (Prentice, 2000, 48).
13 – continued: (ii) At two of Everton’s away games during the 2001-2002 season racist chanting was heard and reported on. In the first of these at Filbert Street Everton played Leicester City (Saturday 24\textsuperscript{th} November 2001). Several newspapers picked up on racist chanting by Everton supporters at this game, one being the \textit{Mail on Sunday} (25/11/2001) that claimed Everton fans where ‘racially taunting the home supporters.’ When more of the same (which one can remember hearing) occurred at Everton’s next away game (versus Fulham at Craven Cottage on Saturday 8\textsuperscript{th} December 2001) the club publicly condemned the fans involved and threatened that if it continued they would stop selling tickets for away games. Corroborating this Nicholls (2002, 152) spoke of what he considered to be a ‘bit of banter at Leicester and yes, racist chanting at Fulham’. This racist chanting prompted Tallentine, M (2001, in \textit{When Saturday Comes}, February 2002 issue p15) to state that ‘the right-wing tendencies of a minority of Everton’s following have been remarked on for years’.

(iii) In the Everton match-day programme (versus Middlesbrough on the 14\textsuperscript{th} of September 2002) at letter from a fan (Mr R.N. Allerton) told how his afternoon was ‘blighted’ on the opening day of the 2002-2003 season (Everton versus Tottenham Hotspur at Goodison Park) ‘by the rabid racism and bigotry of two disgraceful “fans” sat nearby’ to him in the Gwladys Street stand. Their racism was apparently aimed at Li Tie the clubs recently acquired Chinese player and black centre forward Kevin Campbell. In response to this letter Everton’s Deputy Chairman Bill Kenwright (2002, p9) stated that ‘Over the past decade or so, everyone here at Everton has laboured tirelessly and with collective purpose to eradicate the evil of racism – I do believe that those efforts have been met with tangible success.’ In addition he reiterated the clubs support for the “Kick It Out” campaign and their desire to win what he called a ‘prolonged war’ against racism.

14 For example, when the Club go into minority ethnic communities to offer schemes, such as football coaching. Related to this outreach work done by Everton it was discussed with Johnson whether there is any resistance to white coaches / educators when they are sent into the, predominantly black, communities in Liverpool (particularly Liverpool 8). Johnson maintained there is no sign of any such resistance whatsoever and detailed that while Everton does employ mainly white coaches (although they do have two black community coaches) these community coaches are not be allotted outreach work with any consideration of the ethnic make up of the community a given job will be for.

15 One has no reason to doubt Dickinson’s figures in this regard, but would note that players at Everton’s Academy are not necessarily from Liverpool or its immediate surrounds and that therefore the make up of the group of players at the Academy cannot really be related to the area in which Everton FC’s Academy is based (which at the time of this interview was Netherton).

\textbf{NB:} Everton’s Academy subsequently moved to a new training facility (Finch Farm, Halewood) in November 2007.
Johnson said, ‘Although not at the pace we would like, nationally, I believe there is a slight increase in the level of black minority ethnic spectators at live matches. This is particularly so when we profile the change of fans supporting the [England] national team, who now have more Asian and female supporters than in the past’. This was his opinion rather than a proven fact.

NB: The FA Customer Charter 2007 (published by The Football Association (FA)) noted of the membership of englandfans (the official England supporters club) that 1% of the membership (‘current figures’ as of 04/12/2006) is made up of members of minority ethnic groups. It was their aim to have 5% of their membership as being from minority ethnic groups by 2008. Realising that this was ‘unlikely’ they noted ‘we need to understand the barriers that may deter under-represented groups from actively following England’ (FA, 2007: 22). To that end they note that research is being undertaken with the Martin Shaw King Trust in conjunction with the UEFA Hat-Trick Project to explore this area further. Although individual club’s in England may report different findings these from the England national teams supporters club do not tend to support Johnson’s belief.

In this regard it may depend how far back in history one goes. If we consider post John Barnes (as Johnson was talking about) at Liverpool this may be the case. However, prior to signing Barnes Liverpool could it appears, like Everton, quite easily be accused of being institutionally racist if one considers their employment practices (with Gayle the only player of colour to play for their first team) and incidents of racist abuse by Liverpool fans could, similar to those by Everton fans, be identified. With the arrival of John Barnes Liverpool did have some complaints (Hill, 2001) about having signed a black player, although quantifying exactly how many would be almost impossible, but these soon dissipated when he performed well for the club. Indeed the following quotes detail the difference the signing of Barnes made at Liverpool. Rogan Taylor, an academic and Liverpool fan, stated re Barnes that ‘somebody they’d taken to their hearts was being treated in the way they’d treated black players for years. I’m quite sure if Everton had bought Barnes the situation would have been mirrored because the potential for that behaviour existed at both clubs’ (cited in Hill, 2001: 193). Taylor also added how Barnes transformed the behaviour of the Liverpool fans as he ‘made people realise that once you’ve accepted a black player you can’t go hooting another one’ as it would be ‘impolite to John [Barnes] to boo someone else who’s black’ (cited in Hill, 201: 193). In a similar vein Liverpool fan Stephen Kelly, who Hill notes was a Main Stand season ticket holder, said ‘It was so funny. In the previous season they were all talking about “black bastards”. Then as soon as Everton supporters start screaming this kind of filth, everyone’s going on about what a shower of scum they are over there…. short memories’ (cited in Hill, 2001: 193).

In these 4 instances when attendance at live games was mentioned, but was not club specific, respondents said; ‘I have been to live games’ (Joseph), ‘Most people like football and like to go to matches’ (Rio), ‘Now everyone [from minority ethnic groups in Liverpool] likes to go to matches’ (Shaun), ‘I like football, but am new here [recently arrived in England] and have not got to go yet, but hope to soon’ (Leroy).
Shortly after his appointment in March 2002 Everton manager David Moyes, making reference to the number of people on the street who he had met who were Everton fans, coined the phrase ‘The People’s Club’. His description of his, at the time, new club captured plenty of attention and was subsequently used in advertising campaigns by the club themselves.

Back et al (2001) attended a fixture between Everton and Chelsea (13th of January 1996) and recorded numerous incidents of racist abuse aimed at the Chelsea player Ruud Gullit, with ‘the most dramatic and sustained’ coming early in the second half when the crowd perceived he had dived to win a foul. As a result the whole of the central Gwladys began chanting ‘cheat, cheat, cheat’ before individuals began shouting abuse with a range of racialised epithets, ‘Ya fuckin’ nigger!’, Fuckin’ cheatin, divin’ black cunt’, Fucking’ divin’ black cunt’. As Gullit received treatment the racialised abuse continued as more and more fans began to shout racist epithets, ‘Fuck off ya fuckin’ divin’nigger’, ‘Ya fuckin’ black bastard’, ‘Divin’ black cunt’, ‘Get off the pitch ya fuckin’ Gollywog’, ‘Wog ‘ead’, ‘Nigger’, ‘Black bastard’, ‘Nigger’ and ‘Fuck off ya black cunt’ (Back et al, 2001: 131-132). Ultimately, Back et al (2001: 131) suggest that Gullit was singled out since he is an utter outsider’.
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