

**Modern English Football Hooliganism:
A Quantitative Exploration in Criminological Theory**

Rich A. Wallace

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Sociology

Carol A. Bailey, Co-Chair
William E. Snizek, Co-Chair
Clifton D. Bryant
Charles J. Dudley
Donald J. Shoemaker

December 10, 1998
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Football Hooliganism, Criminology, Theory, Subcultural Delinquency
Copyright 1998, Rich A. Wallace

Modern English Football Hooliganism: A Quantitative Exploration in Criminological Theory

Rich A. Wallace

(ABSTRACT)

Studies of football hooliganism have developed in a number of academic disciplines, yet little of this literature directly relates to criminology. The fighting, disorderly conduct, and destructive behavior of those who attend football matches, especially in Europe has blossomed over the past thirty years and deserves criminological attention. Football hooliganism is criminal activity, but is unique because of its context specific nature, occurring almost entirely inside the grounds or in proximity to the stadiums where the matches are played.

This project explores the need for criminological explanations of football hooligans and their behavior based on literature which indicates that subcultural theories may be valuable in understanding why this behavioral pattern has become a preserve for young, white, working-class males. This study employs Albert Cohen's (1955) theory of subcultural delinquency to predict the hooligan activities of young, white, working-class males. West and Farrington's longitudinal study, the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development provides a wealth of data on numerous topics, including hooliganism, and is used to explore the link between hooliganism and criminological theory. The running hypothesis, grounded in Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency, is that the less middle-class the youths are in their values the more likely they will be to engage in football hooliganism.

Cohen initially identified a locus of nine middle-class values: ambition, individual responsibility, achievement and performance, delayed gratification, rationality and planning, etiquette and the cultivation of social skills, self-control, wholesome leisure, and respect for property. These middle-class values have been modified into a shorter set of values; constructive leisure, acceptable conduct, self-reliance, and success, that are more mutually exclusive and easier to test empirically. Scales were constructed for each dimension of the modified version of Cohen's middle-class values using factor analysis with orthogonal rotation. Each scale then underwent reliability analysis using Chronbach's alpha. From there the scales for the middle-class values, the dependent variable of football hooliganism, and controls were tested using both bivariate and multivariate procedures. Results indicate that these modified middle-class values may be an important explanatory factor for football hooliganism.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to those who have made me realize that nature is full of splendor and that life provides limitless opportunities for those who seek them.

To future journeys, knowing that peace truly exists in the wild,
Hooli

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking the members of my committee, Dr. Carol Bailey, Dr. Cliff Bryant, Dr. Jack Dudley, Dr. Don Shoemaker, and Dr. Bill Snizek, who stuck by me patiently as the project came to fruition. Each of you has provided unique contributions to my development and career aspirations. The chairs of my committee deserve special recognition. Dr. Carol Bailey, for helping and encouraging me throughout the development of the dissertation and listening to all my concerns, no matter how deluded they may have seemed. Dr. Bill Snizek, for taking me on as a teaching assistant and for educating me with respect to professionalism and the importance of teaching.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the Department of Sociology at Virginia Tech for providing me with the freedom to fully explore my interests in criminology and criminal justice. A further word of thanks for the financial support that was provided which helped make all of this possible.

Thanks to those colleagues who have been so supportive and encouraging over the past 5 years, especially my co-conspirator D. Alexander and my kindred spirit L. Linares. I must also thank the members of NADS who always made life enjoyable, helped me stay the course, and made me realize that support comes from many unexpected places. The Department of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin - River Falls needs to be recognized for asking me to join them professionally and standing by me throughout the process.

None of these thank you's would be possible or necessary without the eternal love, support, guidance, and nurturing of my wonderful wife. Steph, I can't begin to tell you how much richer my life is for what we have and what we share. "You'll never walk alone" (LFC).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	9
CHAPTER II - THE GENESIS OF FOOTBALL AND HOOLIGANISM	10
2.1 The Development of Modern Football	10
2.2 The Enduring Problem of English Football Hooliganism	14
2.3 Current Status of the Problem	17
CHAPTER III - INVESTIGATING HOOLIGANISM CRIMINOLOGICALLY ..	20
3.1 The Criminological Import of Hooliganism	20
3.2 The Theoretical Basis of the Dissertation	22
3.2.1 A Brief Summary of the Development of Strain Theory	22
3.2.2 The Development of Subcultural Theories	22
3.2.3 The Prominent Subcultural Theories	24
3.3 Making Use of Cohen's Theory of Subcultural Delinquency	27
3.3.1 Basis of the Theory	27
3.3.2 The Theoretical Influence of Merton and Sutherland	29
3.3.3 Delinquent Subcultures - Emergence and Continuation	31
3.4 Attempts to Test Cohen's Theory of Subcultural Delinquency	38
3.4.1 The Relationship between School and Delinquency	39
3.4.2 School Values, Academic Achievement, and Delinquency	42
3.4.3 The Relationship between Social Class and Delinquency	44
3.4.4 Summarizing the Findings of the Theoretical Tests	47
3.5 Making Cohen's Subcultural Theory More Concise and Testable	48
3.5.1 Success	50
3.5.2 Self-Reliance	51
3.5.3 Constructive Leisure	51
3.5.4 Acceptable Conduct	52
3.5.5 Conspicuous Consumption	53
3.6 Theoretical Summary	54

CHAPTER IV - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	56
4.1 Characteristics of Football Hooliganism	57
4.1.1 Defining Hooliganism	57
4.1.2 Identifying Hooligans	59
Gender	60
Age	62
Social Class	66
4.2 State of the Empirical Literature	70
4.2.1 Qualitative Studies	70
Ethnography	70
Content Analysis	74
4.2.2 Quantitative Studies	76
4.3 Criminological Explorations of Football Hooliganism	77
4.3.1 Quantitative Studies	77
4.3.2 Qualitative Studies	81
4.3.3 Theoretical Studies	85
4.4 Using Cohen Theory to Explain Hooliganism	87
4.5 The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development	91
4.5.1 Demographics of the Study Group	92
4.5.2 Issues of Reliability and Validity	94
4.5.3 Unresolved Problems Encountered in the Study	97
4.5.4 Strengths of the Study	99
CHAPTER V - MATERIALS & METHODS	100
5.1 The Data Set	101
5.2 Measurement of the Study's Variables	102
5.2.1 Football Hooliganism	102
5.2.2 Cohen's Middle-Class Values	104
Success	105
Self-Reliance	106
Constructive Leisure	107
Acceptable Conduct	108
5.2.3 Gang Activities Outside the Football Context	109
5.2.4 Controls	110
Social Handicaps	111
Single-Parent Family	111
Differential Association	112
5.3 Analytic Strategy	113

CHAPTER VI - RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	115
6.1 Univariate Statistics	115
6.1.1 Study Variables	116
6.2 Bivariate Statistics	120
6.2.1 Independent Samples T-Tests	120
6.2.2 Correlations	124
6.3 Multivariate Statistics	124
6.3.1 Multiple Regression Models without Control Variables	126
6.3.2 Multiple Regression Models with Control Variables	130
 CHAPTER VII - DISCUSSION	 135
7.1 Present Considerations and Future Research	138
7.2 Concluding Remarks	139
 LITERATURE CITED	 140
 APPENDIX A - DESCRIPTION OF MEASURES	 153
 APPENDIX B - FOOTBALL, AN INTRODUCTION TO THE WORLD'S SPORT .	157
 VITAE	 164

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 - Univariate Statistics for Dependent, Independent and Control Variables	117
TABLE 2 - Independent Samples T-Tests: Mean Differences for Football Hooligans and Non-Hooligans on Middle-Class Values	121
TABLE 3 - Independent Samples T-Tests: Mean Differences for Football Hooligans and Non-Hooligans on Gang Activities and Controls	123
TABLE 4 - Correlation Matrix for All Dependent, Independent and Control Variables	125
TABLE 5 - Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values	127
TABLE 6 - Football Hooliganism Regressed on the Three Most Significant Middle-Class Values	128
TABLE 7 - Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values and Gang Activities	129
TABLE 8 - Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values and Controls	131
TABLE 9 - Football Hooliganism Regressed on the Three Most Significant Middle-Class Values and Controls	132
TABLE 10 - Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values, Gang Activities, and Controls	134

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A gang of young men (possibly neo-Nazis) attacks a police officer and beats him about the head with iron bars and repeatedly kicks him. The officer remains in a coma and doctors believe he has suffered at least some permanent brain damage. Based on reports, pictures, and video footage, three people have been arrested in connection with the crime. (SportsLine Worldwide wire reports 9 July 1998)

An individual taking a long train ride stabs the other man in his compartment to death with a knife. Later the individual is arrested upon fighting with the night watchman of the hotel he is staying at and eventually confesses to the murder. (Reuters 4 July 1998)

Over a three hour period a group of approximately 150 people rampaged through a port town. This mob went through the town "hurling paving stones, bottles and traffic signs, smashing shop and cafe windows and damaging two police cars" (2). Order was restored by police, with the aid of police dogs and water cannons. (Daily Mail 26 June 1998)

One of the public's first questions about incidents such as these center on a desire to know why the events occurred. Questions like "why did the young men decide to attack a police officer," "why did they take it so far," "why did the train passenger stab the other person in his compartment," "why did the crowd riot," and "why did the crowd focus their

attention on destroying property" are frequent and understandable. These inquiries are a struggle to gain an understanding of offender motivation, it is an attempt to find a reason or cause for such criminal behavior.

The public are not the only ones to have such an interest in the motives people have for committing criminal acts, criminologists and criminal justice practitioners also have an intense desire to understand such matters. For these groups trying to understand and explain "why" is often a key aspect of their jobs and research. For these professions the search for the "why" of criminal events focuses upon the etiology of criminal behavior, which attempts to find, describe, and predict the causes of such activities.

Criminologists often argue that the motivation for criminal acts can be understood and explained through the use of a relatively simple dichotomy. This dichotomy of motives identifies crimes as being committed for instrumental or expressive reasons (Glaser 1974; Block 1977; Riedel 1987; Decker 1996; Miethe and McCorkle 1998). Often the criminologists using this dichotomy of motives maintains that they are, at least relatively, mutually exclusive categories -- crimes are committed for either instrumental or expressive reasons.

Instrumental crimes are offenses committed for primarily rational reasons. The basic consideration is that the criminal act is committed in order to bring about specific goals or to fulfill certain needs (Glaser 1974; Riedel 1987; Miethe and McCorkle 1998). A list of possible instrumental motives is supplied by Miethe and McCorkle (1998), who maintain that "money, revenge, status enhancement, control, and domination are often considered instrumental goals of crime" (p. 13). In order to achieve such goals the offender has usually tried to rationally calculate how to maximize benefits while minimizing costs, meaning that instrumental crimes "are a means of obtaining satisfaction from the products of crime rather than from the criminal acts themselves" (Glaser 1974:75). It is quite possible that certain crimes of violence may be committed for instrumental reasons, but the perception is that instrumental motives are most likely to be employed for property offenses, such as; burglary, motor vehicle theft, and shoplifting,

since they provide the offender with financial gain (Chambliss 1969; Glaser 1974; Decker 1996).

Violent offenses are more likely to be perceived as expressive crimes that are committed without the consideration of costs and benefits, especially financial gains. The expressive motives for crime are best exemplified in research and discussions on assaults and homicides, but can also be aptly implemented for all forms of criminality, even crimes like burglary (Block 1977; Tunnell 1992; Decker 1996). Expressive criminal acts are committed as a result of emotions felt by the offender, meaning that the acts are likely to be spontaneous or impulsive (Glaser 1974; Block 1977; Miethe and McCorkle 1998). According to Decker (1996), "it is the expression of a strongly held emotion that most often characterizes expressive motives" (p. 431). The expressed emotions that are likely to precipitate expressive crimes include anger, fear, revenge, aggression, and hatred. A further demarcation for expressive crimes is a list of research which finds that expressive crimes are more likely to involve non-strangers than are instrumental crimes (Decker 1996:430).

A key aspect to understanding how instrumental and expressive criminal acts differ is in the ability to control or deter them. The argument is made time and again that instrumental crimes are more likely to be deterred than expressive crimes because of the rational thought attributed to the instrumental acts (Chambliss 1969; Glaser 1974; Miethe and McCorkle 1998). Violent crimes, especially criminal homicide, tend to reflect the expressive nature of the offense as people go about committing such offenses without regard for the punishments that may await them. Instrumental offenses, on the other hand, are defined by the fact that the offender is taking real and perceived benefits and costs into account, including possible punishments (Chambliss 1969).¹

Expressive and instrumental motives are not only applied to what criminologists would classically identify as street crime, but also are employed in the explanation of

¹In his study of burglars, Tunnell (1992) found that people don't accurately take all possible costs and benefits into account. He saw that a large proportion failed to take possible punishment into account, and when they did they underestimated its possible severity. He and others contend that we work from a point of limited rationality, but rationality none the less.

motives for corporate crime, occupational crime, organized crime, public order offenses, and even political crimes. Some of the offenses in each of these categories appear to have relatively simple, straight-forward motives based on anger, revenge, personal benefit, or financial gain; however, for many crimes the motives are more complicated and are difficult to pin down accurately.

Trying to determine which motive, expressive or instrumental, is at the root of any criminal behavior may be an inaccurate proposition since there are criminal acts where both motives may be working simultaneously. This complication may be best exemplified by the crimes juveniles and young adults commit in an attempt to further develop their self-concepts and gain separation and independence in the adult world (Glaser 1974). The striving undertaken by these young people through crime exhibit both instrumental and expressive motivations. As Glaser (1974:76) argues,

these expressive aspects cannot wisely be overlooked; even in offenses that appear to be instrumental activity pursued in an unemotional way, money or property may motivate behavior not just as a means of getting something else, but as symbols of accomplishment competing with alternative influences on self-conception.

So in certain cases, for certain individuals and groups, it is quite possible that both expressive and instrumental motives are being expressed in criminal activities, regardless of the type of crime that is being committed. This proposition is supported by Miethe and McCorkle (1998) who admit that criminal motivations can be difficult to prove because they may have numerous and diverse sources.

The incidents described at the beginning of this section are criminal offenses which are incapable of being explained as simply being instrumentally or expressively motivated. All three events have similar motivations, even though the first two are crimes of violence and the third involves property-related criminality. Yet the significance of these events goes beyond the category of crime that they represent because all three are

acts of football hooliganism.² Such activities are of great international importance both socially and academically; moreover, it is a class of criminal activity that defies simple categorization.

Acts of football hooliganism are perceived to be an fusion of multiple instrumental and expressive motivations (Dunning, Murphy, and Williams 1988). The instrumental basis of hooligan motivation does not revolve around financial benefit, but does provide those involved with the ability to enhance their status. Among the different groups involved in hooliganism there is an interest in gaining status by being better, stronger, and more destructive than the other hooligans and hooligan groups (Marsh 1982; Dunning, Murphy, and Williams 1986; Dunning 1990; Giulianotti 1994k; King 1997; Armstrong 1998). At the same time, these events also can also be characterized as having expressive motivations. Anger, revenge, and hatred are among the expressed emotional motivations for committing acts of football hooliganism. The vast majority of the violence- and property-related criminality is directed at out-groups, especially in cases where the opposing sides have developed a rivalry (Igbinovia 1985; Murphy, Dunning, and Williams 1988; Redhead 1991; Bromberger 1993; Armstrong 1994; Roversi 1994). In cases such as these the two sides develop a continual hostility toward one another, and criminal acts of hooliganism are often the result of hatred and a desire for revenge. Even without a long-standing rivalry in place, hooliganism could erupt in any situation where opposing fans have a chance to come into contact or where sides come into contact with police (Mathias 1991; Stott and Reicher 1998).

Over time, hooliganism has become a pervasive problem experienced by most football playing nations. Football hooliganism can occur any place in the world any time

²In this project the term football is used in place of the term soccer. In the United States of America most people recognize the sport as soccer, while internationally the sport is identified as football. Most descriptions of the disruptions which occur in this context are aptly referred to as football hooliganism since they are much more likely to occur internationally. So even though it seems that neither term is used exclusively internationally or in the United States football will be the term used in this manuscript.

there is a football match, at any level.³ From local leagues to the World Cup the possibility of hooliganism exists, and while some forms of this behavior are viewed as relatively minor and innocuous, a significant proportion of these behaviors can be legitimately defined as criminal acts, from status and property offenses to violent crimes and conspiracies (Coalter 1985; Williams, Dunning, and Murphy 1986; Armstrong and Hobbs 1994; Giulianotti 1994t). In fact, fighting and assaults are one of the principle characteristics of football hooliganism (Marsh 1977; Ingham 1978; Hobbs and Robins 1991; Archetti and Romero, 1994; Finn, 1994).⁴

While many countries, like Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Germany, Holland, Italy, and Scotland are known to have significant problems with football hooliganism, England long been viewed as the home of the world's worst hooligan problem and is generally considered to be the birthplace of modern hooliganism (Murphy, Williams, and Dunning 1990; Williams 1991h; Giulianotti 1994s; Roversi 1994; van der Brug 1994).⁵ The hooliganism affiliated with English football has been traced back as far as the late 1800s, but has changed dramatically over time (Taylor 1971; Maguire 1986; Mason 1988; Dunning 1990). Present forms of hooliganism are repeatedly thought to have their origins in the period of the mid- to late 1960s. During this period, according to Hobbs and Robins (1991:554),

whole sections of terracing were taken over by the 'youth end' to the exclusion of the older soccer citizenry. This represented a significant

³Acts of football-related violence have occurred even when the match is played in a different town or country. The 1998 World Cup in France bears this out as fans in Argentina, Chile, Cameroon, England, and elsewhere engaged in violent behavior as a result of their teams' performance during the competition (*SportsLine Worldwide wire reports* 23 June 1998).

⁴The vast majority of scholars writing about football hooliganism seem unwilling to go so far as to say that the activities of hooligans are criminal. At the same time, these authors regularly focus their attention on hooligans engaged in fighting, assaults, violence, aggression, destruction of property, and conflicts with the police. They also identify that hooligans get arrested and charged with criminal offenses, yet they refer to such activities as little more than acts of violence that are possibly deviant (for example, Taylor 1971; Finn 1994; Giulianotti 1994t; Stott and Reicher 1998).

⁵As Duke and Crolley (1996) point out while hooliganism is an English import to other nations, whenever it is adopted it is molded to fit specific cultural conditions.

break with traditional ways of watching football and can be dated by most observers, with some precision, to the seasons of 1966-7 and 1967-8.

The 'youth ends' were occupied by individuals who were less interested in football than spectators from previous generations. The interests of these 'youth ends' were perceived to lie in the perception that the stadium was an appropriate place for fighting and destruction. Since the late 1960s, hooliganism has evolved from "anarchic rabble to the highly organized groups which met in pubs to plan violence, which wore items of clothing identifiable as 'uniforms', and which was under the control of 'generals' and 'lieutenants'" (Armstrong and Hobbs 1994:201).

Today the perception of hooliganism as organized crime has become commonplace. But researchers point out that most hooligan crews are loosely knit and informally organized, conforming only tangentially to other, more traditional, forms of organized crime (Armstrong and Harris 1991; Dunning, Murphy, and Waddington 1991; Giulianotti 1994t; Armstrong 1998). Some have gone so far as to state that public officials, the police, and the media have sculpted the problem of hooliganism into a moral panic (Cohen 1973; Dunning et al. 1991; Armstrong and Hobbs 1994).

Regardless of how well organized these English football hooligans are, there is little question about the extent of their aberrant behavior. Hooligans have engaged in a broad array of illicit activities since the birth of modern hooliganism during the 1966/7 season, and many of these behaviors have become more sophisticated and outlandish over time. Williams et al. (1986) describe modern hooliganism as a "'quasi-dialectical' process in which the actions of hooligan fans have led to new control initiatives that, in their turn, have led to new actions by fans, and so on in what has been so far an ever-escalating spiral" (p. 363). This escalation and sophistication is intimately linked to the behavior of English hooligans, but the same progression has occurred all over the globe. It just happens that any time someone mentions the phrase 'football hooliganism' people automatically assume the English are involved.

There is a great deal of effort focused on trying to figure out just who these hooligans are. Many researchers maintain that football hooligans consist largely of young, white, working-class males (Taylor 1971; Moorhouse 1984; Williams et al. 1986; Roversi 1991; Armstrong 1998). Attempts have been made to refute this general characterization of hooligans, but most European studies find that the majority of hooligans are indeed young, white, and working-class (for example, Dunning 1994).⁶ In terms of age, most studies find the core members to be in their late teens and early 20s, before eventually aging out. The social class position of most hooligans is found to be working-class, often including the underemployed and the unemployed. There may be some hooligans from across the social class spectrum, but it has been estimated that as much as 80 percent come from working-class backgrounds (Dunning 1994).

Football hooliganism in England and elsewhere is intriguing, and since the late 1960s has developed into a phenomenon that bears at least some resemblance to the development of gang behavior in the United States (Dunning et al. 1988; Murphy et al. 1990; Giulianotti 1993; Wallace 1996). Both phenomenon focus on working-class juveniles and young adults who are involved in a wide variety of criminal acts, including; violent crimes, property crimes, drug offenses, and conspiracies. Further, both forms of behavior have a variety of motives which make it difficult to define the acts as being primarily instrumental or expressive. Rather than trying to struggle at gaining insight about football hooliganism through a relatively simplistic dichotomy of motives, it may well be more fruitful to approach the motives of such behavior from a different angle, one used to try and understand the developing subculture of youth gangs in the United States.

Back in 1955 Albert Cohen wrote *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang* in an attempt to understand and explain the reasons why lower-class youths in the United States developed subcultures where they committed delinquent acts, especially in group formations. He maintained that the delinquent acts of the subculture are premised on maliciousness, negativism, non-utilitarianism, and group autonomy (Cohen 1955). These

⁶While studies have been done on groups of hooligans in a number of countries, the vast majority have focused on those in Britain, especially England.

descriptions about subcultural delinquency are not unlike the mix of motives for hooliganism.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Even with the pervasiveness of hooliganism in most football playing nations, there is a dearth of criminologically-informed research on this form of criminality. Part of what makes hooliganism a unique set of criminal activities is the fact that it is context specific. Without an attachment to football, hooligans would not be unlike any other group of delinquents. There is even less research designed to address the etiology of hooligan behavior in terms of criminological theory.

The purpose of the present inquiry is to look at the origins of modern English hooliganism in the late 1960s and find an explanation for this behavior through the use of Albert K. Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency. The project will test Cohen's theory as an explanatory factor of hooliganism using data from West and Farrington's longitudinal data set, the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development.

CHAPTER II

THE GENESIS OF FOOTBALL AND HOOLIGANISM

Football hooliganism encompasses a wide array of criminal behaviors that could take place in any setting, but the context of football is what differentiates hooligan activities from other forms of criminality. Ever since the modern sport developed in the late 1800s, spectators have brought an enthusiasm and excitement to the game which has become the catalyst for ardent support as well as hooliganism. In order to understand the importance of football as a context for potential criminality, it is essential to understand how the modern sport of football developed.

2.1 The Development of Modern Football

The theme of the 1996 European Championships in England was "the game returns home", inferring that the game of football originated in England. The modern form of football did indeed emerge in England, but there is some question as to where the game originated. Football's history in England dates back hundreds of years; however, until the mid-19th century the game of football only faintly resembled the modern international sport.⁷ This early ancestor of modern football is identified as 'folk football'.

⁷Elias & Dunning (1986) maintain that football in England can be reliably traced back to the 1300s, even though there is some evidence to show that the game has been around even longer. Taylor (1971) indicates that the game's history extends to the 10th and 11th centuries.

Games were played during a number of special occasions, especially on religious holidays like Shrove Tuesday and Saints' Days. Folk football was a truly communal game, everyone from masons and drapers to clergy were involved in games, and women were encouraged to participate (Taylor 1971; Elias and Dunning 1986; Jones 1986; Canter, Comber, and Uzzell 1989).⁸ These games often involved entire communities, with villagers from different townships competing against one another.⁹ The result was a game that more closely resembled a battle than an entertaining event played on special occasions.

The warlike image of the game is due, in part, to the fact that rules were minimal and based on regional understandings, and that there were no limits on the number of players, which at times exceeded a thousand (Jones 1986; Dunning 1990; Murphy et al. 1990). As such, folk football was a truly inclusive, communal game with an indistinguishable line between players and spectators (Giulianotti 1994s). As underscored by Taylor (1992), "any 'spectating' would have required almost as much involvement as *playing* [emphasis in the original]" (p. 6).

Folk football was a relatively violent and emotional game, a game that heightened in-group solidarity and intensified out-group conflict. Participants often used these games as a way to settle old scores with some, while strengthening bonds to others. The games permitted a high degree of physical violence that often resulted in the destruction of property, injuries, and even death (Taylor 1971; Elias and Dunning 1986; Jones 1986; Dunning 1990). According to Menke (1975), the anything goes mentality prevailed, as there were no laws governing how one could take the ball from an opposing player. By making folk football a ritual part of religious holidays and other celebrations, the game

⁸Canter et al. (1989) point out that one of the most anticipated football games in Cross of Scone, Scotland was the game between the married women and the spinsters.

⁹For certain games, both sides were from the same community but represented different occupational or social groups. One such example was the Shrove Tuesday game in Chester, England where the community's shoemakers competed against the drapers (Elias & Dunning 1986).

provided a formalized outlet for violence and retribution. As stated by Elias and Dunning (1986:179),

semi-institutionalized fights between local groups arranged on certain days of the year . . . were a normal part of the traditional pattern of life in medieval societies. Playing with a football was one of the ways of arranging such a fight. It was, in fact, one of the normal annual rituals of these traditional societies.

These ritualized fights were often played out against the same opponents time after time, because unlike its modern progeny, folk football varied widely by region or even village (Jones 1986). Variations in the game were the result of local customs and traditions that were passed on orally from one generation to the next (Elias and Dunning 1986; Dunning 1990; Murphy et al. 1990). Throughout the history of folk football, chaos existed because the rules were informal and malleable.¹⁰

Authorities throughout England disapproved of folk football because of its violent nature, and because it interfered with more functional pursuits, such as military weaponry training (especially archery). They attempted to eliminate football through the use of orders, edicts, and laws that forbid the play of football and other forms of recreation under pain of imprisonment. According to Dunning (1990), "between 1314 and 1667, unsuccessful attempts were made by state or local authorities to ban these wild games on more than 30 occasions" (p. 70). Among the earliest prohibitions was that issued by Edward II in 1314:

And whereas there is great uproar in the City [London], through certain tumult arising from great footballs in the fields of the public, from which many evils perchance may arise - which may God forbid - we do command and do forbid, on the King's behalf, upon pain of imprisonment, that such game shall be practised henceforth within the city. (Elias and Dunning 1986:175-176)

¹⁰The most notable incident of this type occurred in 1823 when William Webb Ellis of Rugby carried the football, an action which inadvertently led to the creation of rugby football. During this time "it was still not established whether the ball could be handled or not" (Canter et al. 1989:xiv).

Although numerous other proscriptions were introduced throughout England, all were relatively futile. Even in the face of fines, corporal punishment, and imprisonment, people continued to play football. The result was a "recurrent tug-of-war between the people who clung to their violent customs and the authorities who tried to suppress or to change them" (Elias and Dunning 1986:178).

By the mid-1800s, folk football was in decline, but the game had been assimilated by the public schools in England.¹¹ By incorporating football into the schools, the game became a preserve of society's upper classes (Pratt and Salter 1984). During this period, the game of football underwent a myriad of changes, the most significant of which was the formalization of the rules. Such formalization was primarily undertaken by each of the English public schools during the period from 1845 to 1862 (Taylor 1971:137). In 1863 football's rules were standardized, and were subsequently adopted by the newly founded English Football Association (FA) (Taylor 1971; Dunning et al. 1982; Taylor 1992).¹² The founding of the FA and adoption of a standardized set of rules forever changed the way football was to be played.

The organization of football in England also affected the relationship between football and the communities in which it was played. For the first time, a large majority of the community was officially relegated to the role of spectator, a group who was expected to play only a passive role in the game. The development and implementation of modern football left most people without an opportunity to directly participate in the game, though as Taylor (1992) maintained, "somehow football spectators always remained in a highly participatory role" (p. 6).

¹¹The history of football in England, from its folk traditions to its revitalization in the public schools during the 1800s, is closely mirrored by the development of the game in Scotland.

¹²During the inaugural meeting of the FA (at which the standardized set of rules were adopted) football and rugby were officially recognized as distinctly different sports, the former prohibiting the handling of the ball and the latter embracing the handling of the ball (Taylor 1992). Those preferring rugby football formed the Rugby Football Union in 1871 (Dunning 1990).

2.2 The Enduring Problem of English Football Hooliganism

Football has become a significant part of the social and cultural fabric of everyday life for many people throughout the world. Enthusiasts around the globe identify with and follow the progress of their local, regional and national teams. Some societies, especially those in Europe and South America, have become so deeply immersed in football culture that the game and its supporters have taken on a quasi-religious character (Murphy et al. 1990; Bale 1991). The bond between individuals and their football can become so ritualized, intense, emotional, and consuming that at times these fans appear less like football supporters and "appear more like temple-goers of a localized religious sect with international affiliations" (Taylor 1992:185). Loyal football fans will go to great lengths to watch their favorite teams in action, and do so religiously, even in the United States of America (Rushin 1995). Commenting on the devotion of football supporters and the perceived importance of the sport, Bill Shankly, former manager of Liverpool, once described it in the following terms: "some people believe football is a matter of life and death, I am very disappointed with that attitude. I can assure you it is much, much more important than that." Although attempting to overstate the case, he accurately depicts the ritualized intensity and emotionality that football spectators exhibit at matches.

Fan participation at football matches often resembles an emotional roller coaster, starting with eager anticipation, anxiety, or apathy and culminating in revelry, relief, frustration, or anger. Unfortunately, fan participation at football matches has been taken a step further; fans become exuberant about success, lament failure, and have the capacity to turn any match into a veritable bloodbath. These violent and destructive episodes may be a response to the play of their team(s), but more often they are the result of individual and/or group desires to engage in deviant, delinquent, or even criminal behavior. These acts of violence and destruction, regardless of form or seriousness, are labeled as football hooliganism.

Football hooliganism at its best is relatively innocuous, while at its worst, the result can be death and mass destruction. Although the problem of hooliganism afflicts almost all football playing nations, it is considered to be most problematic in Europe,

specifically England. Pundits commonly refer to hooliganism as "the English disease," and the collective view is that football fans in England are "a bellicose, xenophobic, nationalistic bunch" (Beecher 1994:23). Because of tragedies like the Bradford fire of 1985, the 1985 wall collapse at Heysel, the crushing deaths of 95 spectators at Hillsborough in 1989, the 1995 "un"friendly between England and Ireland in Dublin, and numerous other lesser known incidents, English fans have been hung with monikers like "the world's worst fans," "English thugs," and "football louts".

Hooliganism has been a fixture of English football matches since the end of the 1800s, yet until the 1960s, any discussion of hooliganism was limited to FA reports and newspaper articles (Murphy, Dunning, and Williams 1988). Based on extensive research into these accounts, Dunning et al. (1988) found that prior to the First World War, crowd disturbances were a regular occurrence at matches. During this period (1880 to 1914), the predominant forms of spectator misconduct included: "(1) verbal misconduct and disorder; (2) pitch invasions, encroachments and demonstrations; (3) physical violence and assault" (Dunning et al. 1988:50). Most of the disorder during this period was directed toward officials and players, rather than toward other onlookers.¹³

Hooliganism began to taper off after the First World War and remained low during the inter-war period (1919 to 1939) (Murphy et al. 1990). The spectator misbehavior which existed in this era became more infrequent and innocuous than that encountered in the previous era. While there were periodic episodes of serious crowd misconduct during this period, in general the crowd "appears to have grown more respectable and to have adhered more to what was deemed appropriate spectating" (Maguire 1986:229).

English football experienced a resurgence of interest immediately following the Second World War, a trend that continued until the late 1950s. Attendance reached its zenith during this period, with an average annual attendance of 33 million during the

¹³Spectators actions were quite often reactionary to the events taking place on the field. As Wagg (1984) mentions, "pitch invasions were frequent in the early years of the League . . . usually precipitated by a decision by the referee which had gone against the home team" (p. 15). Intra-crowd fighting occurred during this era, but was less common than other forms of crowd disorder (Maguire 1986).

1950s. Hooliganism remained at relatively low rates during this period, especially when compared to levels of crowd disorder prior to the First World War. As Walvin (1986) points out, "there were incidents of disorderly behavior in the late 1940s and 1950s, but they were few and were unusual" (p. 50). This era is often described as the "golden age" of football because of the high levels of attendance and perception of limited hooliganism, especially in the early part of the era.¹⁴

During the 1950s, rates of attendance declined and there was an increase in the amount of spectator disorder, both in rates and in actual numbers (Dunning et al. 1988). The concern about hooliganism and actual football violence continued to escalate into the 1960s, each feeding off the other. As explained by Dunning et al. (1982), "the moral panic [was] leading to an increase in the rate of football hooliganism and the increase of football hooliganism intensifying the moral panic" (p. 152). By the mid-1960s, hooliganism reached "epidemic proportions," and became a cause for national concern; however, it wasn't until England was to host the 1966 World Cup Finals that the situation "became a self-perpetuating social problem" (Dunning et al. 1988).

The current era of football hooliganism is the result of the problems incurred during the 1960s, especially since the 1966 World Cup Finals in England. This assertion is confirmed by Hobbs and Robins (1991:565) study,

all of our respondents located 1966-7 as the season when 'the boys',
inbred with youth culture, and exhilarated by England's victory in
the World Cup, institutionalized soccer violence.

Unlike previous eras, the hooliganism produced in the 1960s and continuing today is more heavily reliant on fights between fans of opposing teams that occur before, during, and after matches both inside and outside football stadia (Maguire 1986; Dunning et al. 1988). This modern era of hooliganism also differs from previous eras because the

¹⁴According to incident reports made to the FA between 1946 and 1959, there was a significant amount of hooliganism, but at levels lower than those found prior to World War I. According to Murphy et al. (1990), "spectator disorderliness [during this period] seems then to have been substantially under-reported by the media" (p. 79). The media's under-representation of the problem is what Murphy et al. (1988) refer to as de-amplification.

hooligan crew (gang) has become the primary source of delinquent activities at and around football matches. Prior to the modern era, most hooliganism took the form of individual activities that spontaneously grew into more serious forms of crowd disorder.

During the 1960s, new bands of youth began to regularly appear at football matches, the most important of which was the burgeoning attendance of skinheads. These deviants and delinquents began to frequent football matches in the late 1960s after newspapers began reporting that football grounds were havens for violence and misbehavior (Pratt and Salter 1984; Williams et al. 1986; Dunning et al. 1988). The skinheads were not as interested in the game as they were in the opportunity to engage in interpersonal violence, and they have affected the form that hooliganism has taken during the modern era in several ways. First, the behavior at matches became even more violent and destructive. Second, football ends became more organized and had higher levels of solidarity. Third, there was a more passionate fight for territorial rights, and finally, football hooliganism spread "not only to railway stations and the immediate vicinity of [the] grounds, but also to city centers and beyond" (Williams et al. 1986:370). The changes caused by groups of skinheads led to the evolution of the hooligan crew, a feature of hooliganism that continues to guide its development.

2.3 Current Status of the Problem

Attendance at matches began to steadily decline as the problem of hooliganism began to escalate in the 1960s, a trend that continued until gates bottomed out in the mid-1980s.¹⁵ During this low point in English football attendance, 20 to 25 percent of people admitted that the threat of violence was the main reason they were not attending football matches (Canter et al. 1989). Even though the threat of hooliganism still exists, people's aversion to the problem seems to have faded, with gates rising steadily since the 1987/8 season (Butler 1996). Additionally, the number of match arrests has fallen continuously

¹⁵While potential violence is a significant reason why some are discouraged from attending football matches, there is a minority who attend matches because such a potential exists.

since the 1992/3 season (*Electronic Telegraph* 8 August 1996). For some, this news builds confidence that the specter of hooliganism is fading, unfortunately hooliganism remains a significant problem at and around matches.¹⁶

Despite the best efforts of administrators, public officials, researchers, and agents of social control, the problem of hooliganism continues to plague football matches throughout England, no matter what precautions are taken. Suggestions have come from all quarters, from official governmental reports to observations by the general public, but most proposals are never implemented (Lewis and Scarisbrick-Hauser 1994). In recent years, recommendations have included a national ID card system, the use of surveillance technologies (especially security cameras), prohibiting the attendance of visiting team supporters, and the removal of standing terraces. Of the recommendations that are actually implemented, few have effectively deterred hooligan behavior. In certain cases, implemented policies have created more hooligan problems than they have solved.¹⁷

In addition to proposals that focus on changing the physical conditions of stadia, especially as they relate to spectating, the problem has also been addressed as a situation ripe for more extensive law enforcement. To this end, England created a special law enforcement unit, the National Football Intelligence Unit (NFIU), designed for the sole purpose of monitoring and tracking known hooligans. The NFIU is designed to eliminate the hooligan factor from domestic and international matches at home and abroad, through a program of high-tech monitoring, identification, and intervention (Armstrong and Hobbs 1994; Taylor 1995; Winter, Davies, and Butcher 1995). The NFIU works closely with the FA and individual football clubs, as well as local and international police forces, in an attempt to contain and eliminate the threat of hooliganism. These techniques and

¹⁶Match arrests are an inexact measure of the amount of hooliganism that occurs during matches since they provide no details about the amount of hooliganism which does not result in apprehension. At the same time, this is often the most unobtrusive measure on the level of hooliganism occurring at any given time or location.

¹⁷One example is the implementation of hooligan fencing, which began as early as 1963 (Murphy et al. 1990). Hooligan fences were designed to segment the crowd and keep fans off the pitch (field). These fences were used until 1989, when 95 people were crushed to death against hooligan fencing at the beginning of the Liverpool-Nottingham Forest FA Cup semi-final at Hillsborough in Sheffield.

policies have aided the NFIU in their response to the problem. As the head of the National Criminal Intelligence Service's (NCIS) football unit stated,

the results are a credit to the police service nationally and show that the close co-operation among football intelligence officers continues to pay dividends. Intelligence remains the key to cracking the menace of hooliganism. (*Electronic Telegraph* 8 August 1996)

In the continuing attempt to expunge hooligans from matches, Police Intelligence Units have appeared throughout Europe (Hobbs and Robins 1991).

Many of the projects undertaken to eliminate hooliganism have been largely unsuccessful, but politicians, agents of social control, and football functionaries alike continue their quest to eliminate the problem. Their attempts support the contention that football hooliganism is a dangerous problem which may detrimentally effect the social order of English society. According to others, the actions of football hooligans are a reflection and magnification of existent social problems (Taylor 1971; Clarke 1978; Hall 1978). As such, the problem of football hooliganism has to be solved by the elimination of societal ills. Regardless of one's position on the link between hooliganism and society, it is important to understand the underlying causes of such behavior so that the phenomenon can be dealt with most effectively.

CHAPTER III

INVESTIGATING HOOLIGANISM CRIMINOLOGICALLY

3.1 The Criminological Import of Hooliganism

The bulk of research on football hooliganism focuses on how the problem has evolved over the past 30 years in Britain. The phenomenon has been analyzed from a wide variety of academic disciplines, such as: (1) psychology, including environmental, mass, and social psychologies; (2) economics and finance; (3) anthropology; and (4) sociology, including the sociology of sport, social and cultural change, and popular culture. Conspicuously absent from these dominant perspectives is work that addresses the problem from the perspective of criminology, a need identified as early as 1980 by Eugene Trivizas.

The few researchers who consciously approach the topic from a criminological point of view tend to focus on providing details on the extensive nature of hooliganism, how it is a form of criminal behavior, and the effectiveness of crowd control activities. Trivizas (1980, 1984) used arrest reports from police stations in the London metropolitan area to analyze the amount and type of hooligan arrests which occurred at football matches, the characteristics of offenders, and to develop a typology of hooligan offenses. In a separate article, Trivizas (1981) compared the form and length of sentencing for convicted hooligans to the sentences received by individuals found guilty of similar offenses in non-football related contexts.

In contrast, Lewis (1982) looked at how English police attempt to maintain order and control in football's terraces¹⁸ and found that police are generally able to control crowds in an effective and often non-lethal manner. The work of Hobbs and Robins (1991) is important, in part because they examine football hooliganism as a form of deviant/delinquent behavior and began to highlight the criminological relevance of the topic.¹⁹

Recent studies by Giulianotti (1994t), Armstrong and Hobbs (1994), and Stott and Reicher (1998) have focused on procedures and policies used by police in trying to control hooliganism. Stott and Reicher's (1998) main point is that some events potentially labeled as hooliganism are the result of inter-group definitions and understandings of people and situations. In contrast, Armstrong and Hobbs and Giulianotti focus on covert police operations against football hooligans. Many of these undercover operations have run into legal difficulties as a result of police procedures and subsequent reductions in charges to ensure convictions (Armstrong and Hobbs 1994; Giulianotti 1994t).

These studies demonstrate that English football hooliganism is recognized as an appropriate topic for criminological investigation, yet they provide little more than evidence about the character, scope and difficulties of the problem. Other non-criminological studies also allude to the fact that the phenomena has a criminological component, and some have gone so far as to suggest explanations which include elements of long-standing criminological theories, especially those focusing on subcultural explanations of delinquency (see the work of the Leicester school, particularly Dunning, Murphy, and Williams). Unfortunately, this corpus of work fails to provide a concise empirical examination of criminological theory in the explanation of English football hooliganism. Bridging this gap in our knowledge of football hooliganism is the impetus

¹⁸Terraces are generally sloped or tiered concrete areas where fans stand during football matches. Until recently, terraces were a predominant feature of English football grounds, especially behind the end lines.

¹⁹Some authors, including the Leicester group (Dunning, Williams, Murphy, and Waddington), have briefly discussed the criminological aspects of hooliganism, but few have made a concerted effort to address it as a criminological phenomenon.

for my dissertation. More specifically, my dissertation will attempt to show how Albert Cohen's strain-based subcultural theory of delinquency can be used to explain the behavior of modern football hooligans in England.

3.2 The Theoretical Basis of the Dissertation

3.2.1 A Brief Summary of the Development of Strain Theory

Strain (anomie) theories of delinquent and criminal behavior have an extensive history, dating back to the work of Emile Durkheim in the 1890s, primarily in *The Division of Labor in Society* and *Suicide*. Durkheim's pioneering work on the conditions that produce strain influenced a host of criminological theorists, including Robert Merton (1938), Albert Cohen (1955), Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960), and Robert Agnew (1992). Strain-based theories of crime and delinquency claim that strain is produced when individuals are unable to achieve the legitimate goals held by society, a condition that motivates certain individuals to engage in illicit activities. Where the numerous strain theories differ is in their explanation of the conditions that produce strain, the types of societal goals, and the form(s) of adaptation taken by the individuals experiencing strain.

3.2.2 The Development of Subcultural Theories

In the 1950s criminological theory started moving in a new direction, one which was to alter the focus of explanations of crime causation, at least temporarily. One aspect of this paradigm shift was a move away from the study of adult criminality and a renewed and identifiable interest in juvenile delinquency (Gibbons 1994; Morrison 1995). The set of theories responsible for the change made explicit in their aims what had previously been accepted as implicit understandings or assumptions. Discussed in these new theories of delinquency were beliefs that:

1. crime was primarily an urban problem;

2. individuals from disadvantaged positions in the social structure committed a disproportionate amount of crime;
3. most delinquency was committed by males; and
4. delinquency occurs most frequently in the setting of a group.

These theories were classified as subcultural theories of delinquency because they focused on the origin, development, and activities of delinquent subcultural forms. Subcultural theories regarded urban juvenile gangs to be the defining, but not sole, formation of delinquent subcultures (Shoemaker 1996).

The key assumption made manifest in subcultural theories is a belief that delinquency is primarily a lower-class male phenomenon.²⁰ For subcultural theories class status was measured by a variety of social and economic factors, including; father's occupation, income, education and training. The classist assumption of delinquency is based on the idea that members of the lower-class experience more impediments to societally defined measures of success than do those of higher social status, especially in terms of educational and occupational opportunities. The existence of multiple, and often competing, value systems within society interferes with lower-class individuals' ability to achieve success; accordingly, the lower-class teaches and promotes attitudes and expectations which are, at times, incompatible with "legitimate" methods for goal attainment. Some individuals struggle to make sense of the contradictions, while others accept their fate of continued lower-class status. A certain proportion of lower-class youths attempt to gain status and achieve success in the eyes of their peers by taking advantage of available illegitimate opportunities. The adolescents who take advantage of, or have access to, illegitimate opportunities often become involved with similar others, thus creating or perpetuating delinquent subcultures.

Subcultural theories of delinquency continually tried to show that delinquency was an activity primarily performed by a group or gang of adolescents, the idealized

²⁰Shoemaker (1996) rightly points out that for some subcultural theorists the terms working-class and lower-class were used interchangeably. I will use both terms in the same manner since the literature on football hooliganism prefers the term working-class and subcultural theories generally employ the term lower-class. Both terms are used to describe people occupying the lower rungs of the social class structure.

representation of the delinquent subculture. If the youths were to act alone, their behaviors were thought to be "strongly influenced by groups, gangs, peers, and the general ambience of their lives and associations" (Shoemaker 1996:103). These theories proposed that existent subcultures of delinquency were not identical, but varied in terms of content and etiology (Cohen & Short 1958).

Subcultural theories of delinquency are often described as being primarily a derivation of the social structure and anomie (SS&A) tradition in criminological theory. Although to characterize this set of theories as simply an extension of the anomie perspective is to misrepresent them. Each subcultural theory of delinquency in the 1950s and 1960s was really an effort to make sense of divergent theories of crime causation. Their link to the tradition of anomie is the result of their collective perception that opportunities for success are differentially distributed throughout the social structure. While there is some common ground between the causal explanations of subcultural and social structure and anomie theories, subcultural theories are not simply an outgrowth of this one paradigm. Subcultural theories have also attempted to integrate the criminological theories of the Chicago School, including ecological and cultural transmission theories (Williams and McShane 1994; Merton 1995; Lanier and Henry 1998). The result of these different influences is an attempt at integration which focuses on how young adults attempt to achieve success by using illicit means when societally-approved means are unavailable. More specifically, subcultural theories are a look at the type of delinquent subcultures created or entered into by adolescents experiencing strain as a result of unattainable success and the influence these subcultures have upon individuals affiliated with them.

3.2.3 The Prominent Subcultural Theories

There were many theoretical statements in the 1950s and early 1960s that fit into the subcultural delinquency paradigm, including: Miller (1958), Short and Strodtbeck (1965), and Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967), but it was the work of Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960) that came to typify this school of thought. Cohen's theory of

subcultural delinquency and Cloward and Ohlin's theory of differential opportunity remain the most widely recognized forms of subcultural theories (Shoemaker 1996). Both theories reflect similar influences, the structural causes of strain as proposed by Merton's anomie theory, and the interactional influence of peers outlined in Sutherland's theory of differential association (Cohen 1983). Cloward and Ohlin were also able to reflect upon and critique Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency in the formulation of their theory of differential opportunity (Cohen 1983; Merton 1995). Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin both attempt to bridge the theoretical gap between anomie and differential association by looking at the types of delinquent subcultures created by youthful members of the lower-class who are unable to achieve goals through the use of legitimate means (Merton 1995).

These two subcultural theories are linked by more than just their common influences, but the differences between them are also readily recognizable and set the two apart. The primary distinction between Cohen's subcultural delinquency theory and Cloward and Ohlin's theory of differential opportunity is their ideas about the availability, nature, and organization of the delinquent subculture(s). Albert Cohen was the first to identify the existence of delinquent subcultures, and his interest was in explaining why delinquent subcultures existed (Akers 1994). In *Delinquent Boys* he went beyond explaining the existence of delinquent subcultures by characterizing their composition and the motivations for their illicit activities. Cohen asserted that delinquent subcultures were malicious, negativistic, non-utilitarian units that were versatile in terms of the types of delinquencies they committed and were guided by short-run hedonism and group autonomy (Cohen 1955).

In contrast, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) argued that opportunities, legitimate and illegitimate, were unequally distributed in society, and that as a result not everyone had access to either of them. While Cohen only described the existence of delinquent subcultures in general terms, Cloward and Ohlin went further, proposing that there were three distinct types of delinquent subcultures; criminal, conflict, and retreatist. Each of these subcultural forms was defined by the type of illegitimate opportunity structure that was available to young lower-class males. The criminal subculture was the most complex

and financially profitable, with a network of interdependence and interaction created between adult criminal role models and aspiring criminal youth. In contrast, conflict subcultures used violence to secure status and success; however, this subcultural form provided few long-term opportunities for the acquisition of criminal or conventional status. The retreatist subculture was the most accessible of the three, and while it did not provide opportunities for advancement, it provided a way to escape through the use of drugs and alcohol.

In general, subcultural theories of delinquency are of great interest in the criminological study of English football hooliganism because of their emphasis on the assumptions that most delinquency occurs within groups and that delinquency is primarily a phenomenon engaged in by lower-class males. More specifically, the development of football hooliganism as delinquent behavior in England closely parallels the line of reasoning developed by the subcultural theories of Cohen and of Cloward and Ohlin, especially because of their integration of strain and cultural transmission theories. The rise of hooligan crews in the 1960s and 1970s signifies the development of a delinquent subculture, one that revolves around the variety of delinquent behavior that is primarily committed by gangs of lower-class males, who are, at times, unable to achieve middle-class standards of status and success (Clarke 1978; Williams, Dunning, and Murphy 1989; Dunning 1994; King 1997). To this point, either Cohen's or Cloward and Ohlin's theories would provide legitimate explanations for why hooliganism occurs, but there are a number of reasons why Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency is the better choice.

Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency does not postulate that society's goals revolve around monetary gain, an aspect of hooligan activities that is non-existent.²¹ A second reason for choosing Cohen's theory is that his primary goal was to explain the development of delinquent subcultures, and during the late 1960s and early 1970s

²¹In the past 5 to 10 years a few hooligans have profited monetarily from their behavior in a football context. A few have published books chronicling their hooliganism over the years, including Allan (1989) and Ward (1989). A few have also turned, in recent years, to dealing drugs in order to obtain a profit from their ties (e.g. Armstrong 1998). All in all, these examples represent the exceptions to the rule.

hooliganism was dominated by the creation of football fighting crews. In their early manifestations these hooligan crews were similar in development to the street gangs developing in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s (Dunning et al. 1988; Giulianotti 1993; Wallace 1996). Cloward and Ohlin focus more on the availability of opportunities and availability of particular subcultural patterns.

Third, English football hooligan crews do not fit well within any of the types of delinquent subcultures identified by Cloward and Ohlin. In contrast, Cohen's theory only attempts to characterize the attributes of delinquent subcultures, making it easier to compare theory and actual delinquent formations cross-culturally. He makes the point that what he proposes may be useful in explaining adolescent gangs in societies that are structurally similar to the United States (1955).

Finally, Cohen's theory is one of the only subcultural theories of delinquency that explains why individuals exit from deviance (Shoemaker 1996), a process that is well-identified in the literature on hooliganism. Those who step away from football hooliganism generally age out of active service to the crew, but may retain status and importance to the group by becoming a "daddy of the ends" (Marsh 1982). As a result, Albert Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency is the theoretical perspective employed in this criminological investigation of English football hooliganism.

3.3 Making Use of Cohen's Theory of Subcultural Delinquency

3.3.1 Basis of the Theory

In *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang* (1955), Albert Cohen identified a gap in existing theories of crime and delinquency, one which persuaded him to explore why it was that adolescents engaged in forms of criminality that bared little resemblance to their adult counterparts. He argued that Merton's theory of anomie was good at describing adult forms of criminality because the goal of such activities was primarily that of monetary success. In contrast to adult crime, Cohen perceived juvenile delinquency to be less focused, less profit-oriented, more destructive, and most

importantly, committed in groups, thus less capable of being explained by individualistic anomie theories. It was the group nature of delinquency which most intrigued Cohen, and led him to theorize that this form of criminality arose in what he termed "the delinquent subculture". Unfortunately, theories of cultural transmission, especially Sutherland's theory of differential association, were of little help in explaining the delinquent subculture because such theories take the subculture as, "something which already exists in the environment of the child" (Cohen 1955:18). Theoretically Cohen attempts to fuse and build upon these incongruous structural and interactional theories of criminality by developing the theory of the delinquent subculture. This development led him to propose two distinct questions:

1. "Why does [the delinquent subculture] have the particular content that it does and why is it distributed as it is within our social system?" (Cohen 1955:18), and
2. "How is it possible for cultural innovations [subcultures] to emerge while each of the participants in the culture is so powerfully motivated to conform to what is already established?" (Cohen 1955:59).

From these queries Cohen began to build a general theory of subcultures which recognized that while structural forces may help create and sustain subcultures (cultural innovations), their emergence is also dependent upon the collective action of individuals. Cohen asserted that human action revolved around efforts to solve problems, and that when one's solutions (which are based on their existing beliefs and values) are not accepted by their existent reference group they experience alienation/strain (1955:50-58). The attempt to alleviate this strain requires the actors to choose between two solutions: (1) defer to their existent reference group(s) or (2) search for a social milieu where others are experiencing similar problems of adjustment. The first scenario isn't really a solution since the individuals set aside their needs (alleviation of strain) for the good of the group. When individuals in the later category find others experiencing the same difficulties and recognize that, together, they can profit from their shared problems, new cultural forms (subcultures) will begin to emerge. As Cohen (1955) asserts, these subcultures are

"continually being created, re-created and modified wherever individuals sense in one another like needs, generated by like circumstances, not shared generally in the larger social system" (p. 65).

These subcultures are deviant, delinquent, and possibly even criminal because the solutions they propose are not condoned by the majority of the society. Cohen's general theory of subcultures was exemplified by the emergence and persistence of gangs, becoming the embodiment of his subcultural theory of delinquency. The importance of the gang cannot be overstated since the delinquency performed by the group is also perceived to be a creation of the group (Cohen 1955).

3.3.2 The Theoretical Influence of Merton and Sutherland

Even though Merton's theory of anomie and Sutherland's theory of differential association were perceived to be deficient as explanations of typical forms of juvenile delinquency, each provided Cohen with material for his own theory of delinquency. From Merton's theory, and the social structure and anomie perspective in general, Cohen adopted the idea that maladaptive strain was produced by "the disjunction between culturally induced aspirations and structurally confined access to opportunities for realizing those aspirations" (Merton 1995:43-44). From this structuralist proposition, Cohen maintained that "these problems are largely problems of status and self-respect arising among working-class children as a result of socially structured inability to meet the standards of the established culture" (Cohen & Short 1958:20). Further, while the sources of strain are socially created, the resultant strain created by these sources is experienced individually.

Cohen concurred with Merton on the idea that the causes of strain were of a structural origin and that they were, in turn, the cause of deviance and delinquency. The source of disagreement between the two theorists stemmed from Cohen's rejection of the solutions Merton proposed for individuals who experience strain. He took exception to the idea that

each person seems to work out his solution by himself, as though it did not matter what other people were doing. Perhaps Merton assumed such intervening variables as deviant role models, without going into the mechanics of them. But it is one thing to assume that such variables are operating; it is quite another to treat them explicitly in a way that is integrated with the more general theory. (Cohen 1965:7)

He proposed that problems of adjustment are most often solved by groups whose members share the same problems. For young members of the lower-class, the solution was delinquency, most of which occurred and was created within the context of the delinquent subculture. The delinquent subculture provided them with "an alternative status system and justifies, for those who participate in it, hostility and aggression against the sources of their status frustration" (Cohen and Short 1958:20). Although disagreeing with Merton's conception of the effects strain may have on the individual, Cohen was still powerfully influenced by the concepts of strain and opportunity structures.

While making use of the ideas provided by the social structure and anomie perspective, these ideas were merged with Sutherland's theoretical developments in cultural transmission. Cohen was intrigued by Sutherland's concept of differential association, which proposed that delinquency was learned from one's associates through a process of social interaction. He incorporated the concept of differential association into his theory of subcultural delinquency, using it to explain how behavior was contrived in subcultures and why they persisted. This theoretical construct allowed him to claim that

deviant as well as non-deviant behavior is typically not contrived within the solitary individual psyche, but is a part of collaborative *social* activity, in which the things that other people say and do give meaning, value and effect to one's own behavior. (Cohen 1965:8)

Yet a gap existed in the explanation of the delinquent subculture, and neither anomie nor differential association were able to explain how subcultures originate.

This deficiency was addressed by applying Sutherland's paradigm in a new way, one that Sutherland alluded to in the 1947 edition of *Principles of Criminology*.

Sutherland "had sensed that the emergence of delinquent behavior patterns was not *simply* the result of cultural transmission but involved a process of social *interaction* [emphasis in the original]" (Merton 1995:36). Cohen applied this knowledge in a concise manner, focusing on idea that delinquency emerged when individuals with similar problems interacted in a way that facilitated the development of collective solutions. More specifically, his theory "emphasizes the role played in the genesis of delinquency, in the 'choice of symptom,' by accessibility to association with others in search of a solution to *their* problems of adjustment" (Cohen 1955:154). The resultant theory of subcultural delinquency proposed that certain individuals will experience strain, some of whom will interact with others experiencing similar strains. Those interactions produce collective solutions to their shared problems, some of which will be delinquent. These delinquent solutions can then be passed on, culturally transmitted, to future individuals experiencing similar problems.

3.3.3 *Delinquent Subcultures - Emergence and Continuation*²²

Albert Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency focuses on the emergence of delinquent subcultures (gangs), especially those which develop in lower-class neighborhoods as a result of strain. This subcultural theory is premised by the idea that one's social class identity determines the values, standards, and styles that children learn during early socialization (prior to enrollment in school) (Cohen 1955:85-88). Lower-class values teach children to have realistic expectations; to be aggressive, spontaneous, yet obedient; and to focus on the present. In contrast, middle-class values promote - ambition, individual responsibility, academic and occupational achievement, foresight and planned action, etiquette, self-control, and respect for property. Although values vary as a result of social class position, children of both classes are instilled with the "appropriate" values by family and community, institutions shaped by the types of values they promote to the younger generations.

²²This section discusses key points of the theory of subcultural delinquency that were developed in Cohen's 1955 book *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*.

Socialization within classes is differentiated by more than just the types of values imparted to the children, it also has to do with expectations and the intensity of training. Cohen believed that socialization is a reflection of the values that were taught. Middle-class socialization is

conscious, rational, deliberate and demanding. . . . The child is constantly aware of what his parents want him to *be* and to *become*. . . . Middle-class people are more likely deliberately [trying] to contrive the child's physical environment, his social milieu and the budgeting of his time with a view to hastening his socialization in the middle-class way of life [emphasis in the original]. (Cohen 1955:98)

In contrast, lower-class socialization is perceived to be more easy-going and relaxed, with children being allowed a great deal of latitude and permissiveness. Parents of working-class children are less actively involved in their children's socialization, often leaving their children to their own devices while alone or in the company of young peers. Cohen (1955) argues that this atmosphere of leniency leaves the child "freer to explore in many areas forbidden to the middle-class child and to encounter a variety of troubles, scrapes and personally meaningful problems" (p. 100).

While each social class has its own method for instilling children with the "appropriate" values, Cohen is quick to point out that the type of socialization provided does not alter the child's ability to learn. This is, at least in part, an attempt to negate beliefs that lower-class individuals fail because they are intellectually inferior to their middle-class counterparts. The net result of early socialization is the provision of a groundwork which will guide the child as they are exposed to new institutions and forms of interaction. The most significant training and testing ground for all youths is the school system.

Prior to being enrolled in school, children are in highly homogeneous social class groups - lower-class associating with lower-class and middle-class associating with middle-class. The school is the first institution where children of different social classes are expected and required to intermix and compete for extended periods of time.

According to Cohen, the school system is a middle-class institution, created and run by individuals of middle-class backgrounds (1955:113-114). Since the school system is based on middle-class values and beliefs, these are the dominant standards expected of the children during their tenure in the schools. Everything that the kids do and how they do it is expected to conform to middle-class standards (i.e. the middle-class measuring rod). On the surface this could mean nothing, but differential socialization creates distinct expectations of kids, allowing some to succeed more easily than others in heterogeneous institutions. For example, lower-class children have been socialized using a set of values that teaches them to take what you can while it is available (orientation toward the present). In contrast, the values of the school, and the middle-class in general, are based on the idea that patience and preparation will get you what you want (orientation toward the future). Since the school system is dominated by the values and standards of the middle-class, lower-class children have to unlearn their values and relearn the appropriate values in a short time in order to be successful in school.

Unlike Merton, Cohen did not equate success with monetary gain, but measured success as one's ability to gain status and acceptance within the dominant social system. While individuals are always striving and competing for status, not everyone starts on equal footing since the dominant social systems are governed by middle-class values (Cohen 1955:110). Those from the lower-class are most hindered by social handicaps which are created through differential socialization, and these handicaps interfere with their ability to succeed. The deficiencies of socialization are most apparent when members of the lower-class compete for status against members of the middle-class. Cohen (1955:122) perceived that this inter-class competition is

an important feature of American "democracy," perhaps of the Western European tradition in general, is the tendency to measure oneself against "all comers." This means that, for children as for adults, one's sense of personal worth is at stake in status comparisons with all other persons, at least of one's own age and sex, whatever their family background or material circumstances.

These status competitions begin at an early age, and the first and most important of these competitions takes place in the school system. Like most other social arenas, lower-class children are at a disadvantage since the school system is dominated by middle-class standards, meaning that they must adapt to succeed, being assessed by "middle-class measuring rods". Cohen (1955) argued that the middle-class measuring rods applied to all students and made it difficult to "reward, however subtly, successful conformity without at the same time, by implication, condemning and punishing the non-conformist" (p. 113). Unfortunately, a large proportion of lower-class children are powerless in the attempt to succeed at school, being unable to cope with, or integrate, the two competing value systems. Their inability to achieve success in school produces strain, what Cohen referred to as "problems of adjustment".²³ Cohen's perception was that "problems of adjustment ... are chiefly status problems: certain children are denied status in the respectable society because they cannot meet the criteria of the respectable status system" (1955:121).

Not all lower-class children experience the same problems of adjustment while in school. Some are more capable of making sense of the competing value systems than are others. Cohen (1955) observed that "the same value system [the middle-class value system], impinging upon children differently equipped to meet it, is instrumental in generating both delinquency and respectability" (p. 137). He went on to propose that lower-class males can make one of three adaptations when experiencing the strain of competing value systems, all of which are based on the idea of being able to succeed and gain status in the eyes of those with whom they regularly interact.²⁴ The school system is where children perceive the status competition most acutely, but status frustration can be

²³Middle-class children are not expected to experience such strains since there is no perceived contradiction between the values they learn at home and the ones that dominate the school system.

²⁴According to Cohen, "a person's status, after all, is how he stands in somebody's eyes. Status, then, is not a fixed property of the person but varies with the point of view of whoever is doing the judging" (1955:123).

experienced in any social institution where one is expected to compete for status and position.

The most adaptive response works only for those students who can integrate the two belief systems - the college boy response. The college boy response requires great effort on the part of lower-class boys because it requires them to accept and work within the middle-class framework of the school while adhering to the lower-class values used in the home. These students are able to make sense of the requirements made in the schools and adapt successfully. They are good students who come to accept the dominant values of the school system.

The second response is the stable street corner response. Cohen (1955) asserted that this was the most common adaptation to the problems of adjustment experienced by lower-class students (128-129). In this case both sets of values (lower-class and middle-class) are not completely integrated, but the children make the best of a situation they cannot seem to change. They continue to try in school, even when it looks futile, but they also make the adaptive response on the street corner. On the streets they have fun and enjoy each other, while allowing school to be what it is, a means to an end -- life beyond school, the work world.

The third response to lower-class students' problems of adjustment is referred to as the delinquent solution. Not unlike the college boy and stable street corner responses, those using the delinquent response initially aspire to achieve middle-class standards of success. These individuals begin to experience status frustration because they fail to measure up to the standards of success "forced" upon them by the middle class measuring rods of the school system. This inability to attain status in school is exacerbated as "his repeated failures in the school system, both academically and socially, cause him to reject the school and the system of values it represents" (Morrison 1995:282). The delinquent solution is the individual's attempt to alleviate their status frustration (strain) by changing their values because middle-class values seem unattainable, and therefore worthless (Cohen 1955:53). This is what he refers to as the process of reaction formation, a hostile

overreaction that allows the delinquent to repudiate "the norms of the respectable middle-class society" (1955:133).

According to Cohen, once lower-class delinquents reject middle-class values, they begin to seek a peer group or gang that can provide them with a nurturing environment that will reinforce their anti-social values and norms. The gang that one decides to join is one that addresses the problems of adjustment they are experiencing, and more importantly, other members of this subcultural form are also experiencing strains, most likely from the same source(s). The ability of the gang to provide acceptable solutions to their shared problems of adjustment is the common ground that allows the delinquent subcultural form to thrive. By establishing or joining a delinquent subculture, these individuals are able to create an alternate set of values, ones which will allow them to succeed, gaining status in the eyes of these same peers. Their adaptive response also protects them from the problems of not being able to succeed in school or any other arena where unattainable, middle-class, standards dominate. The assertion is that "orderliness, amenability to adult supervision and guidance, respect for property, polite speech and manners, the preference of diplomacy to violence - these are contemptuously spurned by the new, jointly supported way of life, the delinquent subculture" (Cohen and Short 1966:114-115).

In addition to providing status and improved self-image, the delinquent gang upend the values of the middle-class; stressing hostility, aggression, malice and destructiveness. By inverting the values of the middle-class, they guarantee that the delinquent will hold higher status than even the most exemplary college boy (Cohen 1955:131). The delinquent subculture also allows and encourages the lower-class delinquent to retaliate against the middle-class values which are perceived to be the source of their status frustration (strain); accordingly, aggression toward those who apply and exemplify the norms of respectable society is lauded (Cohen 1955:168). By extrapolation, those in the delinquent subculture exact revenge against middle-class standards when laws are broken because the laws embody middle-class values and are enforced by agents of the middle-class.

Intrigued by the idea that most juvenile delinquency occurred within the context of the delinquent subculture, Cohen went about trying to identify the content of the delinquent subculture. His impression was that adult criminality and juvenile delinquency were not committed for the same reasons, nor were they caused by the same motivations, so it was important to keep the two separate (Cohen 1955:25). With this in mind, Cohen proposed that delinquent acts committed within the context of the delinquent subculture generally adhered to six characteristics.

- **Non-utilitarianism:** Criminal behavior, especially theft, is often done for the hell of it. Stolen goods are often "discarded, destroyed or casually given away" (Cohen 1955:26).
- **Malice and hostility:** Those in the delinquent subculture enjoy making non-gang others feel uncomfortable or uneasy by being obnoxious, rude and spiteful (Cohen 1955:27-28). This maliciousness is also exemplified by the wanton destruction of property.
- **Negativism:** The delinquent subculture inverts the values of respectable society. "The delinquent's conduct is right, by the standards of his subculture, precisely *because* it is wrong by the norms of the larger culture" (Cohen 1955:28).
- **Versatility:** Even though stealing is the primary activity of the delinquent subculture, these gangs are often involved in a variety of criminal pursuits, ranging from vandalism to acts of interpersonal aggression.
- **Short-run hedonism:** The activities of the delinquent subculture are done for immediate gain and gratification. There is little interest in future returns for present activities. This characterizes the values to which lower-class boys are socialized, not just the behavior of delinquent gangs.

- **Group autonomy:** The gang is the focus of one's loyalty and solidarity, and only members of the gang are able to regulate its activities. Further, gang members subordinate their ties to home and to other groups and institutions; consequently, "relations with other groups tend to be indifferent, hostile or rebellious" (Cohen 1955:31).

These characteristics embody the ideal type of delinquent subculture and motivations for their activities, and will exist to a greater or lesser extent in any actual delinquent subcultural form. Even so, the expectation is that delinquent gangs will be involved in deviance and criminality because it provides lower-class youths with a chance to gain the status that they were unable to achieve in conventional groups and institutions, especially in school.

3.4 Attempts to Test Cohen's Theory of Subcultural Delinquency

To this point in time most studies which have attempted to test hypotheses derived from Cohen's *Delinquent Boys* have been limited in their scope as well as their findings. During the 1960s and 1970s there was thorough discussion and testing of subcultural theories, including Cohen's, but since that time researchers have infrequently touched upon these theories. In the case of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency the vast majority of these studies were narrowly focused, often testing a single aspect of the theory -- the relationship between school and delinquency. Specifically these investigations looked at school in terms of school failure and dropping out (Elliott 1966; Elliott and Voss 1974; Phillips and Kelly 1979; Thornberry, Moore, and Christenson 1985; Farrington et al. 1986; Jarjoura 1993) and school-based values and subcultural influence (Sugarman 1967; Polk 1984). The other, smaller, set of projects looked at the relationship between social class and delinquency (Elliott 1962, 1966; Reiss and Rhodes 1963; Kelly and Balch 1990). The purpose of this section is to discuss the findings of these endeavors and the impact they have on Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency.

3.4.1 The Relationship between School and Delinquency

The largest body of literature concerning the relationship between school and delinquency focuses on school failure and dropping out of school. While not conceptually identical, there is an overlapping logic which is expressed within these studies. Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency maintains that students who perform poorly in school are more likely to engage in delinquency than those who perform adequately and exceptionally. Extrapolating on this proposition these studies maintain that "the act of leaving school should reduce school-related frustrations and alienation and thereby lower the motivational stimulus for delinquency" (Elliott 1978:454). Thus the expectation is that support for Cohen will be garnered if students who drop out have lower levels of delinquency than they did while still in school.

One of the earliest studies to look at this relationship was done by Delbert Elliott in 1966. In this study he tests two hypotheses, "1. The rate of delinquency is greater for boys while in than while out of school. 2. Delinquents who drop out have a higher delinquency rate while in than while out of school" (Elliott 1966:308). These hypotheses are designed in an attempt to explore the notion that dropping out of school allows students to avoid status frustration, a proposition seen to apply equally well to Cohen's and Cloward and Ohlin's theories.

Elliott finds that status frustration and resultant delinquency among lower-class boys are minimized when they leave the supposed source of inadequacy. Thus both hypotheses are supported by the data and roughly support the belief that dropping out may be a way for lower-class students to eliminate status frustration and decrease the need or motivation to engage in delinquency, as Cohen's theory would suggest (Elliott 1966).

While based on the research findings of others, Phillips and Kelly (1979) explore the relationship between school failure and delinquency. They focus on the perception that success in school is more strongly related to delinquency than even social class. Phillips and Kelly's primary interest is in exploring the causal ordering of the delinquency - school failure relationship as it relates to what Cohen theorized. Ultimately they find that cross-sectional research supports the argument that delinquency rates decline after

students leave school, implying that reducing school failure through leaving helps reduce delinquency (Phillips and Kelly 1979:202). While not conclusive, Phillips and Kelly's study does concur with Cohen and a host of others that failure in school is an important factor in the prediction of delinquency.

By far the most influential study on the relationship between school careers and delinquency was that of Elliott and Voss. This 1974 project addressed the impact of dropping out on delinquency in a panel study of more than 2000 California youths throughout their high school careers. Elliott and Voss (1974) collected data on the school performance, self-reported delinquency and police and court records of the students over the four year period.

Among their findings, Elliott and Voss find that those students who eventually drop out have higher rates of delinquency than those that graduate from school (111-113). "Both the official and the self-reported measures of delinquent behavior support the conclusion that dropouts have been involved in more delinquent behavior than graduates, although the differences on the SRD [self-reported delinquency] measure are not nearly as dramatic as those based on official police contacts" (Elliott and Voss 1974:113). More importantly, they find that the levels of delinquency for those that drop out decline subsequent to their dropping out. Therefore support is provided for the argument that motivation for delinquency decreases upon leaving school because it may reduce frustration and alienation. Further, Elliott and Voss (1974) find that dropouts who get married and are employed are at the lowest risk of engaging in delinquency because adult status can be derived from such involvements (128-129). Thus Voss and Elliott provide support for Cohen's theory in terms of the important influence school has on delinquent behavior, especially relating to the effects of dropping out on delinquency. The study also provides limited support for Cohen's proposition that status is an important determinant of success or engagement in delinquent activities.

Thornberry et al. (1985) reconsider the delinquency - dropout relationship in an attempt to replicate Elliott and Voss. Part of their reason for the study is because opposing views on the effects of dropping out are provided by strain and control theories.

Strain theories, represented by Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin, maintain that dropping out of school reduces frustration and therefore delinquency, while control theories, epitomized by Hirschi, contend that dropping out of school reduces control over youth, allowing them to more freely engage in greater amounts of delinquency.

Using longitudinal data from the Philadelphia cohorts study collected by Wolfgang, Thornberry et al. (1985) attempt to clarify which of the theoretical predictions about the dropout - delinquency relationship is more accurate. They argue that, in contrast to Elliott and Voss (1974), their study does not show a subsequent drop off in delinquency following dropping out, as would be predicted by strain theories. When controlling for social class and race, their analysis "indicates that dropping out is not followed by a substantial reduction in criminal involvement" (Thornberry et al. 1985:15). So while their research fails to support the theoretical ideas of Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin about the effect of dropping out on delinquency, they are unwilling to dismiss the possible predictive importance of strain theories altogether. Thornberry et al. (1985:17) assert that

these results cannot be interpreted as providing general support for a control perspective versus a strain perspective. The present analysis has focused exclusively on one behavioral area - dropping out of school - while the theories are concerned with a much wider array of behavioral issues - family, peers, beliefs, and so forth.

While not supportive of Cohen on the issue of dropping out and delinquency, Thornberry et al. rightly point out that both sets of theories are broader than the tests and should not be dismissed outright.

A British project by Farrington et al. (1986) explore the relationship between school leaving and delinquency with the added aspect of unemployment. Using data from the longitudinal Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development they test the position that "if school failure causes offending, then it might be expected that school leaving, if it is followed by successful employment, might lead to a decrease in offending" (Farrington et al. 1986:339). They find that unemployment is related to higher official rates of crime, similar Elliott and Voss's findings, but only for those offenses that were committed for

material gain. More importantly, Farrington et al. (1986) discover that "there was little difference between crime rates just before leaving school and just afterwards in full-time employment" (p. 351). In terms of status, these results would not be unexpected from Cohen's theory since those who find employment after leaving school would have higher status than those who are unemployed. Interestingly, Farrington et al. imply that youths who are unemployed at earlier ages (15) may engage in more delinquency as a result of peer influence than those who are unemployed at later ages (18) (1986:351). The possible impact of peer influence on the commission of delinquency introduced by Farrington et al. is also in line with Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency.

A more recent study by Jarjoura (1993) provides further clarification on the relationship between dropping out of school and subsequent levels of delinquency. After reviewing the different theoretical positions and trying to further specify the relationship through the use of added controls, Jarjoura attempts to clarify the dropout - delinquency relationship through the use of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. Focusing on different possible reasons for dropping out, Jarjoura finds mixed results which leads him to state that "while dropouts were more likely to have higher levels of involvement in delinquency than graduates, it is not always because they dropped out" (1993:167). While some groups of dropouts increase their delinquent behavior after leaving school, such as those who dislike school, there seems to be no significant relationship between participation in delinquency and dropping out as a result of poor grades. The conclusion Jarjoura reaches is that "there are no criminological theories that adequately explain the dropout -delinquency relationship" (1993:169).

Overall the relationship between dropping out and delinquency is definitely mixed on the predictive value of the relationship derived from Cohen's theory.

3.4.2 School Values, Academic Achievement, and Delinquency

Both of the studies in this section look at the norms and values schools try to instill upon their students. Ideally these studies would address Cohen's position that schools try to instill students with middle-class values that lower-class students have

difficulty integrating, and may well invert in their delinquency if they experience failure in school, but they don't. In fact, neither of these studies invoke Cohen, even tangentially. Even so, the subject matter of both articles relates to the role of school norms and values in relation to delinquency.

In an empirical study of 540 secondary school boys in London, Sugarman (1967) addresses the issue of youth culture's²⁵ impact on delinquency. He argues that schools try to instill two important values on all students, delayed gratification and subordinate status in relation to adults. Next he contends that youth culture is important in determining whether or not the values of the school are overturned. Accordingly, Sugarman maintains that youth culture inverts the values provided by the schools.

In place of the officially-expected deferred gratification it puts an emphasis on spontaneous gratification or hedonism. Similarly it repudiates the idea of youth being subordinate to adults and asserts, in effect, that teenagers are 'grown up' in the sense that they are equal in status to adults though different in kind. (Sugarman 1967:154)

While Sugarman does not attribute any of these ideas to Cohen, the rejection of delayed gratification and subordinate status as well as the importance of youth culture in overturning school-promoted values are all curiously similar to those proposed by Cohen in *Delinquent Boys*.

As far as findings are concerned, Sugarman discovers that those who were committed to youth culture held attitudes unfavorable to school (1967:155). Also as predicted, Sugarman finds that rejection of the value on delayed gratification is most likely to be found among those with a commitment to youth culture. These statistical results legitimately provide support for propositions forwarded by Cohen twelve years earlier. One of the statements that is most informative about the implicit link between this article and the arguments made by Cohen is that "pupils who are already becoming

²⁵Sugarman's use of the British term youth culture is quite similar to the American concept of subculture. He argues that youth culture is "a special feature of the U.S." and embodies "values in conflict with those of the adult world" (Sugarman 1967:153).

alienated from school are likely to turn to teenage commitment as a symbolic expression of this attitude and pupils who are ambitious in the conventional terms of the school are likely to avoid teenage commitment for the same reasons" (Sugarman 1967:159).

Although not quantitatively designed or supported, Polk (1984) makes arguments similar to those provided by Sugarman (1967) and also sets forth propositions that have a distinctive ring of Albert Cohen's work without being recognized as such. For example, "the successful student is surrounded with the rewards that accrue to the successful, including supportive and positive feedback from teachers and other, successful peers . . ." (Polk 1984:466). Further, "subcultures are likely to lead to a repudiation of the values and norms of the school, and to serve as a deterrent to academic achievement for its participants" (Polk 1984:471).

Assuming that the Cohen-like propositions are occurring in the schools, Polk argues that alienation experienced as a result of poor school performance can be overcome through a number of pro-active policies. These policies are thought to be important because the experience of alienation within the context of school is believed to be a source of delinquent behavior.

3.4.3 The Relationship between Social Class and Delinquency

The literature on the relationship between social class and delinquency which concentrates on Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency is much less extensive, but still contains a couple of noteworthy inquiries. The primary focus of these studies is on looking at whether levels of delinquency vary as a result of class-based differences in the experience of status frustration. Cohen predicted that lower-class students would experience greater level levels of status frustration in school which would affect school performance and therefore increase the chances that they would engage in delinquency.

The first important study to focus upon was done by Albert Reiss and A. Lewis Rhodes in 1963 and relates to class differences in the experience of what Cohen termed "status frustration". In this investigation of Cohen's predictions about the relationship between social class, status frustration, and delinquency, Reiss and Rhodes center on the

notion that social class comparisons occur which most negatively impact those of lower-class status which is therefore responsible for high rates of delinquency. Reiss and Rhodes argue that it is a test of Cohen's theory, and develops a concept referred to as status deprivation that is used as a measure of status frustration. While this is not problematic in itself, difficulties are created when they attempt to operationalize this concept based on a single Mertonian question about the experience of relative deprivation. Reiss and Rhodes fail to adequately explain how relative deprivation and status deprivation (Cohen's status frustration) are similar, and how the experience of relative deprivation can adequately measure a failure to live up to middle-class standards.

Further, some of the occupations that they refer to as middle-class are questionable. According to Reiss and Rhodes (1963), the middle-class includes "those from homes of craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers, protective service workers, managers and proprietors of small businesses, clerical workers, sales workers not in other categories, and technicians allied to professional services" (p. 138). Ultimately they find mixed results that partially reject the hypothesized link between status deprivation and social class attributed to Cohen. Even with the poor operationalization and measurement of Cohen's theory, Reiss and Rhodes (1963:148-149) state that there is some support for

Cohen's theory in that reported experience of status deprivation is greatest in those positions of the social structure where subcultural delinquency and female delinquency are more prevalent, i.e., among bottom class [lower-class] adolescents in schools where the student body is predominately bottom class.

The value of this study in testing Cohen is questionable at best, and their results should be viewed critically. Kelly and Balch (1990) also attest to the fact that the study is an inadequate test of any aspect of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency.

While recognizing the difficulties of Reiss and Rhodes (1963) test of Cohen's theory, Kelly and Balch (1990) attempt to provide their own thorough test of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency. They employed a survey of more than 1200 students in the Pacific Northwest to help determine whether social class was, in fact, related to

delinquency as hypothesized by Cohen. In addition, they add a locus of school-related factors to see if they intervene in the social-class - delinquency relationship.

In their initial findings, Kelly and Balch (1990) show that the expected relationship between social class and delinquency is not realized according to differences in percentages. At the same time, they do find some important differences in delinquent behavior according to measures of school success, self-evaluations of school, affect toward school, and involvement in school. Upon controlling school-related measures, Kelly and Balch (1990) find that "the relationship between social class and our dependent variables does not depend on school experience as Cohen implies" (p. 254). In effect, they find that items related to school and status derived from school have an important impact on delinquency, regardless of social class. While contrary to the social class-school failure-delinquency hypothesis developed by Cohen, it fails to adequately address the concept of ability to successfully adhere to middle-class values.

Although it has already been addressed in the previous section, Elliott (1966) does make a few secondary comments about social class differences in the commission of delinquent behavior in his study of the delinquency-dropout relationship. In this work he finds it important to see if there is a class difference in levels of delinquency while the subjects were in school and after leaving school. The results indicate that there is a class difference in levels of delinquency related to school status, with levels of delinquency after leaving school dropping off more dramatically for lower-class youths than for those from higher social classes. The perception is that dropping out may be a solution for the status deprivation experienced by lower-class students, whereas dropping out may create further problems for those of higher social class standing. Elliott (1966) concludes that "one might infer that dropout is a satisfactory solution for those from lower SES areas for the delinquency rate of such youth is lower after leaving school than it was while they were in school" (p. 314).

Another study by Delbert Elliott in 1962 also addresses the issue of social class and delinquency from a subcultural perspective. In this study the theories of Cohen and Cloward and Ohlin are explored in an attempt to address how delinquents and non-

delinquents define success and whether the groups have different perceptions of their ability to achieve success. Elliott surveyed 200 high-school males about three different measures of success while getting delinquency data from juvenile court referrals. On each aspect of success there was some indication that delinquents and non-delinquents had similar ideas about how success is defined and identified. When looking at the composition of the delinquent and non-delinquent groups Elliott found that the delinquent group contained a greater proportion of lower- and working-class students than did the non-delinquent group. When controlling for differences in social class, he finds that delinquents are more likely to perceive lower and fewer educational opportunities than are non-delinquents (Elliott 1962).

Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency receives minimal support at best from the conclusions provided by Elliott. While it is the case that there is similarity between lower- and middle-class delinquents in this study, it does not rule out the possibility that Cohen might have some value in the prediction of delinquency. Part of the limited support for Cohen comes across when Elliott (1962) argues that "even among lower-class boys who are subject to essentially the same class barriers to success, non-delinquents are more likely than delinquents to maintain the belief that they can achieve a middle-class occupation" (pp. 224-225). Such a statement implies that the lower-class is likely to perceive impediments to success which delinquents are more likely to allow to stop them in the pursuit of middle-class success than are non-delinquents.

3.4.4 Summarizing the Findings of the Theoretical Tests

All in all, support for Cohen's theory has been mixed over the past 40 years. It is of interest to note that the aspect of the theory that has received the greatest attention, the dropout-delinquency relationship, is one that was not directly proposed by Cohen in the theory, but is extrapolated from his writings and from other strain theories. Other aspects of the theory have been tested in more limited ways, but just as in the case of dropout - delinquency, no consensus has been reached about the value or inadequacy of the theory.

Kelly and Balch's (1990) study has been the broadest of all of the studies to date, and fails to find support for Cohen's theory. Even so, this inquiry, just like most all others, takes the existence and adherence to school-based middle-class values by lower-class youths as a given. When taken altogether there is no compelling reason to completely dismiss Cohen's theory. It seems that Empey's conclusion in 1967 about existing subcultural theories remains applicable today. In essence, it argues that there is not enough solid information to either support or negate the relationships proposed by subcultural theories, including Cohen's (Empey 1967).

3.5 Making Cohen's Subcultural Theory More Concise and Testable

Cohen proposed that youths in the lower-class were taught the values of aggressiveness, obedience, and a focus upon the present. In contrast, middle-class kids were taught values that promote ambition, individual responsibility, academic and occupational achievement, foresight and planned action, etiquette, self-control, and respect for property. This second set of values was perceived to be the set that were dominant within the school system and society itself. From the outside it is easy to see that there is a basic incongruence between these two sets of values, but only a small percentage of the lower-class within society and, more importantly, the school system will be able to make sense of the incompatibility. Those that are able to make sense of the competing systems have a much greater chance of being able to succeed than those that cannot. The individuals who are unable to succeed by incorporating the dominant societal value system will still attempt to become successful and to gain status, either through legitimate or illegitimate means. The most deviant of the attempts to succeed in attaining status is through the delinquent response (delinquent subculture), which takes the dominant societal values (middle-class values) and rejects them, turning instead to acts which are made to flaunt the rejection of socially accepted values. The acts committed by those in the delinquent subcultures are defined by the fact that they are malicious,

negativistic, non-utilitarian, and hedonistic, all of which are characteristics of behavior that are basically incompatible with middle-class values.

Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency is both insightful and straightforward, providing future researchers with a theory that is amenable to empirical tests. In fact, the theory itself was a product of qualitative research and insight, and Cohen provided preliminary data that there was tentative support for his conceptualization. He encouraged researchers to test the theory and to modify it as necessary (Cohen 1955). Researchers have made a number of attempts to test the subcultural theory of delinquency, but results have been less than encouraging.²⁶ Many of these attempts have fallen short of a comprehensive test of the theory's propositions. In the spirit of Cohen's desire to make the theory useful, I am proposing modifications to the theory which may make it more concise and easier to test. These modifications are not designed to affect the theoretical integrity or etiology proposed by Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency, but instead focus on generating more internal consistency among the values and standards proposed therein.

The problem in Cohen's original definition of nine middle-class values is that they are not sufficiently developed to warrant the separation afforded them in textual form. In the description of the middle-class standards, Cohen alludes to the fact that some standards are of an overlapping nature. In some cases the overlap is so significant that it becomes difficult to perceive of them as separate standards, with differences being in focus, not definition. Cohen (1955) propose that ambition means, among other things, "an orientation to long-run goals and long-deferred rewards" (p. 88). Cohen also attempts to make the case that delayed gratification should also be accepted as a middle-class ethic, one which values "a readiness and an ability to postpone and to subordinate the temptations of immediate satisfactions and self-indulgence in the interest of the achievement of long-run goals" (1955:89-90). The result is a set of middle-class standards

²⁶For a thorough overview of studies that have dealt with Cohen's theory see the previous section (3.4). Even though the studies fail to find overwhelming support for the theory, few, if any, were designed to thoroughly test the theory. Even so, as Shoemaker admits, "in both motivation and pattern of conduct, Cohen made an important contribution to the understanding of delinquency" (1996:111).

that are in need of revision, and such revision might make the theory more concise, more logically consistent, and easier to test empirically.

Using Cohen's nine middle-class values as a guide, I am proposing a new scheme which reduces the number of values to five, each of which is made up of at least one of Cohen's original values. The nine middle-class values that he identified are: ambition, individual responsibility, achievement and performance, delayed gratification, rationality and planning, etiquette and self-control, self-control over the physical body, wholesome leisure, and respect of other's property (Cohen 1955:88-92). The revised scheme of middle-class values is composed of the following categories: success, self-reliance, constructive leisure, acceptable conduct, and conspicuous consumption.

3.5.1 *Success*

The construct of **success** is derived from Cohen's values of ambition, achievement and performance, and delayed gratification (middle-class values 1, 3, and 4). Each of these values attempts to instill the middle-class belief in setting goals and striving to meet them throughout the developmental process. Cohen held that "middle-class norms place great value on 'worldly asceticism,' a readiness and an ability to postpone and to subordinate temptations of immediate satisfactions and self-indulgence in the interest of the achievement of long-run goals" (1955:89-90). While this is the middle-class value termed delayed gratification, it is an important component of his values of ambition and achievement and performance. Of achievement and performance Cohen (1955) stated that "there is special emphasis on academic achievement and the acquisition of skills of *potential* economic and occupational value [emphasis added]" (p. 89).

The other ties within these three values can be found when looking at the link between ambition (middle-class value 1) and achievement and performance (middle-class value 3). Both values emphasize achievement through aspiration, effort, and determination. The significance here is that children should be somebody and be better

off than their parents.²⁷ Thus, it is believed that children will be successful in the future as long as they are dedicated, willing to strive, and put off for the future. If, on the other hand, lofty goals are not sought, there is no achievement or performance, and/or immediate gratification is not avoided, the success one anticipates will not materialize as expected. Failure to adhere to these middle-class values has the capacity to interfere with the attempt to get ahead, to attain success.

3.5.2 *Self-Reliance*

Self-reliance is a descriptive term for the value Albert Cohen labeled individual responsibility (middle-class value number 2), and, in fact, there is no discernable difference between the way Cohen defined this value and its present form. He envisioned self-reliance as the middle-class ethic which was fostered by parents to ensure that their children would know how to make it successfully in the world on their own. In Cohen's own words, "it [self-responsibility] applauds resourcefulness and self-reliance, a reluctance to turn to others for help" (1955:89). Lower-class parents are perceived to teach children the importance of helping others, and according to this middle-class value, such behavior may interfere with one's ability to get ahead in life. "If one's first obligation is to help, spontaneously and unstintingly, friends and kinsmen in distress, a kind of minimum security is provided for all, but nobody is likely to get very far ahead in the game" (Cohen 1955:89). Ultimately this means that getting ahead requires one to do things for themselves, and to avoid people and situations that may interfere with personal achievement.

3.5.3 *Constructive Leisure*

The revised component, **constructive leisure**, is modeled after Cohen's values of wholesome leisure and rationality and planning (middle-class values 5 and 8). There is a

²⁷It is interesting to note that in the middle-class value of ambition it is implied that it is the father's role to encourage their children. "It is incumbent upon the good parent to encourage in his children those habits and goals which will help them to be 'better off' than himself" (Cohen 1955:88).

core provided by both middle-class values which states that all activities should be planned and have focus, even if it is a leisure activity.²⁸ In the construct of constructive leisure frivolous activities are to be avoided, everything should be done out of reason and rationality. Cohen (1955) ascertained that the requirements of wholesome leisure are based on not wasting time, "play gains in merit to the degree that it involves some measure of foresight, study, practice and sustained endeavor toward the development of a collection, a skill or a fund of specialized knowledge" (p. 91). Similarly, rationality and planning is valued because of "the exercise of forethought, conscious planning, the budgeting of time, and the allocation of resources in the most economic and technologically most efficient way" (Cohen 1955:90).

In effect, wholesome leisure is by implication subsumed under rationality and planning in Cohen's original discourse on the existence of middle-class values and their description. While wholesome leisure looks at making the most out of activities in a single context, rationality and planning places value on constructive activities in all contexts. An important point to make is that rationality and planning also contains another meaningful component, a distrust of gambling and other activities based on chance (Cohen 1955:90). This element contends that such behavior may be popular, even among middle-class youths, but ultimately it is not wholesome or efficient and cannot be planned. This aspect of planning and rationality will be retained in the revised middle-class value of constructive leisure.

3.5.4 Acceptable Conduct

Cohen's middle-class values of self-control over the physical body and etiquette and self-control (middle-class values 6 and 7) are analogous and should be combined into a single middle-class value, **acceptable conduct**. Acceptable conduct centers on the belief common to both values that one must engage in proper behavior at all times.

²⁸Although non-constructive leisure activities are not valued, so to speak, Cohen does not state that such endeavors should be avoided altogether. It is just that these ventures are not observed to help one get ahead in life.

According to their original descriptions, these middle-class values stated that fighting and aggression are not proper behavior in any situation. Etiquette and self-control stressed two things: (1) the use of proper behavior in all circumstances (etiquette and courtesy) and (2) becoming adept at secondary group relations. As Cohen (1955:90-91) stated that an

ability to "make friends and influence people," or at least to avoid antagonizing them is important. . . . The achievement of these skills necessarily implies the cultivation of patience, self-control and the inhibition of spontaneity.

Great emphasis is placed on recognizing that etiquette and courtesy are highly valued and help open doors that may make success possible.

Where etiquette and self-control overlap with self-control over the physical body is in a necessary reliance on acting in a suitable and controlled manner at all times. Violence and aggression, Cohen argues, interfere with the ability to uphold good interpersonal relationships. Further, self-control ensures that "intellectual, technical and social skills may realize their maximum value" (Cohen 1955:91). Each of these middle-class values places great emphasis on the use of etiquette and self-control in all situations, meshing to such a degree that logically the two can be combined into a single middle-class value of acceptable conduct without losing meaning.

3.5.5 Conspicuous Consumption

Conspicuous consumption is really just another name for Cohen's perception of a middle-class standard that values the respect of other's property. This is the standard that Cohen most clearly outlined, explaining not only the significance of property rights, but also the attitudes that are to be held about the accumulation of property. In the description of this value he mentioned that other's property should be respected because it is the most conspicuous sign of achievement and is something that individuals should also strive to attain.

What Cohen is describing is quite similar to Thorstein Veblen's concept of conspicuous consumption, hence the reason for renaming this middle-class standard. In *The Theory of the Leisure Class* ([1899] 1953), Veblen coined the term conspicuous consumption to describe a situation where people purchase unnecessary goods and services as a means to display their social status. In fact, Cohen (1955) claims that "property, furthermore, is not only of utilitarian or esthetic value, but it is extraordinarily ego-involved, for it is the most conspicuous sign of achievement, the most universally legible symbol of worth" (p. 93).

The middle-class value of conspicuous consumption is defined in such a way that it is difficult to test because it is diametrically opposed to delinquency. It is difficult, if not impossible, to steal a person's property and respect their rights to that property. While not stating it in terms of property offenses, Cohen does maintain that "things are to be husbanded, treated carefully, not wantonly wasted, carelessly abused or destroyed" (1955:92). At the same time he perceives that delinquency is motivated by maliciousness and non-utilitarianism. Realistically the relationship between conspicuous consumption and delinquency is such that a tautological argument is created.

3.6 Theoretical Summary

The modifications to the middle-class values identified by Cohen should make it easier to examine whether or not they have any impact on the propensity to engage in delinquency, specifically football hooliganism. While several authors have pointed out limitations to Cohen's concept of delinquent subcultures, many of their empirical tests of the theory have been less than rigorous in their approach to this theory, often testing only certain aspects of it at any given time. More importantly, studies such as Elliott and Voss (1974), Thornberry et al. (1985), and Farrington et al. (1986) provide at least tacit support

for certain aspects of the theory, specifically a relationship between dropping out of school (school failure) and subsequent levels of delinquency.²⁹

I am proposing a more in-depth test of Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency, looking specifically at the evolution of modern English football hooligans and hooligan crews as an example of subcultural delinquency. It is hypothesized that since football hooliganism is inclusive of multiple forms of delinquent behavior, those who engage in such activities are less likely to adhere to middle-class values than are non-hooligans. Specifically, hooligans orientation toward success, self-reliance, acceptable conduct, and constructive leisure will be less middle-class than their non-hooligan counterparts.

²⁹These findings are further detailed in section 3.4 of this chapter, which highlights empirical tests of Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency. Another good source for discussion about empirical tests of Cohen's theory can be found in Shoemaker (1996).

CHAPTER IV

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There is a large body of literature, generated by both academic and non-academic sources, that describe the variety of football cultures throughout the world. This diverse work includes everything from the histories of football and specific clubs to reports on distinctive events and players, but football hooliganism is by far the most studied aspect of the football culture. As Duke (1991) explains, "this preponderance of work on one issue is not surprising given its high visibility in media discourse and the greater likelihood of funding for policy relevant research" (p. 627). Studies of hooliganism have proliferated over the past 30 years, the majority of which focus on the problem in the United Kingdom, yet the situation has been defined as a social problem by political, academic, and sports authorities the world over (Johansson 1987).

The purpose of this review is to address the state of the literature on football hooliganism, especially that written about the problem in England, and to provide support for the use of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency as an explanatory model of hooligan involvement. More specifically, I will focus on five aspects of the available literature:

- 1 the defining characteristics of football hooliganism;
- 2 the nature of the empirical research to date;
- 3 the literature which focuses on the criminological aspects of the phenomena;

- 4 the relevance of a criminologically based subcultural explanation derived from the work of Albert Cohen; and
- 5 the quantitative data set that is employed in this project.

It will be revealed that studies of football are dominated by qualitative investigations that focus on the sociological, psycho-social, and psychological features leading to football hooliganism. Many of these studies also recognize that there is an important sub-cultural dimension to hooliganism, and vaguely suggest explorations that look at this component of the phenomenon.

4.1 Characteristics of Football Hooliganism

4.1.1 Defining Hooliganism

The term football hooliganism is decidedly English, thought to be derived from the surname of the "infamous" criminal Patrick Hooligan, who went about the streets robbing and beating his victims (Hobbs and Robins 1991). Since the term was first invoked to describe fan disorder at English football matches, nations all over the world have adopted the expression for the development of similar football-related behavior in their countries (Duke and Crolley 1996). When English football hooliganism attained social problem status in the 1960s, it was the media that helped define the parameters of the problem for the public (Hall 1978; Murphy et al. 1988; Kerr 1994). Serious academic and political dialogue on the topic was not undertaken until the late 1960s, and the definitions developed from these discussions were shaped to a large degree by the public's image of the problem. Since that time, numerous definitions have been put forth in an attempt to accurately describe the phenomena.

Football hooliganism has become an inclusive term used to represent a wide variety of mischievous and malicious activities that occur in the context of football matches. These behaviors run the gamut from disruptive non-criminal activities to serious criminal offenses (Ingham 1978; Carroll 1980; Trivizas 1980; Armstrong and Hobbs 1994; Kerr 1994). According to Melnick (1986), "the forms of misbehavior commonly

associated with football hooliganism include physical assaults on opposing fans and police, pitch invasions, throwing missiles, verbal abuse, vandalism, drunkenness, theft and possession of an offensive weapon" (p. 1-2). Even though activities commonly described as hooliganism encompass a wide variety of criminal acts against persons and property, football hooliganism is not a specific crime (or set of crimes) under British criminal or civil law (Williams 1980; Melnick 1986; Redhead 1991; Armstrong 1998).³⁰ The absence of a comprehensive criminal law on hooliganism is due to the fact that the term encompasses a wide array of activities that occur before, during, and after matches inside and outside of the football grounds (Canter et al. 1989; Roversi 1991; Kerr 1994).

Any accurate definition of hooliganism should address four important issues. First, football hooliganism is inclusive of both simple and complex behaviors. As Carroll (1980) states, hooliganism "has become used in a 'blanket' fashion, which covers a multiplicity of actions, some of which are law breaking offences, some of which are more nuisance value or are frightening" (pp. 77-78). Second, acts of hooliganism can be performed by either individuals or groups. Since juvenile gangs (teddy boys, punks, and skinheads) started attending matches in the 1960s, group-based hooliganism (fighting crews and casuals) has become a more or less permanent aspect of the phenomena, displacing less organized (almost individualistic) forms of fan disorder (Murphy et al. 1990; Armstrong and Hobbs 1994; Finn 1994; Stott and Reicher, 1998).

Third, acts of hooliganism occur inside and outside of football stadia. Traditionally hooliganism occurred inside football grounds, but since rival fans have been segregated "more and more effectively within the stadia, face-to-face confrontation is only possible outside the ground" (Canter et al. 1989:108). Other advances have also

³⁰People are often arrested in the context of football matches, but since hooliganism is not crime they are not charged with football-related offenses. Trivizas (1980) found that 67 percent of arrests in this context were for the use of "threatening, abusive or insulting words or behavior with intent to provoke a breach of the peace or whereby a breach of the peace is likely to be occasioned" (p. 278). The majority of prosecutions for this offense were brought "under section 5 of the Public Order Act 1936 and a small number under section 54(13) of the Metropolitan Police Act 1839" (Trivizas 1980:279). Part of the reason for the wide use of Section 5 is that it is more practical than other, often more accurate, charges, especially when "victims" are unavailable or unwilling to testify (e.g. Williams 1980).

made it more difficult to engage in hooliganism inside stadia, including the use of closed circuit television, added law enforcement personnel, and all-seater stadia (Giulianotti 1994s; Kerr 1994; King 1997). Areas outside football grounds are more difficult to control, leaving motivated hooligans opportunities for confrontations with rivals (Dunning 1994; Kerr 1994; Armstrong 1998).

Fourth, football hooliganism occurs occur prior to, during, or after matches. The variety of times hooliganism may arise is due in large part to the fact that agencies of social control have limited the opportunities to engage in disruptive and criminal activities inside the grounds during matches (Coalter 1985; Williams et al. 1986; Canter et al. 1989).³¹ For the purposes of my dissertation, football hooliganism is defined as behavior that ranges from disruptive and nuisance acts to property and violent crimes committed both inside and outside football grounds by individuals and/or groups commonly affiliated with football.

4.1.2 Identifying Hooligans

Since academic studies of football hooliganism began to proliferate in the 1970s, numerous attempts have been made to identify the individuals who engage in these activities. The demographic characteristics (namely gender, age, and social class) of this sub-population have been well documented in the literature, yet little is known or contested about their backgrounds outside the context of football (Marsh 1977). Even so, the identification of hooligans is one of the few areas where general agreement exists in the literature, an agreement built up since the beginning of academic studies. This section of the literature review discusses the identification of hooligans in terms of the overriding characteristics of those who have emerged since the 1966/7 season. It also helps reinforce the position that Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency is an appropriate explanatory model for individual involvement in hooliganism.

³¹For a thorough discussion of incidents attributed to individuals attempting to engage in pre- and post-game hooliganism outside football grounds see Armstrong (1998) and Armstrong and Harris (1991).

Gender. Football is a traditionally male preserve, and the gender composition of hooligans is often implicitly treated as a foregone conclusion.³² The proportion of female spectators at a match can vary quite widely, studies by Coalter (1985) and King (1997) found that the proportion of female spectators varies by club, and is, to a certain degree, a reflection of the club's facilities and policies. In the 1980s and 1990s numerous findings have shown that more women are attending football matches in England, but generally speaking they make up little more than 10 percent of attendance figures (Waddington, Dunning, and Murphy 1996). Regardless of the crowd's composition, football is viewed as a male pursuit in almost all reports (Williams and Woodhouse 1991), and more importantly, football hooliganism is, and has been, a male dominated phenomena.

In one of the few quantitative studies on hooliganism, Trivizas (1980) found that hooliganism was disproportionately a male problem. Based on arrest information gathered in England he found that 99.2 percent of individuals arrested at and around football matches were male. In a comparable control sample, matched by offense, only 87.3 percent of those arrested were male. Even so, Trivizas (1980) points out that while women are often not actively involved in acts of hooliganism, "their presence in the crowd may indirectly lead to the commission of offences by males" (p. 285). Generally speaking, female hooligans are a rare breed, and where they do exist they are greatly outnumbered by their male counterparts (Roversi 1991; Del Lago and De Biasi 1994; Giulianotti 1994k; van der Brug 1994).

Other quantitative findings that explicitly address the issue of gender and hooliganism come from investigations of football violence in Italy. Zani and Kirchler (1991) confirm that 'fanatic' fans (hooligans) were "more likely to be male ($z = 3.20$; $p < 0.01$)" (p. 9). Even so, they found that female 'fanatics' accounted for approximately 11.9 percent of their total sample. Roversi (1991) reported a surprisingly high percentage

³²Canter et al. (1989) provide a prime example of how researchers' take the "maleness" of football supporters as a given. In their survey of more than 1000 football supporters at 10 different clubs they contacted only males.

(17.1) of female hooligans within a sub-group of his sample.³³ The different levels of female participation in hooligan activities found in these studies may be due in part to cultural differences in attendance and television viewership (e.g. Canter et al. 1989).

The qualitative work done by the Leicester group also shows hooliganism to be an overwhelmingly male phenomenon and helps to provide reinforcement for the norms of masculinity that seemingly affect those involved in such behavior. Based on their analysis of hooliganism, they conclude that "fans who fight at football matches are engaging in an expression of norms of masculinity that are generally characteristic of patriarchal society such as modern Britain" (Dunning et al. 1991:474). Spectators use hooliganism as a way to express their machismo, "either factually by inflicting defeat on the rival fans and making them run away, or symbolically, via the medium of song and chants" (Dunning 1986:279). Marsh (1978) also supports the position that hooligan behavior is influenced by the norms and values of masculinity.

While a focus on the influence of masculinity norms and values upon those involved in hooliganism goes back at least to the work of Marsh (1978), recent years have seen increasing numbers of discussions about the existence and values of masculinity that hooligans attempt to fulfill. Finn (1994) argues that hooligans' identities are wrapped in a need to express themselves, their masculinity, and their support through aggression and violence. From a social psychological perspective Finn perceives that aggression and violence are the foundation of football and that fans engaged in such behavior are looking to have peak experiences that provide unequalled excitement. Analyzing the comments of one self-proclaimed hooligan, Finn (1994) argues that the acts of hooliganism are "so intensely and positively overwhelming that he is unable to find any adequate description of the totality of feelings that result" (p. 117).

Others have similarly argued that there is in hooliganism an overt perception and expression of masculinity. As King (1997:333) points out,

³³Roversi (1991) attributes this high proportion of female hooligans to a number of factors, including shorter periods of involvement and the existence of a female hooligan group (pp. 324-325).

the lads also attain pride for themselves by the demonstration of loyal support: regular attendance, singing (even when losing) and fighting. The notion of pride is important in the lads' everyday lives for their masculinity is substantially defined through football.

This perception of masculinity among hooligans requires a shared definition of what masculinity means and how it is expressed (Haynes 1993; Armstrong 1998; Stott and Reicher 1998). This development of a shared social identity helps to define "both the extent and the direction of crowd action: who acts together and how they act" (Stott & Reicher 1998). Among football spectators and hooligans alike, masculinity is defined both by action and by dress, and only certain groups are perceived to be masculine. As one of King's (1997) interviewees identified, "it just fucks me off so much to look at them all just sat there in shirts not singing" (p. 359).

The Leicester group posits that the violent masculine style at football matches is a reproduction of the way hooligans are socialized. Guided by Gerald Suttle's work on 'ordered segmentation' they establish that hooligans' violent masculine style at football grounds is the result of sexual segregation occurring in the neighborhoods in which they grow up (Dunning et al. 1982; Dunning 1990).

The overwhelming maleness of hooliganism strengthens the argument for a subcultural theoretical explanation of the phenomenon since one of the major arguments made by subcultural theories is that delinquent behavior is a primarily male phenomenon (Gibbons 1994; Shoemaker 1996). The assumption about the predominately male character of hooliganism is one that can be readily applied to English football hooligans.

Age. The issue of age and football hooliganism has yet to be completely resolved; however, there is considerable agreement about the nature of the relationship. Hooliganism is generally perceived to be an activity of adolescents and young adults, a perception borne out by most research on the subject. The ambiguity attached to specific ages (or age ranges) is compounded by the fact that a number of writers refer to hooligans as being "young" without elaborating on approximate age (Marsh, Rosser, and Harre

1978; Carroll 1980; Pratt and Salter 1984; Giulianotti 1994k; van der Brug 1994). Where ages (or age ranges) are reported there is a degree of variance, but these findings generally support the existence of a strong relationship between youth and hooliganism.

The stereotypical view about modern football hooligans was that they were young schoolboys, but numerous studies have rejected this supposition, at least partially. Focus on the age of hooligans became more important as age segregation began to gain prominence at football stadia during the 1950s and 1960s, with young spectators coming to dominate the "football ends."³⁴ According to Hobbs and Robins (1991), "this represented a significant break with traditional ways of watching football and can be dated by most observers, with some precision, to the seasons of 1966-67 and 1967-68" (p. 554). As this change in terrace composition occurred, hooliganism took on a broader and more organized form (Williams et al. 1986; Armstrong 1994; King 1997). The development of "youth ends" and "hooligan gangs" helped to create a process whereby individuals were weaned into hooligan groups, took on more active roles, then faded from active participation.

Studies have found that individuals become involved in hooliganism at an early age. Marsh (1982) found that children from 9 to 13 years of age became involved as novices, undergoing a social learning process through which they learn "the essential skills required by a successful football fan" (p. 250). In a study of the Hibs (Hibernian) casuals in Scotland, Giulianotti (1994k) identified the existence young prospective crew members known as "the Baby Crew". He maintains that "in Wittgensteinian terms, they are already socialized: they understand The Family language game, follow the rules and conventions within it, and are learning how to enforce, adapt, and add to them" (Giulianotti 1994k:351). While such young apprentices may exist, most studies pinpoint entry into hooliganism further into adolescence, around school leaving age, ages 15 to 17

³⁴"Football ends" refer to the areas directly behind each goal. These ends were/are the areas where standing terraces predominated. Large groups of spectators, especially hooligans, have traditionally congregated in these sections of the stadium. There are three main reasons that these sections are desirable to hooligans: (1) the close proximity of large groups of non-segregated spectators, (2) lack of physical impediments (rows of seats/benches), and (3) inexpensive match briefs (tickets).

(Roadburg 1980; Williams et al. 1986; Armstrong 1994). Similarly, Roversi (1991) found that among the "ultras" in Italy, less than 2 percent were age 15 or under.

Those at the core of the hooligan crew are often in their late teens and early 20s (Canter et al. 1989; Giulianotti 1994k; Armstrong 1998). In their ethnographic study of Sheffield United hooligans, Armstrong and Harris (1991) found that the core group was in their early 20s. The core group is perceived to be "very enthusiastic in their support . . . and are very commonly present when trouble breaks out with rival fans" (Armstrong and Harris 1991:435). This core is the most active part of any hooligan crew; instigating chants, starting demonstrations, and initiating or being the first to retaliate during attacks. These individuals, like most hooligans, begin drifting away during their mid- to late 20s (Marsh 1982; Williams et al. 1986; Giulianotti 1994k; Kerr 1994).

Police records provide a similar picture of those engaged in football hooliganism. Based on data provided at the time of apprehension, Marsh (1977) found that the mean age of football offenders at Oxford United, during the 1974/5 season, was just over 18 years of age. Trivizas (1980) reported that the mean age of arrested hooligans was 19 in his study of football-related arrests in the London metropolitan area. In addition, he found that individuals under 21 years of age committed 76.3 percent of all offenses, only 17.7 percent of which were committed by youths between the ages of 10 and 16.

The reliability of these English findings are strengthened by similar findings in other European nations. Mignon (1994) reports that 62 percent of French hooligans were between 16 and 22 years of age. Zani and Kirchler's (1991) study of the hooligan fringe in Italy find that those fans described as being "fanatics" are significantly younger than the groups of moderate supporters ($F(1,498) = 131.15; p < 0.001$). In a study of Italian 'ultras' from Bologna, Roversi (1991) shows that 80.6 percent are less than 24 years of age, with the modal group being between 19 and 21 years of age (31.4 percent of the total sample).³⁵ Other studies, such as van der Brug's (1994) study in Holland and Dal Lago

³⁵Roversi (1991) believes that the age of ultras may be slightly skewed. He qualifies these statistics by stating that "it must also be considered that in this case the number of youngsters under 15 is very probably underestimated" (p. 327).

and De Biasi's (1994) study in Italy, vaguely refer to hooligans as being young. The age of the hooligans they talk about can only be extrapolated from their discussions about the occupational and school-related information they present, and in these cases the hooligans are in their late teens and early 20s.

Most researchers find that hooligans become less actively involved, or exit altogether, during their 20s, what is described in delinquency as a process of aging out. While there are a number of reasons a person may age out of hooliganism, such as marriage and family, work and fear of arrest and sanctions. A developing explanation for aging out in the 1980s and 1990s is based on fears that "age might be equated with leadership by the police and prosecution counsel" (Armstrong 1998:267). Even though these "older" hooligans graduate/retire from active service in the ends and undertake "normal" adult lives, they may still hold important roles (Hobbs and Robins 1991; Giulianotti 1994k; Kerr 1994). Those who remain involved are referred to as 'Daddies of the Ends,' a group of individuals who have secured their reputations and no longer have to prove themselves. By aging out of hooliganism, the 'Daddies of the Ends' enter a role not unlike that of "tribal elders whose experience and personal qualities serve as models for those lower down in the social hierarchy" (Marsh 1982:252). At times they may even rejoin the crew for a specific match or rivalry, helping boost the size of the group (Giulianotti 1994k; Armstrong 1998). Although most hooligans age out during their 20s, their role as a mentor can continue for a number of years (Hobbs and Robins 1991). Although a number of those who age out remain involved, a fair proportion of graduates eventually migrate to the seated sections of the football stadia (Taylor 1971; Giulianotti 1994k), while others disappear from the game altogether (Horak 1991).

At a general level, the relative youthfulness of hooligans matches well with the assumption of youth held by subcultural theories, which focused on the development and maintenance of delinquent gangs (implying an emphasis on young offenders) (Williams and McShane 1994; Shoemaker 1996). A second parallel with subcultural theory made in the literature identifies a process whereby individuals age out of hooliganism. Few subcultural theories explicitly recognize the process of exiting delinquency (Shoemaker

1996), but of existing subcultural theories Cohen's middle-class measuring rod handles this situation best by proposing a move away from delinquency when the individual leaves the institution (school) which is producing the strain (Cohen 1955).

Social Class. The link between social class and football is one of the most consistent and long standing relationships found in the literature. Football originated and evolved from working-class origins, a fact which is traced back to the folk football games of the Middle Ages. As the game professionalized in the late 1800s and early 1900s the majority of spectators came from working-class backgrounds (Clarke 1978; Dunning et al. 1986; Walvin 1986; Dunning 1994). The strong presence of working-class spectators at football matches continues in the present era. Although there is some debate about the reliability and validity of depending on a single indicator of social class (the Registrar General's classification scheme), most quantitative and qualitative studies report that the majority of English hooligans come from the lower-classes. The sole source of controversy about social class stems from a lack of agreement about what part of the working-class most hooligans inhabit.

In early studies published on the phenomena, hooliganism was identified as a behavioral pattern most often associated with the lower-classes. The emphasis on the central role of lower-class hooligans began with a report by the Birmingham Research Group to the Minister of Sport, known as the Harrington Report (Harrington 1968). This report was the first to provide quantitative support for the assertion that hooligans came from working-class backgrounds. The 1968 Harrington Report found that 64.0 percent of convicted hooligans held unskilled and semi-skilled occupations.

A few years later, Taylor (1971) hypothesized that "this rump [football hooligans] will include the unemployed and the unemployable, the downwardly mobile and the totally immobile, e.g. those from broken families who cling to neighbourhood ties in the absence of kin-involvements" (p. 154). Taylor went on to propose that the violence occurring at and around football matches was a form of working-class rebellion against the "more total and material estrangement of this isolated group from the wider society"

(1971:155). Clarke (1978) took this line of reasoning a step further when he located the source of hooliganism within the younger members of the working-class. He perceived that during the 1970s these working-class youths "have greater relative social, economic and cultural freedom from their parent class. . . . And it is this relative freedom from their parent class - this dislocation of the working class young - which lies at the centre of football hooliganism" (Clarke 1978:51).

Since these early studies located hooliganism within the lower-classes numerous studies have supported the perception of hooligans as working-class louts. The Leicester group has been the dominant force in assessing the class position of English hooligans. The group focuses on the appeal football has for members of the rough working-class.³⁶ They ascertain that rough working-class youths grow up in an environment that stresses the importance of violent masculinity, the ability to fight and the need to defend one's family friends and turf (Dunning et al. 1986; Williams et al. 1989; Dunning et al. 1991; Williams 1991w). These youths are attracted to football hooliganism because it provides an opportunity structure which reinforces norms learned through socialization in lower working-class families and neighborhoods. As Dunning et al. (1991) state, "it is from groups in the lower reaches of the stratification hierarchy, groups which lack the advantages in the educational, occupational and leisure spheres that are available to the higher strata, that the football hooligans are principally recruited" (pp. 474-475). Based on data they collected and compiled, they find that "the majority of football hooligans in England since the mid-1960s - around 70 per cent or 80 per cent - have always been employed in unskilled or semi-skilled manual occupations or unemployed" (Dunning 1994:152-153).

Other quantitative studies, many of which are based on arrest information, provide a similar picture of the social class background of those who are centrally involved in football hooliganism. In Trivizas's (1980) research, he found that 68.1 percent of those

³⁶The Leicester group uses the term "rough" to refer to those individuals who come from lower working-class backgrounds, especially unskilled occupations and the unemployed. A background that dominated by standards that "valorize and help to produce and reproduce assertively aggressive and physically violent expressions of masculinity" (Williams et al. 1991:474).

charged with hooligan offenses were in manual occupations, 12 percent were unemployed, and another 10 percent were in school. Fully 80 percent of all individuals arrested in Trivizas's study were from what is traditionally referred to as the lower-classes. Melnick (1986) points out that Coalter (1985) lent support to the depiction of hooligans as members of the working-class. Even the Leicester group's data on football and social class supports the general trend that the working-class accounts for the majority of football-related arrests (Dunning et al. 1982).

In recent years, a few authors have attempted to refute the general characterization of hooligans as individuals predominately from lower- and working-class backgrounds (Armstrong and Harris 1991; Hobbs and Robbins 1991; Moorhouse 1991). In actuality, the debate is more accurately identified as an argument about which *section* of the working-class is most centrally involved in hooliganism. Authors have taken exception to the idea that the majority of hooligans are from the lower (rough) reaches of the working-classes, not the idea that they generally hold some form of working-class standing. Yet, in most cases, those attempting to disprove the relationship have little evidence that can be used to effectively counter this recognized relationship.

Armstrong and Harris (1991) attempt to show that the characterization of hooligans as working-class is an overstatement, as some hooligans are from respectable and middle-class backgrounds. The basis for their rebuttal is two years of ethnographic research on the Blades, a group of Sheffield United hooligans. Their description of Blades' social class fails to support the contention that hooligans are not predominately working-class. Dunning et al. (1991) critically re-examine Armstrong and Harris's work and find that "none of the occupations mentioned by Armstrong and Harris is anything other than unambiguously working class" (p. 470).

Hobbs and Robins (1991) also take exception to the Leicester school's characterization that the lower (rough) sections of the working-class make up the core participants in football hooliganism. "The assertion that the lower (and therefore rougher) working class make up the British football hooligan groups is not substantiated by

empirical evidence" (p. 557).³⁷ It becomes evident later in their critique that at the core of their challenge is the Leicester group's focus on a single sub-unit of the working-class, namely the lower segments of the working-class. As Hobbs and Robins (1991) state, "our analysis of similar data suggest a wide range of occupations across the working class spectrum" (p. 558).

Some of the same arguments about social class origin appear in the context of continental Europe, but a very similar picture is drawn. Continental studies also reinforce the position that most hooligans are of working-class origins or are attempting to preserve lower-class culture. In France, Mignon (1994) maintains that while regional differences in class may exist among football supporters, the hooligan culture is predominantly working-class. He contends that "although the hooligans are not mainly unemployed people or socially detached individuals, they belong to the working class with an equal balance between skilled and unskilled jobs" (Mignon 1994:283).

Researchers focusing on Italian 'ultras' (hooligans), come to similar conclusions about the social background of those involved in football violence. Portelli (1993) locates within the poor a propensity for violent and unruly conduct at football matches. Looking more specifically at the 'ultras', Roversi (1994) finds that the vast majority of the employed are predominately located within blue collar occupations (80.3 percent of all males and 51.9 percent of all females).

While not fully in agreement about the working-class origins of hooligans in the Netherlands, van der Brug (1994) does find that educational levels are indicative of decline in socio-economic status. Looking at comparisons of educational levels of hooligans and their fathers, van der Brug (1994) finds, "a relationship between individual downward mobility and participation in football hooliganism" (p. 180). All in all, football hooligans on the continent of Europe seem to resemble their English counterparts when it comes to social class origins and cultures.

³⁷There is ample empirical evidence about the relationship between football hooliganism and working-class status, as has previously been shown in this section.

As a result, the squabble is over which section of the working-class is most centrally involved in English football hooliganism. Furthermore, most authors are in agreement that the working-class, or at least some segment of it, is responsible for the majority of football hooliganism. The general characterization of football hooligans as working-class is also generally in line with subcultural theories, and more specifically, fits well with respect to Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency which speculates that most delinquents are of lower-class status (Gibbons 1994; Shoemaker 1996).

4.2 State of the Empirical Literature

The problem of football hooliganism is proclaimed to be most severe in England, yet there is a dearth of quantitative data on English hooligans. As Williams (1991w) points out, "most of the (rather little) actual research on football hooligans in England has been conducted using the methods of observation or participant observation" (p. 25). What follows is an overview of the forms of research undertaken to date.

4.2.1 Qualitative Studies

The primacy of qualitative research becomes readily apparent when reading through the literature on English football hooligans. Researchers maintain that the use of qualitative methods provides them with an opportunity to make contact with the individuals that are centrally involved (Williams 1991w; Giulianotti 1995; Armstrong 1998). Additionally, such methods provide researchers with the prospect of separating those actively engaged in hooliganism from the "bullshitters" who are more talk than action. Within the broad array of such studies it becomes readily apparent that there are two primary qualitative methods used in the research, participant observation and content analysis (predominately reliant on historical documents).

Ethnography. Even though participant observation is the primary method for empirical research on football hooliganism, there are numerous risks that impede those

wishing to study this subcultural form. While some dangers are intrinsic in any project of this sort, there are a few unique risks that may be experienced when doing research on illicit/deviant groups. Giulianotti (1995) provides an excellent description of the difficulties prospective researchers may face. One of the greatest challenges is that of gaining access to members of hooligan crews. This task has become more arduous in recent years because of police attempts to infiltrate these gangs. These problems are well illustrated by Giulianotti (1995:5),

at the time I had been seeking entree, the Hibs [Hibernian Football Club] casuals had believed the police were about to mount an undercover operation against them, a strategy liberally used in England against football hooligan formations (see Armstrong and Hobbs 1994).

Armstrong (1998) relates similar difficulties in his study of football hooliganism in Sheffield. Even though he was native to the area and the groups involved, there was still a great deal of mistrust and suspicion about his motives and research. The suspicion in this case, just as in Giulianotti's research, was because of group fears about police infiltration and prosecution.

In doing participant observation studies of hooligans, researchers run the added risk of becoming caught up in fights (aggro) between gangs. Along the same lines, they run the risk of being arrested when the crews engage in criminal activities. This situation presents an important ethical quandary. Giulianotti brings up several possible questions which may arise if the researcher attempts to avoid arrest.

How could I regain the trust of my research subjects if I abandoned them to their fate? What guarantees could I give to the police that I did not involve myself in violence? What guarantees could I offer the research participants that my early release was not brought through providing evidence against them? (Giulianotti 1995:11)

Participant observation of football hooligans presents numerous difficulties for the researcher(s), yet many of them maintain that today's hooligans "are themselves not

adverse to the matter of compiling information and data on soccer hooliganism" (Giulianotti 1995:7).

One of the first important empirical studies of English football hooligans was undertaken by Peter Marsh, who studied the terraces occupied by hooligans at Oxford United matches. Marsh attempted to show that the crowd disorder in the terraces was not dominated by chaos, but was in fact governed by a unique social order (hierarchy) based primarily on age and reputation. Employing an ethogenic methodology, Marsh (1982) "concentrated on the social dynamics of groups of soccer fans and recurring patterns of collective action" (p. 248). By observing behavior on the terraces, he determined that hooligans could be classified into several distinct groups, including; novices, rowdies, and graduates (Marsh et al. 1978; Marsh 1982). Further, hooligans aggressive behavior against other hooligans was deemed to be a symbolic display for status rather than an attempt to cause serious injury.

Pratt and Salter (1984) advocate Marsh et al.'s (1978) thesis that hooliganism supports the existing social order. Although their research supports the existence of social order, they disagree with Marsh's findings that hooligan violence is ritualistic or symbolic.

We would emphasize the *seriousness* of the violence that takes place from time to time, i.e. hooliganism is not all 'symbolic or ritualized'; indeed, in the last decade, in addition to the commonplace Saturday afternoon incidents above, threatening behavior, general unpleasantness and often 'real' violence, several young people have actually been murdered as a result of hooliganism [emphasis in the original]. (Pratt and Salter 1984:215)

Their findings are based on observations made at matches hosted by Cardiff City, Millwall, and Portsmouth.

The most extensive participant observation has been undertaken by the group at the University of Leicester. While the lead researcher and spokesman for the Leicester group is Eric Dunning, most of the actual observation was done by John Williams, who spent extensive amounts of time in several locations. He engaged in participant

observation of English hooligans in Spain during the 1982 World Cup, the 1988 European Championships in Germany, and during World Cup 1990 in Italy (Williams et al 1989; Dunning et al. 1991). The group's research has focused on exploring the relationship between English hooliganism and the working-class, especially the "rough" (lower) working-class. More in-depth information about their research is presented in the content analysis section.

Since 1990, there have been several intriguing studies based on the methods of participant observation. Armstrong and Harris's (1991) study of Sheffield United hooligans set off a lively, at times ruthless, debate about the nature of hooliganism (see *Sociological Review* 1991, volume 39, number 3). They attempted to show that hooligans crews are loose-knit organizations with informal leadership and that hooligans come from a number of social class backgrounds, not just the working-class. The work explored here has recently culminated in an in-depth look at Sheffield United hooligans by Armstrong (1998). While Armstrong attempted to look at the motive for the group's hooliganism, the book is more realistically a narrative of the Blades which attempts to dispel a number of myths about the present nature of hooliganism.

More recently King (1995, 1997) published studies on the beliefs and behavior of Manchester United supporters, particularly the "lads" (the hooligan element). The first of these studies focused on the violent events involving Manchester United supporters that occurred in Turkey during the 1993 European Cup competition. He used participant observation in an attempt to show the "centrality of nationalism and masculinity to the fans' identity and, therefore, to the disorder in which fans are sometimes involved" (King 1995:635). These findings are useful in providing insight to the causes of hooliganism between teams from different nations, but provide little information on forms of hooliganism occurring during league matches in England.

King's 1997 study of Manchester United supporters addresses the nature of support provided by the lads in relation to recent changes in football consumption. The lads are a group of male Manchester United supporters who have a definitively masculine style of support that finds "the appropriate support of the team as centering on drink,

singing, and fighting, and who have, since the mid-1980s, adopted very expensive 'casual' styles of dress" (King 1997:332). The lads perceive themselves and their support to originate in the working-class, and are experiencing difficulties maintaining a masculine style of support at a club which is experiencing commercial and social success.³⁸ Even so, they believe themselves to be the backbone of support which the club and ownership will again have to rely upon when the club faces hard times. Although this study does not give primacy to the hooliganism of the lads, it does serve to reinforce the belief that a certain style of masculine, acceptably aggressive, support is provided by men who regard themselves as working-class and have their status completely wrapped up in their football.

There are three other important studies that have employed the methods of participant observation in an attempt to better understand hooliganism: Lewis (1982), Hobbs and Robins (1991), and Stott and Reicher (1998). Since these studies address the issue of hooliganism in terms of criminology and criminal justice, they will be detailed in a later section in this review (4.3).

Content Analysis. In contrast to the considerable use of participant observation, fewer researchers have employed content analysis in the study of English football hooliganism. All of the studies reviewed here were undertaken by individuals affiliated with the Leicester group. The purpose of the Leicester group's work in this area is fourfold: (1) to examine the nature and extent of football hooliganism throughout the history of modern football in England, (2) to provide evidence on the working-class's relation to football and crowd disorder based on Gerald Suttle's conceptualization of ordered segmentation, (3) to furnish support for Norbert Elias's theory of the civilizing process, and (4) to show the media's role in shaping the nature and extent of hooliganism.

³⁸Manchester United is perhaps the most recognized and supported English club team in the world. They have experienced such immense commercial success over the past decade that no other English team has been able to achieve. Examples of this success can be found in Rushin (1995) and King (1997).

Newspaper articles on football matches and FA reports form the basis for the Leicester group's studies. Through these sources they describe how hooliganism has changed over the course of the FA's existence. From this data they show that the nature and extent of hooliganism has varied over time (Dunning et al. 1982; Maguire 1986; Dunning et al. 1988; Murphy et al. 1990). The Leicester group conclude that if the amount of hooliganism over time was graphed, it would resemble a U-shaped curve beginning with relatively high levels at the beginning of the 1900s, lower rates from the 1950s to the 1960s, and rapid growth since the mid-1960s (Dunning et al. 1988). Part of the significance of their research on changes over time is in showing that the amount of hooliganism has varied quite broadly over the past 100 years. Just as important is that this research also shows that the character of hooliganism has changed from relatively spontaneous explosions of violence directed at players and officials to planned acts of violence by groups of hooligans directed against opposing groups of hooligans (Dunning 1994).

Using the same source materials, Dunning et al. (1982, 1986, and 1988) also attempt to show that football has traditionally been a sport of and for the working-class. Using qualitative methods they provide an explanation for hooliganism that occurs at football matches based on Suttles work on ordered segmentation. The basic premise of the idea is that young males from the lower working-class are socialized in an atmosphere that promotes violence and aggression, and these values make it difficult to achieve status and gratification from education or occupation (Dunning et al. 1986). As a result, these individuals have found that football matches provide a context where they can gain status and gratification for their violent and aggressive behavior and have been found to make up a disproportionate number of spectators, and more importantly hooligans (Dunning et al. 1982; Dunning 1994). This explanation of hooliganism lends credence to the notion that Albert Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency is an appropriate theoretical model for a criminological investigation into the phenomenon by the focus on the need to obtain status from non-work and non-educational sources.

The third goal of the Leicester group is to provide support for Elias's theory of the civilizing process. This theory is based on the idea that

in societies of Western Europe between the middle ages and modern times, a more or less continuous refinement of manners and social standards can be shown to have taken place, together with an increase in the social pressure on people to exercise stricter, more even and continuous self-control over their feelings and behavior. (Dunning 1990:66)

This civilizing process is intended to limit not only the desire to engage in violence and aggression, but also to limit the opportunity to engage in such behavior. The Leicester group view hooliganism as a regression in the civilizing process (Elias and Dunning 1986; Dunning et al. 1988; Dunning 1990, 1994), and they support this premise through the use of source material which describes the form and content of football hooliganism over the past century.

The Leicester group's fourth goal in content analysis is to describe the relationship between the media and crowd disorder at football matches (Murphy et al. 1988). As previously stated, many writers argue that the media was one of the primary forces which motivated lower working-class gangs to engage in violent and destructive behavior at and around football grounds. Murphy et al. (1988) reveal that the media is actively involved in a process of amplifying and de-amplifying the problem of hooliganism. This conclusion is based on the media's "manner of reporting football crowd disorders after the 1950s as compared with their treatment of football crowds in the inter-war years and in the decade or so immediately following the Second World War" (Murphy et al. 1988:668).

4.2.2 *Quantitative Studies*

In contrast to the wide array of hooligan studies that employ qualitative methods, there is little quantitative information on the nature of the problem in England. Some researchers have expressed a belief that English hooligans are not amenable to being surveyed or interviewed. As Williams (1991w) explains, researchers do not "expect

serious hooligans in England to respond positively to attempts to collect data in this way" (p. 25). The majority of quantitative studies that do exist only tangentially address the problem of hooliganism, surveying football fans in general. Studies of this type are exemplified by projects like that of Moorhouse (1986) and Canter et al. (1989).

The only work to date that provides a detailed quantitative analysis of football hooliganism is that done by Trivizas (1980, 1981, and 1984). This series of articles supplies valuable information on the types of offenses hooligans are arrested for and the way these offenders are treated by the English court system. These studies are discussed in greater detail later in this review of the literature.

4.3 Criminological Explorations of Football Hooliganism

In 1980 Trivizas asserted that "although much has been written on the subject [football crowd disorders], there is a lack of objective data in the literature regarding the criminological aspects of the problem" (p. 276). The literature currently available accurately reflects the absence of criminological influence that Trivizas identified eighteen years ago, and much of the criminological research in existence is atheoretical. There are a limited number of criminologically-informed empirical studies (both qualitative and quantitative), which are predominated by the work of Trivizas (1980, 1981, and 1984). My goal is to provide insight into the three main forms of criminological research on hooliganism that have been undertaken; studies based on quantitative, qualitative, and theoretical methods.

4.3.1 Quantitative Studies

Criminological explorations on English football hooliganism have utilized quantitative methods on a limited basis, and the majority of these empirical studies rely on data that are available in arrest reports and charge sheets. Marsh (1977) employed arrest data in an attempt to show that football hooligans engaged in symbolic, rather than actual, violence. In a more thorough investigation, Trivizas analyzed information

provided on arrest reports to address multiple issues: the types of arrests made at football matches; police discretion in the selection of charges; the severity of sentences placed upon convicted hooligans; and the formulation of a typology on the forms football crowd disturbance that result in arrest. More recently, Farrington (1994ch) made use of some of the data on football hooliganism that was available in West and Farrington's Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. This limited study attempts to identify some possible causes and correlates of football hooliganism.

Marsh (1977) briefly addressed the frequency and variety of football-related arrests at Oxford United's grounds during the 1974/5 season. He argued that English society demanded stiffer punishments be imposed on hooligans, even though there was an absence of objective information on the frequency and type of hooliganism in the context of football. Marsh found that arrests at matches were infrequent; furthermore, the majority of those who were arrested were charged with non-violent offenses.³⁹ His data furnished support for later theoretical arguments which maintained that hooligans were engaged in a process of ritualistic violence (see Marsh et al. 1978; Marsh 1982).⁴⁰

Marsh recognized that what was known about the phenomenon of football hooliganism was limited. "Little is known concerning the number of offences committed by fans outside the grounds or on coach and rail journeys to matches. We also know very little about the types of offenders and the extent of their involvement in the football culture" (Marsh 1977:258). From this lack of evidence he concluded that investigations of hooliganism have overblown the situation and that the predominance of myth making has interfered with an examination of what is really going on in the football culture.

In a much more rigorous study of arrests, Trivizas (1980, 1981, and 1984) provides the most thorough criminological analysis of quantitative data to date. The first of Trivizas's criminological investigations of hooligans focuses on the type of offenses

³⁹For a critique of Marsh's conclusions see Williams (1980), an article that will be discussed later in this review of the literature.

⁴⁰The premise of this theory is that hooligans aren't interested in causing serious bodily harm to other individuals, but engage in aggressive behavior in a ritualized display of masculinity (Marsh et al. 1978).

individuals are charged with during football matches. Based on information provided in charge sheets, arrest reports and other police documents, he discovers that over two-thirds (67.1 percent) of all offenses were categorized under "the use of threatening or insulting words or behavior," with most being prosecuted under Section 5 of the Public Order Act 1936 (Trivizas 1980). Trivizas goes on to identify arrested hooligans on the basis of age, gender, social class, and prior criminal records. Arrested hooligans are most likely to be young, working-class males with no prior criminal records. Individuals with previous convictions committed only about one-third (36 percent) of the football-related offenses analyzed by Trivizas.

These findings were compared to those of a matched control sample of individuals arrested in non-football contexts. Trivizas found that there were several differences between the experimental and control samples. For example, in the control samples the "proportion of females and manual workers was lower, the age of the offenders higher and a higher proportion of persons with previous convictions was found" (Trivizas 1980:287). This analysis led Trivizas to argue that: (1) football hooliganism is not restricted to juveniles; (2) people in football crowds engage in criminal behavior they would not commit alone; and, (3) there is a certain degree of social order within the context of the football crowd.

In his second article, Trivizas (1981) uses the same offense data to explore how the courts punish convicted football hooligans in comparison to control groups convicted of similar offenses in non-football circumstances. In the majority of cases (80.8 percent), offenses committed in the context of football resulted in the imposition of a fine. The fines imposed on individuals convicted of offenses relating to football hooliganism ranged between £1 and £100, with a mean fine of £31.14. Trivizas (1981) found that the type of crowd influenced the severity of punishment, "persons committing offences in football crowd disorders were punished more severely than persons committing similar offences in other circumstances" (p. 346).

In his 1984 article, Trivizas presents a typology of English football hooligan activities and an examination of police discretion in the choice of offense. The typology

of hooligan activities includes fourteen distinct forms, which are re-classified into four categories based on the target of the hooligan behavior: (1) the opposing team's crowd or crowd members; (2) football players, officials and club property; (3) football spectators and the general public; and, (4) the police (Trivizas 1984:372). Trivizas goes on to address how these incidents are defined into applicable legal categories by police and the discretion they use in making the decision to arrest and for which offenses to charge the individual.

Police discretion is an important part of any decision about which offense to charge a football crowd offender with since the applicable laws (both common law and statutory) are often "broadly defined, imprecise, vague and overlapping, with a considerable duplication of prohibitions" (Trivizas 1984:376). Trivizas concludes that the discretion used by police when selecting charges is influenced by: "(1) administrative considerations; (2) certainty of conviction; (3) severity of sentence" (1984:380). He concludes that police discretion often leads them to charge football offenders with statutory offenses which, (1) can be dealt with by court magistrates; and, (2) carry more severe penalties (fines and incarceration).

The most recent criminologically-based quantitative study of football hooliganism is done by David Farrington (1994ch). He does an exploratory study of the causes and correlates of hooliganism using data from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. Farrington finds that football hooligans come from relatively poor social class backgrounds, have limited education, poor parental supervision, and tend to lead working-class lives as adults. Further, hooligans are likely to be "impulsive, heavy drinkers, drug users, and sexually promiscuous, like many other antisocial males in this Study" (Farrington 1994ch:236).

When comparing football hooligans to other criminal groups in the study, Farrington identifies that hooligans are prone to be involved in frequent group fighting and violent offenses in general. Even so, the findings indicate that "there seem[s] to be important differences between soccer hooligans and other groups of violent males" (Farrington 1994ch:237). So while a few parallels between the causes and correlates of

hooliganism and other violent offending are found, the differences appear to be as important as the similarities.

4.3.2 *Qualitative Studies*

The qualitative studies of criminological relevance provide insight into the aggressive, often violent, behavior of hooligans in and around football matches. This research is written in response to quantitative studies on the criminological aspects of the topic, and focus on legal aspects of the phenomena, especially those experienced by the police. Among the most recent criminological studies of a qualitative nature are those which look not only at police activities, but also people's perceptions of their policies and actions.

Marsh (1977) contends that the majority of individuals arrested at football matches were charged with non-violent offenses, providing support for his theory that hooliganism is primarily ritualistic, not violent. In re-evaluating Marsh's findings, Williams (1980) discerns that the charges against those arrested at football matches were often determined by convenience rather than appropriateness. He demonstrates that Section 5 of the 1936 Public Order Act is an appropriate charge to be used for both violent and non-violent forms of football hooliganism. Police often rely on Section 5 because of the "practical limitations of those competing charges which appear to have more explicit links with violence" (Williams 1980:107). One such limitation is that serious charges, such as assault, require police to identify both the assailant and the victim, a situation unlikely to occur in the context of football. Williams (1980:107) points out that:

firstly, the owners of flying fists and boots are difficult to locate on crowded streets or terraces. Secondly, even when an arrest is made for behavior consistent with assault, the victim of attack may also be rather difficult to find. Typically, "victims" of assault at football matches have either been involved in fighting themselves, or, for various reasons, are loathe to become embroiled with the police.

Accordingly, some hooliganism may be a form of ritualized terrace behavior, but it is inaccurate to describe all such behavior in this way when the existence of violent, often bloody, confrontation on these same terraces continually occurs and leaves people hospitalized and occasionally dead.

Lewis is one of the few researchers who employs the methods of participant observation in an attempt to look at crowd disorder from the perspective of criminal justice, a previously ignored aspect of hooliganism. This article explores the tactics used by police to maintain control at the Aston Villa Football Club's football grounds (Villa Park). A description of the police and their typical game day routines are provided before discussing the techniques and styles police use to maintain crowd order.

Based on his participant observation of the police at work during matches, Lewis (1982) finds that "the British police use five techniques to control football crowds: presence, warning, searching, ejection, and arrest" (p. 421). There is a significant police presence at football matches, as the police to supporter ratio is around 1 to 200 or 250. Lewis proclaims that searching, ejection, and arrest are controversial techniques used by constables to maintain order. Even so, he finds that the police rarely arrest people at matches for two reasons:

One, it ties up two or more officers who could be working with the crowd. Second, when things get fast and furious, such as rushing a fence or barrier, many police feel that it is better to separate supporters than to arrest. (Lewis 1982:422)

As such, individuals are less likely to be arrested than they are to receive warnings or to be ejected.

Lewis also discusses the styles of policing the law enforcement officer uses to carry out crowd control, of which there are four: "polite, service, humorous, and macho" (1982:421). Constables generally use the polite, service and humorous styles to try and maintain control. The macho style is only employed when the other styles fail to control spectator behavior. Lewis concludes that English police deal with football crowds primarily through friendly persuasion; consequently, they seldom engage in methods

which may lead to serious injuries or deaths. However, "it is likely that, as more and more police are injured, there will develop pressures from some quarters in England for police to take stronger measures when dealing with unruly elements" (Lewis 1982:423).

In contrast to watching and talking with constables at football matches, Mathias (1991) provides a unique analysis of the situation in England. Unlike most studies written by academicians and journalists, Mathias has first-hand experience working crowd control at Arsenal's home football matches. He makes some insightful observations about the aggressive behavior of spectators based on his experiences. Mathias maintains that the composition of the crowd affects the nature of any aggressive behavior that may occur. In homogeneous segments of the stadium, aggressive behavior is a ritualistic part of each match, whereas similar behavior in heterogeneous segments may preclude further violence against opposing groups of fans. As the degree of conflict rises in heterogeneous segments opposing fans often make physical contact, resulting in verbal abuse and physically violent confrontations. Physical conflict inside the stadia "is often short-lived due to police intervention or police strategies which reduce the likelihood of it happening or restrict its actual escalation" (Mathias 1991:31). Even with the intervention strategies of police constables, hooligans are not often dissuaded from engaging in violence.

Efforts to help police effectively deal with the threat of hooliganism have, since the early 1980s, included the continual use of undercover policing. Armstrong and Hobbs (1994) take a critical look at the covert policing operations that occurred in England and Wales between 1985 and 1992, including their legal and political outcomes. Unlike U.S. society, the British have a higher level of distaste and distrust of undercover police activities, but as Armstrong and Hobbs (1994) point out, "football hooliganism has made it possible for the British police to introduce and normalize covert tactics and strategies of surveillance" (p. 224). Part of the growing acceptance is traced to changes in media portrayals of hooligans, making them out to be a dangerous and cabalistic bunch.

Based on newspaper and police-related sources, Armstrong and Hobbs show that over the period of March 1986 to April 1992, a significant number of dawn raids were carried out by police against hooligan groups based predominantly on information

collected by undercover officers. While some of these covert operations were successful in netting a large number of arrests, prosecution of these cases was much less successful. Prosecutors ran into problems related to evidentiary procedure, and it seems that in several cases arrested hooligans maintained that undercover officers encouraged violent behavior (Armstrong and Hobbs 1994:213-214). Even with the mixed results of these police efforts, the National Football Intelligence Unit (NFIU) came on-line in early 1990 in an attempt to more effectively collect information on hooligans, with the hope of making more arrests, securing more convictions, and decreasing the threat created by hooliganism. Armstrong and Hobbs (1994) conclude that while the use of surveillance technologies and procedures against football hooligans is deemed to be acceptable to the public because they are a marginalized (criminal) group, there is no guarantee that the same procedures will not be used against the rest of the public in the future.

The final qualitative study addressed in this review is a recent article by Stott and Reicher (1998) which maintains that crowd disorder (and hooliganism for that matter) is only partly the result of the crowd's intentions. They argue that definitions and activities created by the groups are the result of inter-group dynamics whereby "police fears of hooliganism (and their consequent actions) may create the very conditions in which those fears are realized" (Stott and Reicher 1998).⁴¹ Using the methods of participant observation they attempt to analyze the inter-group dynamics that occurred between English fans and Italian police during the first round of World Cup 1990 in Italy (Italia 90).

During the first round of Italia 90 the English team was forced to play their matches on the island of Sardinia as a result of fears about hooliganism on the part of English fans. It was determined that hooliganism was most likely to occur in relation to the match against the Netherlands since they also had significant problems with hooliganism. Based on the actions of English fans and police perceptions and intelligence

⁴¹The lack of page numbers for quotes from Stott and Reicher (1998) is the result of limited resources. I was unable to gain access to a physical copy of the article directly from the journal *Sociology*, but I did have electronic access to it through the world wide web which did not provide accurate pagination for the article.

about them, a situation was created where English fans came into conflict with Italian authorities in a series of violent skirmishes (Stott and Reicher 1998). While not dismissing the actions of English fans, the authors hold that police actions helped solidify in-group and out-group feelings which allow and accept the use of violence, even among those who normally avoid violence. As stated by Stott and Reicher (1998:),

once the police are seen as attacking (or about to attack) the crowd indiscriminately, so crowd members see that they have no option but to fight back. . . . In this way, the collective understandings of England fans, built up out of their prior interactions with the Italian police, explain their interpretation and reaction to police actions

Although Stott and Reicher are focused on hooliganism at a national level in an international context, the information they provide is an interesting commentary on how certain violent events may occur which will inevitably be blamed on hooligans.

4.3.3 Theoretical Studies

Those social scientists addressing hooliganism from a criminological perspective have at times employed theoretical constructs to explain the occurrence of such behavior. One of the first academic forays into the problem of football hooliganism, Taylor (1971), set a precedent for the use of criminological theory, yet no one followed up in this direction for the better part of twenty years. The other study discussed here, Hobbs and Robins (1991), uses findings based on the methods of participant observation to provide tentative support for their thesis that football has become a recurrent context for a subculture of violence.

Taylor (1971) attempts to explain, at least preliminarily, how people come to be identified as football hooligans based on strain and labeling theories. Taylor demonstrates that as a section of working-class football fans become educated about the history of their club they come to believe that the club is theirs, a value uniting all the individuals within this football subculture. Unfortunately as the game becomes more international and commercial, members of the football subculture become alienated, which generates a "continuing source of ambivalence and creates the possibility of a drift into 'hooligan'

resistance" (Taylor 1971:153). These active members of the subculture are labeled as thugs and hooligans by the game, the press, and the public. These are labels they don't have the power (socially, politically, or economically) to resist. As Taylor (1971) states, "it matters little that the terrace supporter is in all accounts the most knowledgeable and fervent supporter of the team. In the process of societal reaction, he has become merely a hooligan and a parasite (alighting on the soccer ground because he likes a fight)" (p. 159). While he does not explain how to solve the problem of hooliganism, Taylor sets the stage for further investigation of the problem from the perspective of criminology.

The most recent theoretical examination of English football hooligans is provided by Hobbs and Robins (1991). Based on the techniques of participant observation they attempt to illustrate that fighting is a central characteristic of "hard core" hooligans. Hobbs and Robins (1991) go on to show that the most "hard core" individuals would engage in violence even if the football context were unavailable, "football provides but one environmental rationale for the implementation of a variety of violent strategies" (p. 569). The context of a football match provides well-defined territory (turf) that can be attacked and defended by easily identifiable in-groups (home club supporters) and out-groups (visiting club supporters).

Further, Hobbs and Robins attempt to explain why these groups rely upon fighting and violent conflict by employing theories of gang-related delinquency, namely Wolfgang and Ferracutti (1967) and Yablonsky (1970). They reveal that hooligan groups provide vital affiliations for many young adults, a form of delinquent surrogate family. The individuals involved in these hooligan gangs hold strong emotional ties to one another. As Hobbs and Robins (1991) assert, "the mob represents something of a 'haven in a heartless world'. Many of our respondents talked with extraordinary feeling and affection about 'my little posse'" (p. 576). Hobbs and Robins generate insight into the relationship between football and violence by viewing football as a context where individuals can develop status and emotional bonds, thereby creating and reinforcing the delinquent youth culture.

4.4 Using Cohen Theory to Explain Hooliganism

The literature on hooliganism repeatedly suggests that subcultural theories, like that developed by Albert Cohen, are appropriate explanatory models for describing the development of and involvement in hooliganism (Pratt and Salter 1984; Williams 1991w). Elements of Cohen's subcultural theory of group delinquency has been used in some examinations of English football hooliganism and reinforces the need to make a more concerted effort to examine hooliganism from this criminological perspective. In fact, Murphy et al. (1990) state that "the behaviour of the English soccer hooligans seems to conform closely in many ways to the present-centred hedonism described by [Albert] Cohen. In short, soccer hooliganism can be understood in part as involving the usurpation of a major professional sport by street gangs" (p. 207).

Maguire (1986) adds support to the applicability of Cohen's theory by recognizing that distinct values and norms are held by different parts of English society, and that "the higher and more established classes have sought, with varying degrees of success, to regulate, supervise and control the everyday behavior of the lower, less established classes" (p. 238). Hobbs and Robins (1991) also make the argument that the dominant sections of society (middle- and upper-classes) are attempting to assimilate the working-class. These assumptions are analogous to Cohen's proposition that the middle- and lower-classes hold separate values, yet it is the values of the middle-class that predominate (Cohen 1955). Further, working-class youths feel the dominance of middle-class values most acutely within the school system (Shoemaker 1996). In his look at a specific sub-grouping of Manchester United supporters, the lads, King (1997) takes an approach that the school system is an important determinant of position and dominance. Borrowing from other work, he takes the stance that the social positions of working-class youths remain similar to that of their parents because of "their resistance to school, which is regarded as the embodiment of middle-class and establishment values" (King 1997:33).

It is within the institution of the school that many young working-class males first experience strain and status frustration. The inability to gain status and self-esteem through school is, according to some researchers, a trait found among a certain percentage

of individuals who have engaged in hooliganism (Taylor 1971; Dunning et al. 1986; Hobbs and Robins 1991; Mignon 1994). Marsh (1982) supports a belief that hooliganism is an attempt to offset alienation and status by stating that "football-terrace culture [hooliganism] exists, in large part, as an *alternative* to the uneventful, safe, and often alienated lives that working-class youths lead [emphasis in the original]" (p. 254). Mignon (1994) identifies a similar process of school failure occurring within certain poorer segments of French society, especially among immigrants. Part of the reason for delinquency and hooliganism among these sections of society is traced to a perception that "they have not much to expect from school" (Mignon 1994:284). For Cohen, school is the primary source of strain for lower-class males (Morrison 1995; Shoemaker 1996) and is identified as one of the main sources of strain and frustration by Marsh (1978), Dunning et al. (1986), and Hobbs and Robbins (1991).

One of the stronger endorsements for the use of subcultural theories of delinquency is van der Brug's research on football hooligans in the Netherlands. Although not specifically developed along the lines of strain or subcultural theories, he and his colleagues found that problematic school career was a good predictor of hooliganism when coupled with lack of parental control (van der Brug 1994). In multiple studies of Dutch hooligans it was found that having a poor educational experience was part of a strong predictive model with hooliganism as the dependent variable.^{42,43} Using Lisrel, van der Brug's model, incorporating problematic school career and ineffective parental control, "has explained more than 60 per cent of variations in the variable under examination (football hooliganism)" (van der Brug 1994:179). Appropriately enough, he goes on to argue that football hooliganism is similar to acts of delinquency in that they share these causal factors. Although it is not a direct endorsement of Cohen's theory of

⁴²These findings are supported in the English quantitative study done by Farrington (reported in section 4.3) which finds that as kids hooligans had short educational careers and a lack of parental supervision (Farrington 1994ch).

⁴³Unfortunately most of this research is inaccessible unless one can read Dutch, but the success of the predictive model in successive trials is summarized in the cited article.

subcultural delinquency in the context of hooliganism, both school success and parental control/supervision are factors that are incorporated into this theory.

Status frustration is produced when these lower-class youths cannot meet the middle-class standards of performance (Akers 1994). When the frustration and strain become too much they remove themselves from the source of their discontent, and consequently begin to reject their wants and aspirations because it is perceived that they cannot be attained. Some of these individuals begin to make their careers on the football terraces because they don't see any legitimate way to acquire status (Marsh 1978). Hobbs and Robins (1991) describe it as a process whereby the youths have "disassociated themselves from middle class educational and occupational status hierarchies" (p. 574).

Part of Cohen's argument was that since status could not be generated from traditional and acceptable sources those experiencing strain and status frustration would attempt to achieve status in the eyes of similarly affected others through delinquency (Cohen 1955). While, as previously identified, several researchers have found a similar process occurring with regard to football hooliganism, none have made the effort to relate it to Cohen's work. Armstrong (1994), for example, asserts that hooligans are concerned about acquiring status, both individually and as a group, in relation to their hooligan peers. Further,

whilst fellow hooligans can be either honoured or shamed by their counterparts, the wider audience (i.e. the public) find the various groups' very pursuit of honour shameful. Yet, the more the audience think them shameful, potentially the more the Blades can obtain honour in the smaller 'court of reputation', the hooligan gossip network. (Armstrong 1994:301)

The process of gaining honor and reputation alluded to by Armstrong meshes well with Cohen's (1955) predictions about status attainment through the commission of delinquent acts.

The focus on status has recently been addressed by King. As previously stated, he perceived that the problems in school experienced by working-class youths were a reflection of competing norms and values. This is seen as an important explanatory factor

behind the hooliganistic behavior of the lads because their status is tied to the masculinity (including fighting) achieved in the context of football (King 1997). Taking things a step further, King sees recent developments in football and its support to be creating a more intense competition between class-based norms and values. Attempting to cater to a more affluent audience in recent years, football clubs have created a situation where "the lads have faced increasing difficulty in gaining entry to the ground as a result of both intentional and unintentional forms of exclusion" (King 1997:335). This exclusion is perceived to interfere with the norms and values of "appropriate" team support, namely a masculine style that embraces interpersonal conflict. The concepts and arguments made by King bear a strong resemblance to those made by Cohen in 1955, but are focused on the context of football rather than society as a whole.

Cohen (1955) postulates that those who reject accepted middle-class standards will seek status and self-esteem by becoming involved in non-utilitarian, malicious, negativistic activities that are based on hedonism and group autonomy. Most researchers writing about hooligans maintain that youths engage in such illicit activities because of the thrill and the excitement, which is basically hedonism (Johansson 1987; Williams 1991w; Kerr 1994; van der Brug 1994). At the center of hooligan hedonism is violent conflict. As Allan (1989) states, "when your [sic] in the thick of the action even sex doesn't come close to the feeling of being hyped up so much" (p. 135). The essential nature of violence and destruction to hooligans goes beyond simple explanations of hedonism, these activities are also malicious and negativistic. Kerr (1994:66) explains it in the following manner,

not only does the street provide a potential source of proactive, 'just for the hell of it', negativism through the manufacture of excitement, it is also potentially rich in opportunities for reactive negativistic acts during interaction with the police or other forms of authority.

By engaging in violent and destructive activities hooligans are afforded an opportunity to gain status through their illicit behaviors (Carroll 1980; Trivizas 1981; Williams et al. 1986; Hobbs and Robbins 1991; King, 1997).

4.5 The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development⁴⁴

The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development initiated by Donald West at the beginning of the 1960s and later joined by David Farrington constitutes the data set used to explore the subcultural basis of football hooliganism, and is one of the longest running longitudinal studies to date. The study is a longitudinal analysis of the evolution of delinquency among a normal population of boys that began at when they were age eight or nine and continued well into their 30s (Farrington et al. 1986; Farrington 1994ch, 1995). The study is designed to "trace the influence of community, family and individual factors, as seen at this early age [8-9], upon personality, performance and social adjustment in later years" (West 1969:1). Key to their study is looking at the development and nature of delinquency within the study group. As Farrington (1995:930) contends,

the original aim of the Study was to describe the development of delinquent and criminal behaviour in inner-city males, to investigate how far it could be predicted in advance, and to explain why juvenile delinquency began, why it did or did not continue into adult crime, and why adult crime usually ended as men reached their twenties.

Although the two views of the studies purpose differ, partly as a result of development over time, they both reflect important aspects of the study.

The study began with a sample of 411 males who lived in a working-class section of London and were born between 1951 and 1954 (West 1982). By age 18/19, West and Farrington were able to do interviews with 389 of the original 411 subjects (94.6 percent) (West and Farrington 1977).⁴⁵ They considered the sample to be "fairly representative of the normal male population of that particular area and generation, and probably similar to

⁴⁴Since the project is based on data provided through the collection point at age 18/19, the focus of this section of the review will be limited to this period.

⁴⁵They were able to remain in contact with the vast majority of subjects throughout the length of the study. In fact, at age 32 they were able to find 378 out of the surviving 403 (94 percent) (Farrington 1995). From first interview to the most recent they have lost only 33 subjects (8 percent), eight of whom have passed away.

the population of many comparable working-class neighbourhoods" (West and Farrington 1977:1). The goal of this section of the literature review is to address some of the concerns about the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development and the data collected during the project. Realistically, the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development has few detractors, and those who show the most concern about the viability, reliability, and validity of study seem to be West and Farrington.

4.5.1 Demographics of the Study Group

It becomes readily apparent that the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development looks at a particular segment of English society, namely young, working-class males. There is continual debate in criminology and juvenile delinquency about limiting the scope of a study group by gender or social class, yet there is no consensus on such issues. These issues are addressed by West and Farrington repeatedly (West 1969; West and Farrington 1977; Farrington et al. 1986; Farrington 1995), and have a negligible impact on the present study since the bulk of existent research on football hooliganism shows that the vast majority of hooligans have the same general characteristics (see section 4.1).

As previously stated, the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development provides data on 411 working-class boys who initially attended one of six primary schools in the London area.⁴⁶ The sample focuses on working-class males for two reasons: (1) "because a much larger sample would have been needed to produce sufficient numbers of delinquent girls" (West and Farrington 1973:1); and, (2) "because of the prior expectation of a high prevalence of convictions among them" (Farrington 1994ca:1). Part of the reason for the limit in focus was purely logistic. West had limited funding and in an attempt to statistically compare delinquents to non-delinquents the study was limited to boys from an urban working-class area (West 1969). "Since relatively few girls become officially registered delinquents, to obtain enough of them would have necessitated a

⁴⁶A research center was set up in the working-class neighborhood around which all the primary schools were located. Each of the six schools selected for inclusion in the study was within a mile of the research office (Farrington 1994ca).

larger sample than we could manage, and thus they were excluded from our study" (West 1982:7).

Beyond the fact that the research subjects were males living in a working-class section of South London no other significant selection criteria; such as race, psychological makeup, or academic ability, were used (West 1969). In choosing the boys living in this area, West's study population was, "not a probability sample drawn from a population, but rather a complete population of boys that age in that area at that time" (Farrington 1995:931). In a retrospective look at the group's composition West and Farrington (1977) were of the opinion that, "there is no reason to suppose that the sample of 389 youths described in this book is not typical of young British working-class males reared in urban environments" (p. 18).

The respondents in Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development are overwhelmingly working-class, a fact not disguised by West or Farrington. Based on the prestige of the father's occupation (as of age 8/9), as measured on the Registrar General's Scale of Occupational Prestige, approximately 93.7 percent of the boys were working-class. The vast majority of respondents' fathers were employed in skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled manual labor (Farrington 1995). National figures at this time show that approximately 78.3 percent of the population falls into these same categories, so this study significantly under-represents those from higher socio-economic statuses (West 1969, 1982; Farrington et al. 1986; Farrington 1995). While such disproportionate representation is likely to affect the generalizability of the study to some degree, limited financial resources necessarily require difficult choices be made.

Age is generally considered to be an important issue to address in studies of delinquency, but in this study it is an irrelevant point because the study is both prospective and longitudinal. The present study used multiple techniques to collect data on the sample at different intervals between the ages of 8 and 19.

The boys were tested in their schools at ages 8, 10, and 14, and interviewed outside school at ages 16 and 18. . . . Their parents were interviewed in their homes about once a year from when the boys

were 8 until their last year of compulsory schooling at age 15, and their teachers filled in questionnaires about them at ages 8, 10, 12, and 14. (Farrington 1982:173)

The other important aspect of the study in terms of age is that the study is prospective. One of the values of being prospective is that "repeated questions at regular intervals are likely to provide more accurate estimates than retrospective questions covering a long period" (Farrington 1982:184). The result is a study of more than 400 subjects which is designed to look at what factors during the process of development and socialization are important determinants of delinquent behavior (West 1969), while being "large enough for many statistical analyses, but small enough to permit detailed case histories of the males and their families" (Farrington 1995:932).

4.5.2 Issues of Reliability and Validity

All in all, West and Farrington are quite forthright about issues of reliability and validity, to the point of openly discussing some of the difficulties that were experienced in the study. They attempted to minimize any such problems by collecting the same information through multiple methods over time, including the use of interviews, questionnaires, tests, and content analyses. As Farrington (1994ca:vii) mentions,

[the] advantages in measuring variables from different sources are that it helps to determine whether observed relationships reflect real associations between theoretical constructs or measurement biases, it helps to establish validity and reliability and it permits the reduction of measurement error by combining variables from different sources.

While there are a few areas where these issues need to be focused upon, none is more important than the issue of measuring delinquency.

Part of the concern in all criminological research is whether measures of criminal behavior are reliable and valid indicators of the amount of criminality occurring within the group. Generally the belief is that official reports result in an undercounting of criminality, what is often described as the "dark figure" of crime, while self-reports are thought to overestimate the level of criminal activity among respondents. The Cambridge

Study in Delinquent Development takes few chances by gathering both official records and self-reports of delinquent activity. Official records of convictions for criminal activities were done primarily through the Central Criminal Record Office in London (Farrington 1994ca, 1994ch). According to West (1982), "at the time our record searches came to an end the youngest member of the study was 25 years 6 months. Information is believed to be complete on convictions for offenses committed in England up to the twenty-fifth birthday" (p. 163). The researchers went so far as to request conviction records for those living outside Britain during any period of the study (Farrington 1982, 1995).

Self-reports of delinquent behavior were first collected when the subjects were 14/15, and further inquiries were made during all subsequent interviews (16/17, 18/19, 21/22, and 24/25) (Farrington 1994ca, 1995). Part of the stated reason for using self-reports of delinquency was "to see if this measure of delinquency would give results differing from those obtained when official records were used" (West and Farrington 1973:151). In the end, West and Farrington found that their self-reports of delinquency were valuable measures. "Our confidence in self-reports as an index of delinquency was increased by noting the consistency between the self-report rankings of individuals at age eighteen and those at ages fourteen and sixteen" (West and Farrington 1977:41). While relying solely upon self-reports could create difficulties like telescoping, validity, and reliability, using official conviction records and self-reports in tandem provides a system of checks and balances that addresses all three possible issues.⁴⁷

When comparing the official conviction records and self-reports West and Farrington (1973, 1977) came away with similar results, bolstering the validity and reliability of data on delinquency. Overall the value of having both sources of information on delinquency is reflected by West and Farrington's (1973) statement that "when a delinquency scale based solely upon the boys' self-reports was substituted for the scale based on official records, the findings concerning the characteristics and backgrounds of

⁴⁷Maxfield and Babbie (1995) provide in-depth information about some of the possible advantages and pitfalls of self-reports of behavior.

delinquents remained substantially unchanged" (p. 187). While there was some difference between the methods, self-reports and official records provided similar results and identified most of the same people as being the worst offenders (Farrington 1995).

In an attempt to deal with possible problems of reliability, West and Farrington used a large number of repeated measures. Not only would they ask for the same information over different collection points, they also attempted to get the information through multiple methods and sources. With few exceptions, most of the repeated measures provided similar results (West 1969). West and Farrington attempted to assess concerns about inter-rater reliability on multiple occasions, especially when it came to interviews with parents and personal interviews with the subjects (West 1969, 1982; West and Farrington 1973, 1977). One of the ways they addressed inter-rater reliability was to tape record the personal interviews in addition to having the interviewer take written notes. The goal was to ensure that the results of the interviews were as reliable as possible and that lapses and biases of individual interviewers would be minimized (West and Farrington 1977).⁴⁸

One important area that has bearing on the use of Cohen's theory concerns measures that were taken within the school setting. An important aspect of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development is the data provided by teachers who filled out questionnaires about each respondent. The questionnaires were completed by different teachers at each collection point, so evaluations were done when the boys were 8/9, 10/11, 12/13, and 14/15 (West 1969; West and Farrington 1973).⁴⁹ The purpose of asking the same questions of different teachers at different collection points was to look for consistency over time, therefore enhancing the reliability of the school-based data.

⁴⁸Having recorded versions of the interviews also allowed West and Farrington to detail specific case histories relating to any number of topics.

⁴⁹The questions asked at age 8/9 were replicated at 10/11. The questions were altered slightly when asked at 12/13 but were then replicated at 14/15. So while the content of some questions changed between primary and secondary school, similar information was asked for and replicated at least once.

Concerns about the validity of the study, or the questions therein, fail to appear with any regularity. Many important tests, scales, rankings, and questions were replicated, sometimes with minor modifications, from other studies. One example of the attempt to improve the validity of the study can be found when looking at the initial teacher questionnaires which were modeled after those suggested by J.W.B. Douglas (West 1969:11). Many important components of the study were achieved with the cooperation of other researchers.

4.5.3 Unresolved Problems Encountered in the Study

A host of difficulties can be encountered in any research project, especially those of a longitudinal variety (see West and Farrington 1973; Farrington 1982). The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development had its share of difficulties, ranging from refusals for interviews to changing governmental regulations about collecting data on school students. Fortunately many of these issues were resolved sufficiently to have a negligible impact on the study, but two lingering and inter-related issues remain unresolved: (1) information collected by psychiatric social workers and (2) refusals for interviews by parents and later the subjects.

West employed psychiatric social workers to conduct home interviews with the subjects' parents (West 1969). One of the unresolved concerns about the psychiatric social workers was their reliability in collecting information about the parents and the home environment. The main aspect of concern centered on what West described as a negative halo effect in which the assessor perceives the overall situation to be all good or all bad based on certain factors or findings (West 1969, 1982; West and Farrington 1973). This problem was most readily perceived to occur when the psychiatric social workers were required to make subjective ratings of the home situation, such as whether or not the home is dilapidated.

While it could be perceived that there was incompetence on the part of the psychiatric social workers involved in the project, there were several other factors that should be introduced. First, the family interviews were complex, difficult, and at times

tedious, especially in cases where the parent(s) was uncooperative (West 1969:60-66). Second, there were a few anomalous cases where difficulties in familial relationships may have been missed (West and Farrington 1973:145). This is not a problem encountered only by ill-prepared psychiatric social workers, but may occur to any researcher. Third, psychiatric social workers attempted to correct inconsistencies when recording their information by reviewing tapes of the interviews, and they compiled case summaries which gave the researchers greater insight into the family and the difficulties that arose (West 1969:155). So while there are lingering concerns about the validity and reliability of the data collected by psychiatric social workers, not all of the problems should be attributed to the psychiatric social workers and attempts were made to minimize their effects. Even with the apparent concerns and difficulties, parental interviews by psychiatric social workers "took place about once a year from when the boy was about 8 until when he was aged 14-15 and in his last year of compulsory education (Farrington et al. 1986:341).

As previously mentioned, and should be expected in any study, not all of the parents were cooperative about being interviewed. Even when parents consented to personal interviews they were not always candid about certain information, sometimes not knowing answers and at other times refusing to answer specific questions (West 1969). In all, "parents of 22 boys had to be written off as total refusers and in a further 21 cases parental co-operation was very reluctant and the information obtained . . . was correspondingly scanty or unreliable" (West 1982:10).

A related concern about the parental interviews has to do with the methods that were employed. Psychiatric social workers were given a great deal of freedom, sometimes being provided little more than a subject sheet. In addition, West (1982) points out that "there was inadequate pre-testing of the reliability of the interview methods used to obtain information from parents" (p. 7). The conclusion reached in the study was that there were limitations to the type and amount of data that could be elicited from parental interviews.

Over time some of the subjects also became recalcitrant about getting involved in further interviews. The interviews done at age 18 involved more than 94 percent of the

original subjects (389 of 411); however, 64 of the subjects were somewhat uncooperative, but eventually agreed to do the interview. Persistence seemed to be the key as financial enticements were perceived to have limited effectiveness. Farrington et al. (1986) state that "of the 22 youths missing at age 18, one had died, one could not be traced, six were abroad, 10 refused to be interviewed, and in the other four cases the parents refused on behalf of the youth" (p. 341). Even with the loss of 22 cases over a ten year period the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development experienced less attrition than most other longitudinal studies (Farrington 1982; West 1982).

4.5.4 Strengths of the Study

While there are concerns about reliability and validity, and a couple of unresolved issues, none of these makes the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development untenable. At the same time, it is important to briefly identify a couple of important features of the study. While it is not the first, largest, or most comprehensive longitudinal criminological investigation, the study is "probably the first to combine the following features: delinquency as the focus of interest; use of a cohort of unselected, normal children; and observations (including interviews) repeated over a substantial span of time" (West 1969:7).

The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development is also an important and useful study because of what it can contribute to the theoretical aspects of crime and delinquency. The study and its data are not driven by a specific set of theories or hypotheses, but was designed to test multiple, competing theories and look at previously unexplored causes of behavior, especially delinquency (West 1969; Farrington 1994ch, 1995). A further advantage is that data were collected on the subjects prior to the age of criminal responsibility (age 10), ensuring that proper time order can be achieved in statistical computations (Farrington 1995). By collecting data starting at age eight and continuing well into adulthood, West, Farrington and others are able to explore developmental factors that could contribute to delinquency over time, as well as develop and test theories of crime and delinquency.

CHAPTER V
MATERIALS & METHODS

Cohen's theory on the subcultural nature of delinquency has not been effectively tested, and the literature on football hooliganism reveals that it may be useful in describing why certain youths become involved in such activities. The present endeavor is designed to explore the feasibility of using a modified version of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency as an explanation of English football hooliganism in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The parameters of the revised version of Cohen's theory have been set out previously (see chapter 3), and the central aspect of the theory focused on in this study is the degree to which the working-class respondents adhere to middle-class values, specifically success, self-reliance, constructive leisure and acceptable conduct. Thus the driving hypothesis of the study is as follows:

H₀: Hooligans and non-hooligans equally adhere to the same middle-class values.

H_a: Hooligans are less likely to adhere to middle-class values than their non-hooligan counterparts.

The rest of this section is designed to layout the design of the study, the measurement of key variables, and the analytic strategy.

5.1 The Data Set

Donald West and David Farrington's Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (CSDD) is employed to quantitatively investigate the proposed hypothesis.⁵⁰ The CSDD is a prospective longitudinal study that began in 1961 and focuses on the development and delinquent behavior of a cohort of London youths (Farrington 1982). The survey population is comprised of 411 boys living in a working-class section of London when they were between eight and nine years of age. Data was collected on the whole sample five times between the ages of eight and 18, and during this period they lost only 22 of the original 411 (94.6 percent of the starting population) (West and Farrington 1973).⁵¹

A majority of the information provided in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development was derived from personal interviews with the youths. West and Farrington also collected data on the youths through psychological tests, self-report questionnaires, and interviews with the boys' parents, peers, and teachers (Farrington 1994ca). Additionally, the investigators made "repeated searches in the Central Criminal Record Office in London to try to locate findings of guilt sustained by the boys, by their parents, by their brothers and sisters, and (in recent years) by their wives" (Farrington 1994ca:iii). The resultant data set provides detailed information on numerous aspects of the subjects' lives, which makes it possible to "test many hypotheses about delinquency, investigate the relative importance of variables, and to study the importance of some variables while controlling for others" (Farrington 1994ca:vii). The CSDD provides researchers with an in-depth, longitudinal data source which addresses a wide array of aspects of the lives of a cohort of London youths.

⁵⁰The study will use the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research's (ICPSR) second edition of this data, which was first available in November of 1994.

⁵¹Subsequent interviews of subsets of the population were conducted at 21 and 24 years of age. This data will not be used in the present study since the CSDD, as archived at ICPSR, concludes after the interviews at age 18/19.

The data itself is contained in a single data file consisting of more than 800 items covering most aspects of the youths development over a ten year span. This data file is comprised of information related to the their home lives, social lives, school performance and behavior, teacher and parental evaluations, self-reported delinquency, official conviction records, and football-related behavior. The study provides behavioral and contextual data on the youths beginning at age 8/9 in order to be used to predict and explain future involvement in delinquency within a normal working-class population of London youths (West 1983).

5.2 Measurement of the Study's Variables

This section describes the primary dependent, independent, and control variables used in the study. It deals with the selection of the items to be incorporated into the study and the development and reliability of scales that were developed to more accurately represent some concepts.

5.2.1 Football Hooliganism

Football hooliganism is the primary dependent variable in the present study. It is a designed from a group of four self-reported items about behavior at football matches that was addressed in the CSDD's follow-up at 18/19. The items ask about the respondents' involvement in fights at football matches and whether they had been apprehended at matches from 1968 to 1971, such as "In the past year have you been arrested at a football match?" (West and Farrington 1977; Farrington 1994ca). Fighting and arrests were each asked twice, first covering the past year's activities and the second time inquiring about the previous two years. While hooliganism was not the central focus of West and Farrington's work on the CSDD, they found that football matches were a popular location for fights. West and Farrington report that 7.9 percent of all fights reported by the respondents took place within the context of football matches (both inside and outside the

stadia) (West and Farrington 1977). Refer to Appendix A for a complete listing of the items on hooliganism.

Each item was dichotomous, with "yes" and "no" response categories, and there is a total of 389 valid cases for each item. The separate fighting and apprehension questions were then combined into more general measures in an attempt to determine if the behavior was infrequent or persistent. The next step was to combine the two general items into a single measure of football hooliganism. The final item has a range of 0 to 3, where 0 means that the respondent never engaged in acts of hooliganism and a respondent with a score of 3 is persistently engaged in hooliganism.

There are several benefits to the questions on football hooliganism that West and Farrington inquired about. First, asking about such behavior at age 18/19 is beneficial because it taps hooligan behavior from approximately ages 16 to 19, which coincides with the bulk of research findings that show hooligans to be relatively young (between 14 and 21 years of age). Second, the timing of the questions is important because it provides information on the first generation of modern hooligans (mid-1960s to the present), a group that is quite distinct from hooligans of previous eras. Little is known about the social, personal, and criminal backgrounds of this generation of hooligans; consequently, this study can provide important insight into them and their behavior. Unlike their successors, they did not have a group of mentors from which to model their behavior at football matches.⁵² This first generation of modern English hooligans eventually took on the role of mentor in the 1970s, teaching subsequent groups of aspiring hooligans the appropriate techniques and behaviors. In the modern era of hooliganism these mentors, referred to as "Daddies of the Ends" often tutored younger individuals (a) to recognize available opportunity structures, (b) to acquire the skills necessary to successfully engage in acts of hooliganism, and (c) to understand how to rationalize and explain such behavior (Bryant 1990; Wallace 1994).

⁵²These mentors are derived from previous generations of hooligans. In this era there were no adequate models from previous generations because the phenomenon changed quantitatively and qualitatively during the 1960s, including the development of hooligan crews (for more detail see chapter 2).

5.2.2 *Cohen's Middle-Class Values*

The revised version of Cohen's middle-class values, including; success, constructive leisure, self-reliance, and acceptable conduct are the primary independent variables in the present study. For the revised middle-class values a number of items were identified as possible components for each value, and the complete list of items can be found in Appendix A. The frequencies on each set of items was then checked to determine whether they would be useful in further analyses. Items were dropped for having an excessive number of missing cases (more than 15 percent of the overall sample size) and for having excessive levels of skewing (skewness > 2.00).⁵³ The next step was to run each set of items through factor analysis. After determining which factor the items were most strongly loaded upon in the rotated (varimax rotation - orthogonal) component matrix (a value of ≈ 0.50) reliabilities were run upon each factor (Kerlinger 1986).⁵⁴ A determination was then made about the effectiveness of combining these items into a useful construct based on the reliabilities of the scales using a standard on Chronbach's alpha of $\alpha \approx .70$ (Nunnally 1978).⁵⁵ The end result of this process was the development of scales to represent each revised dimension of Cohen's middle-class values. All of the items are continuous, with low values reflecting a strong adherence to the middle-class value and high values reflecting a weak or non-existent adherence to the value.

⁵³There is no set standard for what level of skewing makes an item problematic and possibly a non-valid predictor. Even so, skewed items indicate a non-normal frequency distribution based on the difference in value of the mean and median for the item (Blalock 1972; Sirkin 1995; Agresti and Finlay 1997).

⁵⁴The choice of the varimax (orthogonal) rotation method for a factor analysis solution is based on the fact that it is perceived to be "much simpler to understand and interpret" than other rotation methods (Kim and Mueller 1978:50). Further, Kim and Mueller indicated that any rotation method provides adequate solutions.

⁵⁵It seems that few people are willing to tackle the issue of minimal scale reliability based on Chronbach's alpha. Nunnally (1978) suggests that constructs having "modest" reliabilities of .70 or higher will suffice for early tests of hypothesized constructs (p. 245). In contrast, Carmines and Zeller (1979) do not provide a guideline, minimum acceptable score, for the development and testing of new scales, yet "as a general rule, we believe that reliabilities should not be below .80 for widely used scales" (p. 51).

Success. The revised middle-class value of success revolves around the institution of the school, which Cohen perceives to be the key to prosperity. As a concept, success is multifaceted and broadly incorporates the elements of aspiration and achievement (especially in school), delayed gratification, and a determination to get ahead. While there were numerous items which could legitimately fit into this concept, the hope was to come away with a single factor that represented success. Several items were eliminated early on because they were strongly skewed, had an excessive number of missing cases, or failed to adequately embody the conception of this middle-class value. Even so, this meant that there were still 13 items to be molded into a measure of success. Five of these items were universal measures of school-related concepts that were measured on multiple occasions.⁵⁶

A factor analysis on the remaining 13 items revealed that the items tapped into four distinct dimensions of success rather than a single one. The factor loadings of the items on the orthogonally rotated factor matrix were then used to test the reliability of each factor. Three of the factors provided a Chronbach's alpha greater than the .70 standard, including; a primary school scale of items describing hard work and aspiration ($\alpha = .8149$), a factor measuring overall school performance and ability ($\alpha = .7592$), and a secondary school measure of hard work and aspiration ($\alpha = .7703$). The primary school scale was ultimately dropped in favor of the secondary school measure since it was determined that a lack of ambition, aspiration and hard work at this level would have a more acute effect upon youths' desire to uphold the middle-class value of success.

While the desire was to come away with a single scale representing the concept of success, the two selected factors seem to more adequately reflect this middle-class value. The items included in these two factors are:

⁵⁶The five universal measures included a primary school teacher rating of laziness (measured at ages 8/9 and 10/11), a primary school teacher rating of the subjects' attempt to be a credit to their parents (measured at ages 8/9 and 10/11), an overall estimate of the respondents' class positions throughout their schooling, a secondary school teacher rating of laziness (measured at 12/13 and 14/15) and a secondary school teacher rating of the subjects' attempt to be a credit to their parents (measured at 12/13 and 14/15).

Factor 3 - Success in School: Performance (SSP) - designated school tracking level (TRCKNG); junior school attainment scores, a combined measure created by West and Farrington to reflect scores on math, verbal reasoning and English (JRSCMBAT); and age upon leaving school (LFTSCH2).

Factor 2 - Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW) - respondent's class position by quartile (POSCLASS); secondary school teachers ratings of youth's attempt to be a credit to their parents (CRPRNT2); and secondary school teachers ratings of the boy's laziness in school (LAZY1215).

These two factors measure distinct and equally important aspects of success as they relate to the environment of the school, specifically they address the elements of aspiration and achievement (factor 3) and a determination to get ahead (factor 2).

Self-Reliance. The middle-class value of self-reliance looks relatively straight forward since it is comprised of only one of Cohen's middle-class values, namely individual responsibility, but in reality this one may have caused the most difficulties. Initially nine items were found to reflect at least some aspect of self-reliance, but upon closer inspection it was found that parental supervision (PSUPERV) was actually a combined measure of two other items, parental rules (PRULES) and parental vigilance (PVIGLNT). As such, parental supervision was dropped in favor of the two individual items since no details could be found on how and why parental rules and vigilance were combined. The descriptives on the eight items revealed no items with an excessive number of missing cases, but engaging in solitary activities was removed as a result of excessive skewing.

The seven remaining items were then factor analyzed and three components were extracted. Using the orthogonal (varimax) matrix as a guide, the items loading on each component were tested on scale reliability using Chronbach's Alpha. Unfortunately none of the three scales provided an alpha above a .70 standard ($\alpha = .5605, .3360, \text{ and } .0856$

respectively), but in order to have at least one measure of each revised middle-class value for subsequent hypothesis testing, the most reliable of the three was retained.

The factor selected to represent self-reliance contains three items:

Factor 1 - Self-Reliance (SR) - adventuresomeness of the respondent (ADVENT); quality of parental rules (PRULES); and parental vigilance over the boy (PVIGLNT).

The scale developed from these three items reflects how much freedom the parents allow their boys to have at age 8/9 and embodies the idea that youths' upholding middle-class values are reluctant to turn to others for help and are resourcefulness.

Constructive Leisure. Constructive leisure focuses on planning and engaging in behaviors that may be of future value while avoiding frivolous activities. The key elements of constructive leisure included; planning of events, constructive and wholesome activities, efficient allocation of resources (budgeting time), and avoidance of betting. There were a total of 9 items that matched these elements and were included in the initial analysis. The descriptive statistics on these items revealed that the item on the boys' frequency of outside activities (FREQACT) had a large number of missing cases (19.7 percent) and was eliminated. The item on the number of juvenile convictions was strongly skewed (skewness = 4.947), but was retained since there is an expectation that only a small percentage of juveniles will ever be convicted, thus strongly skewing the response distribution. Since there was a relatively small number of items these were retained for factor analysis.

The factor analysis on the constructive leisure items resulted in the identification of three components. The first two components had eigenvalues well over 1.0 and the other one was slightly below 1.0, at .998. Component 3 was removed when the rotated component matrix revealed that there was only one item loading on it. The remaining two factors then underwent reliability analysis, which revealed that only factor 2 was reliable enough to use. The three items that comprise factor 2 had a reliability coefficient of $\alpha = 0.7098$. The reliability could have been increased if the CLUBS item was dropped, but it

was the only one that measured activities other than sports and games. Factor 1 fared decently in the reliability analysis ($\alpha = .6309$) with all four items and .6229 when DRUGS was removed), but was eliminated since factor 2 was revealed to be more reliable.

The results of these analyses provides one legitimate scale of constructive leisure, what could accurately be described as engaging in wholesome activities. This scale is represented by the following items:

Factor 2 - Constructive Leisure (CL) - attendance of youth and sports clubs (CLUBS); involvement in games and sports (SPORTS); and involvement in organized games and sports (ORGSPT).

Since this is an extension of the ideals of rationality and planning, the factor seems to fit well into this dimension of Cohen's middle-class values.

Acceptable Conduct. Acceptable conduct was a construct developed around a common thread of self-control that existed in two of the middle-class values proposed by Cohen. The commonality in these two values suggests that the key elements of a combined measure include the ability to get along with others, the ability to excel at secondary group relationships, and staying in control of one's physical body. Initially 16 items, several of which were combined measures, were found that would likely fit at least some aspect of acceptable conduct. Upon closer inspection the item on fighting seriousness was removed since any type of fighting, regardless of seriousness, fails to uphold the middle-class ethos. Descriptive statistics were run on the remaining items and revealed that two other factors (respondents' obedience and respondents' level of defiance) be removed because of an excessive number of missing values.

A factor analysis was then performed on the 13 items in an attempt to come away with a scale that would accurately represent the middle-class construct of acceptable conduct. The factor analysis revealed that there were 4 components with an eigenvalue above 1.0 and a fifth component with an eigenvalue of .989. The orthogonally rotated

component matrix then revealed that each factor was comprised of at least two items, so reliabilities were run on each set of related factors.

Factors 2, 4, and 5 were eliminated as a result of the reliability analyses which revealed that none had a Chronbach's alpha above .70 (.5739, .6293, and .1933 respectively). Factor 1 was found to be a relatively good scale construct, having a reliability of $\alpha = 0.8449$. Factor 1 is composed of the following items:

Factor 1 - Acceptable Conduct: Behavior (ACB) - how much the boy acts out (ACTOUT); a combined measure of conduct disorder based on teacher and parent information (CDCOMB); an overall primary school teacher rating (TRCMB); and a combined teacher rating of troublesomeness (TRUBLC).

The other remaining component, factor 3, also performed well in reliability analysis, with a reliability of $\alpha = .7906$. This factor has only two items:

Factor 3 Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF) - combined measure of teachers' rating on the respondent's popularity (TRPOPLR) and a combined measure of the boy's ability to make friends as rated by teachers (TRFRDMK).

The result of the analyses on acceptable conduct revealed two factors of strong reliability which reflect very different aspects of this middle-class construct. Factor 1 is a behavioral measure of controlled conduct while factor 3 reflects the interpersonal ability to develop good secondary group relationships.

5.2.3 *Gang Activities Outside the Football Context*

The birth of the modern era of football hooliganism in England is generally thought to be tied to the presence of gangs and gang members at matches who facilitate criminal activities and respond to the challenges made by others (see chapter 2). The inclusion of a gang variable in the present analysis is designed to address this development and test whether or not it is a significant predictor of hooligan behavior at the beginning of the modern era.

The CSDD provided two different ways to measure the gang activities of the respondents outside of the context of football. The gang measure used for this study is derived from the self-reported delinquency questions that were asked of the youths at ages 14/15 and 16/17, and is the only one that adequately avoids problems of time order.⁵⁷ The self-report items on gangs inquired as to whether or not the respondent had been involved in non-football affiliated gang activities. The responses to the gang question at age 14/15 and 16/17 were combined into a more universal measure of whether or not the youth had engaged in gang activities at any time up to age 16/17.

The reason for combining the two items is because neither question puts the behavior into a specific time frame, and a lack of consistency was found when a cross-tabulation was done. There were a total of 34 cases where the youth answered that they had been involved in gang activities at one follow-up and that they had not been involved in gang activities at the other follow-up.⁵⁸

The more universal measure of self-reported gang activities (GANG) that was developed is a dichotomous variable, taking a "have you ever" format. The result is a variable that asks the youths if they ever engaged in gang activities outside of football up to age 16/17, and provides the response categories of "never" and "at least once".

5.2.4 *Controls*

A number of different possible control variables were initially conceived of, from socio-economic status and parental education to measures of delinquent peers and criminal family members. Realistically three control items stood out as important; a measure describing the social handicaps of the family, whether or not the youth spent any

⁵⁷The other measures create possible time order problems since it was asked during the same follow up as the questions on hooliganism and covers the exact same period of time (last year and the previous two years).

⁵⁸While there were some cases where the youth answered that they were only involved during the follow-up at age 16/17, the more problematic inconsistency was when the youth responded that they were involved in gang activities at 14/15 but not at 16/17. Since there is no indication of a time frame on either question it was felt that the best course of action was to combine them into a more universal measure.

time prior to age 15 in a single parent home, and a measure of differential association based on the delinquency of the respondent's peers.

Social Handicaps (FAMDISAD). While the youths involved in the Cambridge Study could broadly be described as working-class, it is conceivable that there is a great degree of variance in the socio-economic statuses represented by this categorization. If, as Cohen predicted, all working-class youths are introduced to middle-class standards and are expected to uphold them (at least in the context of school), differences within social class standing should have no impact upon hooliganism.

Most studies would employ a measure such as socio-economic status or parental occupation in order to look at differences within the group, and that was the initial plan for this study. The situation changed upon recommendations garnered from West and Farrington's manuscripts on the CSDD, where they found that the item "social handicaps" was a good, robust indicator of overall socio-economic status, often being a better predictor than more traditional measures (West and Farrington 1973). The item social handicaps is an assessment of family standing and material standards comprised of measures like "'poor housing', 'interior of rooms neglected', 'family supported by social agencies', 'mother has no paid job', 'erratic paternal work record', and 'boy physically neglected'" (West and Farrington 1973:30). Since West and Farrington found this item to be more useful than many other measures of relative socio-economic standing within the working-class, it is employed as a control measure in the present study.

Single-Parent Family (BRKNHM). The literature on delinquency and home situation often debates the effect growing up in a single-parent family (broken home) has on juveniles, and thus far no consensus has been reached. It was felt that such a variable would be a good control in the present study, especially since it might reveal that adherence to middle-class values is mitigated by the parental structure of the home.

The CSDD provides information on the parental structure of the respondent's homes at two periods of time, age 10/11 and age 14/15. Both items identify whether the

respondent spent time in a single-parent family up to the time of measurement. In order to check the reliability of the later item to see if it was inclusive of cases found in the initial query, the two items were combined and the descriptive statistics were compared. The results showed that the measurement taken at age 14/15 was identical to the combined measure, with 76 youths (9.2 percent) growing up in a single-parent family.

The initial items inquired about the reason behind the existence of a broken home, dividing responses into death and other reasons (including desertion, divorce and separations) (West and Farrington 1973; Farrington 1994ca). As the data provided by the items are at a nominal level a decision was made to simplify this control into a dichotomous variable reflecting whether or not the youth experienced a broken home situation at any time up to age 15.

Differential Association (DIFFASS). A measure based on Edwin Sutherland's theory of differential association provides a valuable control in any test of delinquency theory, and enough information was provided in the Cambridge Study to create just such a measure. The central items in the development of a measure of differential association asked the respondents about the level of delinquent involvement of friends and acquaintances. The questions on friend and acquaintance delinquency were asked at age 14/15 and 16/17. The items from age 14/15 are the only ones used in the present study since, for unexplained reasons, the measurement at 16/17 was modified in an unspecified manner.

The individual questions on friend and acquaintance delinquency are both ratio level measures with a possible range of 0 to 38.⁵⁹ These two items were combined into a single, continuous scale based on the results of factor analysis which revealed that they loaded on the same component. The adequacy of making the separate measures into a

⁵⁹The respondents provided self-reported data on their delinquency at age 14/15. Each of the 38 questions asked how often they engaged in a particular form of delinquency. They were subsequently asked whether they had any friends or any acquaintances who had also engaged in these same types of delinquency. The items for friend's delinquency and acquaintance's delinquency are derived from the responses provided to these queries.

scale was confirmed through reliability analysis. In the reliability analysis the scale items provided a Chronbach's alpha of .9134. Thus the variable designed to represent the delinquent propensities of the youths' peers will act as a control in the prediction equation that football hooligans are less likely to adhere to middle-class values than their non-hooligan counterparts.

5.3 Analytic Strategy

The data provided by the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development provides a unique opportunity for an in-depth quantitative analysis of English football hooliganism right at the leading edge of the modern era. The present study will calculate all statistical information using SPSS 7.5.1, the Standard Version for Windows.

Since a number of the key variables for the study have been developed through the use of factor and reliability analyses and the code book for the CSDD does not provide any statistical results for existing measures, the first step will be to provide univariate statistics for all study items. Bivariate analyses will be performed after reporting on the descriptive statistics for the items. Included within this portion of the analysis will be correlations for independent, dependent, and control variables to determine the direction and magnitude of relationships between the variables (Hanushek and Jackson 1977). The other bivariate analyses to be done for the present study are independent samples t-tests of each of the items measuring adherence to middle-class values on a recoded, dichotomous measure of hooliganism (HUULI). The hope is to find that there is a significant difference in adherence to the middle-class values for hooligans and non-hooligans, with hooligans having higher mean scores on the formulated values than non-hooligans.

The final step of the statistical analyses will be the use of multivariate statistical procedures to more thoroughly examine the predicted relationship between adherence to middle-class values and hooliganism. The primary multivariate procedure for the project is multiple regression. After initial regression analyses using only the independent

variables, appropriate control variables will be added to the regression analyses to determine whether the hypothesized relationship holds up under these conditions.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter is divided into three sections, beginning with a univariate analysis of the study group and key variables. The second and third sections are based on bivariate and multivariate statistics respectively. Statistical information will be provided and the results of the analyses will be discussed throughout each section.

6.1 Univariate Statistics

Throughout each of West and Farrington's reports on the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (CSDD) (1969, 1973, 1977, and 1982) they provide a significant amount of descriptive data about the composition of the study group. The CSDD is a prospective longitudinal study of 411 boys who lived in a working-class section of London at the time of the first data collection in 1961 and 1962, at which time the respondents were age 8/9. As West and Farrington (1973) report, 93.9 percent (n = 386) of the boys were "white in racial appearance and reared by parents who were themselves brought up in the United Kingdom or Eire" (p. 1).

Based on the Registrar General's Scale of social class, only 6 percent of the sample could be identified as coming from a family from the upper- or middle-classes (West and Farrington 1973:43). Each youth's socio-economic status was determined from the status of the job they held at age 18/19, whereby it was found that only 5.4 percent (n

= 19) of the 349 classified youths were in occupations that could be classified as professional, managerial, or clerical. The remaining 330 of 349 (94.6 percent) were either unemployed or in skilled, semi-skilled, or non-skilled manual occupations (West and Farrington 1977:183). Another interesting finding is that 24.1 percent (99 of 411) of CSDD respondents came from large families (four or more siblings), while 11.2 percent (46 of 411) of the boys were only children (West and Farrington 1973).⁶⁰

6.1.1 Study Variables

The range, mean, standard deviation, number of valid and missing cases, and skewness are reported for each of the dependent, independent, and control variables in Table 1. For scaled variables composed from factor and reliability analyses the final Chronbach's alpha for all included items is reported in parentheses.

Looking more closely at the items, it can be seen that no item contains more than 63 missing cases, which would represent more than 15 percent of the total sample size. Only two items, football hooliganism and single-parent home are strongly skewed (beyond 1.0). Those variables with a range beginning at zero represent items where there is a possible response of "no", "never", or "none". Each of the middle-class values items has a range beginning at 1, representing the most middle-class adaptation to that particular value, while the highest possible score shown in the range for each one represents the most working-class adaptation to that same middle-class value.

Two measures of the dependent variable football hooliganism are shown in Table 1, the first (HOOLIGN) is a grouping variable defining different levels of hooligan involvement at an ordinal level. The other measure of football hooliganism (HUULI) is a dichotomous variable that is used for t-tests (reported in section 6.2). The 22 missing cases are those cases which could not be reached for the interviews at age 18/19. Of the

⁶⁰These descriptive statistics were replicated with the data set, as used in the present study, to ensure that the data file was set up correctly.

TABLE 1**Univariate Statistics for Dependent, Independent and Control Variables**

Variable Description DATA NAME - (Scale α)	Valid Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Possible Range	Skewness Coefficient
DEPENDENT VARIABLES					
Football Hooliganism HOOLIGNS	389 (22)	.18	.56	0-3	3.39
Football Hooliganism - Dichotomous HUULI	389 (22)	.12	.32	0-1	2.37
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES					
Gang Activities Outside Football GANG	393 (18)	.32	.47	0-1	.76
Middle-Class Values					
Constructive Leisure CL - ($\alpha = .71$)	390 (21)	3.60	2.08	1-7	.36
Acceptable Conduct: Behavior ACB - ($\alpha = .85$)	411 (0)	6.08	3.37	1-13	.43
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking ACF - ($\alpha = .79$)	368 (43)	4.756	1.33	1-9	.16
Self-Reliance SR - ($\alpha = .56$)	367 (44)	4.00	1.23	1-7	.23
Success in School: Performance SSP - ($\alpha = .76$)	384 (27)	7.60	2.65	1-13	-.32
Success in School: Hard Work & Striving SSW - ($\alpha = .77$)	348 (63)	7.17	2.52	1-13	-.02
CONTROL VARIABLES					
Social Handicaps of Family FAMDISAD	411 (0)	.69	.69	0-2	.50
Single-Parent Family BRKNHM	411 (0)	.19	.39	0-1	1.63
Delinquency of Peers: Differential Association DIFFASS - ($\alpha = .91$)	405 (6)	37.37	15.22	0-76	.23

389 valid cases, 46 (11.8 percent) reported that they had engaged in some form of football hooliganism at least once.⁶¹

Looking more closely at each of the variables which represent each of the aspects of Cohen's middle-class values, there are a few important things to note. First, the middle-class values are all designed as continuous variables, with low scores representing a middle-class orientation to the values and high scores representing a working-class orientation to the values. Second, each of the variables has a relatively low skewness coefficient, meaning that there is a broad range of actual responses that are fairly evenly distributed. Third, each of the variables has a value on Chronbach's alpha above $\alpha = .55$, and all but self-reliance has a value exceeding $\alpha = .70$.

The other independent variable, gang behavior outside football is dichotomous, separating those who have not engaged in any gang activity from those that have engaged in at least one gang activity. This item reveals that 32.3 percent (127 of 393) of the youths in the study have engaged in at least one gang activity outside of the football context by age 16/17. While these results are skewed toward those who have never engaged in gang activities, the skewness coefficient remains acceptable at .76.

Of the three control variables shown in Table 1, only the measure of differential association is a continuous item. The level of social handicaps of the respondent's family and whether or not they spent time in a single-parent family prior to age 15 are both grouping variables, with the later being dichotomous. The social handicaps variable is scored on the relative level of problems identified with the youth's family, with 0 = none, 1 = moderate, and 2 = severe. The responses are fairly evenly distributed, with only 182 of the 411 cases (44.3 percent) having no discernable inadequacies. The other 55.7 percent of the boys are in families that have at least moderate difficulties. This variable

⁶¹From age 16 to 19, the approximate time frame for the measure of football hooliganism, 61.2 percent of all respondents (238 of 389) reported that they had attended at least one football match during the same span. So of those who attended at least one football match, 19.3 percent (46 of 238) engaged in at least one act of hooliganism.

has no missing cases, as it was the focus of the initial interviews with the youth's parent(s).⁶²

The dichotomous measure of whether the respondent grew up in a single-parent family prior to age 15 is another item for which there were no missing cases. This information could be provided from a number of sources (the respondents, teachers, and parents), so parental interviews were not the only source for this information. The frequencies for this item reveal that 18.5 percent ($n = 76$) of the boys did spend time in a single-parent family. Since 81.5 percent of the youths did not spend time in this particular family structure the skewness coefficient is relatively high, 1.63. The item is important for the present study and is retained since the skewing cannot be remedied.⁶³

The final control included in this study is a measure of differential association. More specifically, this variable is a measure of the amount of delinquency in which the respondent's peers (both friends and acquaintances) are engaged. This continuous item has a possible range of 0 to 76, and there is at least one response at both extremes. Looking at the skewness coefficient, it is relatively low, .23, revealing a well spread distribution on this variable.

Overall, based on the univariate statistics there are no glaring problems with the variables included in the analysis. While there is skewing on the dependent variable and one of the controls, single-parent family, there is nothing that can be done to reduce the skewness coefficient in either case. The variables representing the middle-class values have more missing cases than either the controls or the dependent variables, but none of them have an excessive number of missing cases. Based on the information provided by

⁶²Most of the markers used to determine the family's social handicaps were based on visual information rather than responses provided by the parents. So even though a minority of parents refused to be interviewed, information could be gathered based on physical appearance.

⁶³West and Farrington (1973) compare the number of single-parent families in the CSDD to those reported in the National Child Development Study of the early 1960s and another national survey. They find that these studies have similar levels of single-parenthood at similar ages, with single-parent homes being slightly more prevalent in the CSDD than the other two studies.

the univariate statistics, all of the variables will be included in bivariate and multivariate statistical procedures.

6.2 Bivariate Statistics

Two types of bivariate statistics were employed in the present study, t-tests and correlations. The t-tests were run to find out if there were significant differences between hooligans and non-hooligans on their adherence to Cohen's middle-class values and involvement in gang activities outside football. The correlations were run for more the informative purpose of finding out if there was a significant relationship between any of the variables.

6.2.1 Independent Samples T-Tests

Independent samples t-tests were done on each middle-class value scale against the dependent variable - football hooliganism. The dichotomous measure of football hooliganism (HUULI) was employed for these analyses. The results of the independent samples t-tests of each middle-class value on football hooliganism is presented in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, there was a statistically significant difference in adherence to middle-class values among hooligans and non-hooligans on only two of the six variables. The mean score on constructive leisure was 3.44 for hooligans and 3.63 for non-hooligans. Contrary to expectations, hooligans adhered slightly more closely to this middle-class value than their counterparts, but the difference is not statistically significant ($p = .534$).⁶⁴ Also non-significant in this analysis is the mean difference for hooligans and non-hooligans on both measures of the middle-class value of acceptable conduct,

⁶⁴One possible explanation for this finding is that constructive leisure is laden with items asking about participation in sports activities. Often those people attending football matches are also playing the game, at least at a recreational level, which would be picked up by items comprising constructive leisure.

TABLE 2**Independent Samples T-Tests:
Mean Differences for Football Hooligans and Non-Hooligans on Middle-Class Values**

[On the middle-class values (cl, acb, acf, sr, ssp, and ssw) higher scores indicate a weaker adherence to middle-class values]

Middle-Class Values (DATA NAME)	Football Hooliganism - HUULI	
	Mean for Hooligans	Mean for Non-Hooligans
Constructive Leisure (CL)	3.44 (n = 46)	3.63 (n = 332)
Acceptable Conduct: Behavior (ACB)	6.17 (n = 46)	5.99 (n = 343)
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF)	5.00 (n = 42)	4.71 (n = 310)
Self-Reliance (SR)	4.60*** (n = 42)	3.91*** (n = 310)
Success in School: Performance (SSP)	7.82 (n = 45)	7.55 (n = 321)
Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW)	8.28** (n = 39)	6.98** (n = 293)
***p ≤ .001 **p ≤ .01 *p ≤ .05		

behavior ($p = .736$) and friendmaking ($p = .139$). The mean value for football hooligans on acceptable conduct: behavior was 6.17 while the mean for non-hooligans was 5.99. Similarly, the mean value for hooligans on acceptable conduct: friendmaking was 5.00 and for non-hooligans the mean was 4.71. The final non-significant mean difference is on the middle-class value of success measure - success in school: performance. In this case, non-hooligans have a mean score of 7.55 and hooligans have a mean score of 7.82, which is non-significant with a $p = .503$. In all but one of these cases, constructive leisure, the difference is in the expected direction, albeit non-significant, with hooligans being less likely to adhere to the particular middle-class value than their counterparts.

Looking at the significant results, two different middle-class values reveal significant differences in the means for hooligans and non-hooligans. In the case of self-reliance, it is revealed that non-hooligans significantly more likely adhere to the middle-class value of self-reliance ($\bar{x} = 3.91$) than their hooligan counterparts ($\bar{x} = 4.60$), which is a highly significant difference ($p = .001$). The other significant mean difference ($p = .005$) is for success in school: hard work and striving (SSW). Non-hooligans have an average of 6.98 on success in school through hard work and striving whereas hooligans have an average score of 8.28.

Additional t-tests were run for each of the controls and the independent variable of gang behavior. These were run in order to find out if there were any significant differences between hooligans and non-hooligans for each of these items. The results of these t-tests are provided in Table 3. Among the control variables, the differences in the means was in the expected directions, with hooligans slightly more likely to be in disadvantaged families, to come from a single-parent home, and to have more delinquent peers than non-hooligans, but none of these relationships was statistically significant. The level of significance achieved on familial disadvantage was $p = .245$, for single-parent home it was $p = .606$, and $p = .294$ for delinquent peers. In contrast to these results, it was found that hooligans had an mean of .54 on gang activities while the mean of non-hooligans was only .29, meaning that hooligans were slightly, but significantly, more likely to engage in non-football related gang activities ($p = .002$) than their counterparts.

TABLE 3

**Independent Samples T-Tests:
Mean Differences for Football Hooligans and Non-Hooligans on
Gang Activities and Controls**

Variable (DATA NAME)	Football Hooliganism - HUULI	
	Mean for Hooligans	Mean for Non-Hooligans
Gang Activities Outside Football (GANG)	.54** (n = 46)	.29** (n = 337)
Social Handicaps of R's Family (FAMDISAD)	.80 (n = 46)	.67 (n = 343)
Single-Parent Home Prior to Age 15 (BRKNHM)	.22 (n = 46)	.18 (n = 343)
Delinquency of Peers: Differential Association (DIFFASS)	39.85 (n = 46)	37.09 (n = 341)
***p ≤ .001 **p ≤ .01 *p ≤ .05		

6.2.2 *Correlations*

Correlations fail to provide any level of causation regarding the relationships between variables. However, they do contribute valuable information on whether or not variables are related to one another and how significant the relationships are. Table 4 provides a complete correlation matrix, including levels of significance, for all of the variables used in this study. While correlation is most appropriate for interval and ratio level data, it is an adequate, yet imprecise, statistical tool for ordinal level data (Blalock 1972; Kerlinger 1986; Norušis n.d.).

While it is disappointing to see that some of the middle-class values, constructive leisure, acceptable conduct: behavior, and success in school: performance are not correlated significantly with hooliganism, the value for constructive leisure is the most unusual because it does not run in the expected direction. One reason for the direction of this relationship may lie in a likelihood that they play football, which is identified as a form of constructive leisure (see note 61). The inter-correlations between some of the middle-class values shows that the different dimensions are related in a statistically significant manner. At the same time, the moderate significance to these relationships implies that each is measuring something unique, adding to the reliability of the different scales. Another interesting, and unexpected, finding is that the measure of differential association is significantly correlated with four of the six measures of adherence to middle-class values. While the correlations are modest at best, the implication is that the more working-class one's orientation is on each of the middle-class values (ACB, SR, SSP, and SSW) the more delinquent friends and acquaintances the person will have.

6.3 **Multivariate Statistics**

In this section the results of several regression analyses are presented. All of these regressions are done under the premise that all of the Ordinary Least Squares assumptions are being upheld. The regression equations are divided into two sections, those run without controls and those run after controls were added to the equations.

TABLE 4

**Correlation Matrix for All Dependent, Independent and Control Variables
Correlations with Level of Significance in Parentheses**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
DEPENDENT VARIABLES												
1 - Football Hooliganism	1.00 (.)											
2 - Football Hooliganism As a Bivariate	.90** (.000)	1.00 (.)										
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES												
3 - Gang Behavior Outside Football	.21** (.000)	.18** (.000)	1.00 (.)									
4 - Constructive Leisure	-.01 (.798)	-.03 (.557)	-.04 (.454)	1.00 (.)								
5 - Acceptable Conduct: Behavior	.04 (.401)	.02 (.731)	.19** (.000)	.09 (.081)	1.00 (.)							
6 - Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking	.11* (.049)	.07 (.190)	.08 (.135)	.09 (.114)	.09 (.074)	1.00 (.)						
7 - Self-Reliance	.19** (.000)	.18** (.001)	.23** (.000)	-.00 (.958)	.31** (.000)	-.01 (.895)	1.00 (.)					
8 - Success in School: Performance	.06 (.264)	.03 (.514)	.27** (.000)	.20** (.000)	.47** (.000)	.14** (.008)	.19** (.000)	1.00 (.)				
9 - Success in School: Hardwork and Striving	.20** (.000)	.17** (.002)	.22** (.000)	.11 (.054)	.40** (.000)	.30** (.000)	.29** (.000)	.33** (.000)	1.00 (.)			
CONTROL VARIABLES												
10 - Social Handicaps of the Family	.10* (.042)	.06 (.209)	.17** (.001)	.09 (.082)	.34** (.000)	.12* (.019)	.34** (.000)	.31** (.000)	.17** (.002)	1.00 (.)		
11 - Single-Parent Family	.03 (.533)	.03 (.583)	.10 (.051)	.12* (.017)	.07 (.188)	.02 (.698)	-.05 (.384)	.05 (.315)	-.03 (.600)	.17** (.001)	1.00 (.)	
12 - Delinquency of Peers: Differential Association	.06 (.227)	.06 (.246)	.36** (.000)	-.07 (.155)	.19** (.000)	-.04 (.458)	.27** (.000)	.19** (.000)	.23** (.000)	.17** (.001)	.09 (.063)	1.00 (.)

Level of Significance: **p ≤ .01

*p ≤ .05

6.3.1 *Multiple Regression Models without Control Variables*

Three distinct regression models are presented in this section on multivariate statistics. Table 5 presents the results of the prediction model where football hooliganism is regressed upon all of the revised middle-class values. While the model is significant ($\text{Prob}>F = .000$), in this model there is a single independent variable, self-reliance, that is highly significant, and two independent variables of questionable significance, acceptable conduct: friendmaking and success in school: hard work and striving.⁶⁵ In the present configuration approximately 9 percent of the variance of football hooliganism is explained by the six measures of middle-class values.

Based on the findings of the regression model presented in Table 5, a reduced model was then calculated using the three middle-class values that were the most significant. The results of the reduced model is presented in Table 6. This model also is found to be statistically significant ($\text{Prob}>F = .000$), and the combination of acceptable conduct: friendmaking, self-reliance, and success in school: hard work and striving explain 6.7 percent of the variance in football hooliganism. The removal of the other three middle-class values does not improve the significance of the remaining values. Acceptable conduct: friendmaking and success in school: hard work and striving are still only marginally significant, $p = .098$ and $p = .076$ respectively, while self-reliance remains significant at the level of $p \leq .01$.

The final regression model presented without controls regresses football hooliganism on all of the middle-class values and gang activities outside football, Table 7. In this model the magnitudes of the three most significant middle-class value scales change, but remain significant at the same level as previous models. The added independent variable of non-football ganging is significant ($p = .013$), and boosts the percent of the variance explained in the equation to approximately 11 percent; consequently, gang activities is a valuable, and significant,

⁶⁵Most regression modeling limits statistical significance to $p \leq .05$, but since this is a test of a new theoretical development it was thought to be important to identify those items which were also marginally significant.

TABLE 5

Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values

[On the middle-class values (cl, acb, acf, sr, ssp, and ssw) higher scores indicate a weaker adherence to middle-class values]

N = 298	Football Hooliganism (HOOLIGNS)	
Independent Variables (DATA NAME)	b	β
Constructive Leisure (CL)	-.01 (-.65)	-.04
Acceptable Conduct: Behavior (ACB)	.00 (.03)	.00
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF)	.05* (1.76)	.11
Self-Reliance (SR)	.09*** (2.86)	.18
Success in School: Performance (SSP)	.00 (.27)	.02
Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW)	.03* (1.82)	.13
Constant		
	-.56	
R²	.088	
Adjusted R²	.067	
<p>The b's are the unstandardized regression coefficients, shown with their t-ratios in parentheses. The β's are the standardized regression coefficients.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">* p ≤ .10 ** p ≤ .05 *** p ≤ .01 **** p ≤ .001</p>		

TABLE 6**Football Hooliganism Regressed on the Three Most Significant Middle-Class Values**

[On the middle-class values (acf, sr, and ssw) higher scores indicate a weaker adherence to middle-class values]

N = 298		Football Hooliganism (HOOLIGNS)	
Independent Variables (DATA NAME)	b	β	
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF)	.04* (1.66)	.10	
Self-Reliance (SR)	.07*** (2.80)	.17	
Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW)	.02* (1.78)	.11	
Constant			
		-.47	
R²		.067	
Adjusted R²		.058	
<p>The b's are the unstandardized regression coefficients, shown with their t-ratios in parentheses. The β's are the standardized regression coefficients.</p> <p>* p ≤ .10 ** p ≤ .05 *** p ≤ .01 **** p ≤ .001</p>			

TABLE 7

Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values and Gang Activities

[On the middle-class values (cl, acb, acf, sr, ssp, and ssw) higher scores indicate a weaker adherence to middle-class values]

N = 270		Football Hooliganism HOOLIGNS	
Independent Variables (DATA NAME)	b	β	
Constructive Leisure (CL)	-.01 (-.48)	-.03	
Acceptable Conduct: Behavior (ACB)	.00 (.02)	.00	
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF)	.05* (1.72)	.11	
Self-Reliance (SR)	.08*** (2.52)	.16	
Success in School: Performance (SSP)	-.00 (-.21)	-.02	
Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW)	.03* (1.67)	.11	
Gang Activities Outside Football (GANG)	.19** (2.51)	.15	
Constant			
		-.51	
R²			
		.109	
Adjusted R²			
		.085	
The b's are the unstandardized regression coefficients, shown with their t-ratios in parentheses. The β's are the standardized regression coefficients.			
* p ≤ .10 ** p ≤ .05 *** p ≤ .01 **** p ≤ .001			

addition to the prediction model without much adverse effect upon the middle-class values.

6.3.2 *Multiple Regression Models with Control Variables*

This section uses the three models discussed in the previous section and adds the control variables of familial disadvantage, single-parent home, and delinquency of peers. The first model, Table 8, regresses football hooliganism upon all of the middle-class values, with the addition of the three controls. The only variable of real significance in this model is the middle-class value of self-reliance ($p = .012$), all other independent and control variables are non-significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. Acceptable conduct: friendmaking and success in school: hard work and striving retain a level of significance similar to the models that did not include control variables ($p \leq .10$). The percent of variance in football hooliganism explained in this model, nearly 9 percent, is almost the same as the amount of variance explained by its regression counterpart which is absent of control variables (Table 5). When the two models are compared, it reveals that the addition of controls fails to modify the relationship between middle-class values and football hooliganism.

The next regression equation adding control variables is the reduced model of middle-class values. The control variables in this equation are non-significant, but seemingly have a greater impact on the significance of the three middle-class values, leaving only self-reliance and success in school: hard work and striving significant at the $p \leq .10$ level, or better. The results of the reduced model of football hooliganism on middle-class values, with the addition of controls, is presented in Table 9. The F-statistic for this model has a value of 3.63, meaning that the model is significant at the .002 level. While the addition of controls does eliminate the limited significance of acceptable conduct: friendmaking, the overall results are not entirely dissimilar from the regression model of the three most significant middle-class values regressed upon football hooliganism without controls (Table 6). As a result, it appears that the addition

TABLE 8**Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values and Controls**

[On the middle-class values (cl, acb, acf, sr, ssp, and ssw) higher scores indicate a weaker adherence to middle-class values]

N = 270	Football Hooliganism (HOOLIGNS)	
Independent Variables (DATA NAME)	b	β
Constructive Leisure (CL)	-.01 (-.66)	-.04
Acceptable Conduct: Behavior (ACB)	-.00 (-.09)	-.01
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF)	.05* (1.70)	.11
Self-Reliance (SR)	.08** (2.54)	.17
Success in School: Performance (SSP)	.00 (.20)	.02
Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW)	.03* (1.82)	.13
Control Variables		
Familial Disadvantage (FAMDISAD)	.03 (.64)	.04
Single-Parent Home Prior to Age 15 (BRKNHM)	-.00 (-.03)	-.00
Delinquency of Peers: Differential Association (DIFFASS)	-.00 (-.02)	-.00
Constant	-.54	
R²	.089	
Adjusted R²	.058	
<p>The b's are the unstandardized regression coefficients, shown with their t-ratios in parentheses. The β's are the standardized regression coefficients.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">* p ≤ .10 ** p ≤ .05 *** p ≤ .01 **** p ≤ .001</p>		

TABLE 9**Football Hooliganism Regressed on the Three Most Significant Middle-Class Values and Controls**

[On the middle-class values (acf, sr, and ssw) higher scores indicate a weaker adherence to middle-class values]

N = 298	Football Hooliganism (HOOLIGNS)	
Independent Variables (DATA NAME)	b	β
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF)	.04 (1.63)	.10
Self-Reliance (SR)	.06** (2.27)	.15
Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW)	.02* (1.66)	.11
Control Variables		
Familial Disadvantage (FAMDISAD)	.03 (.67)	.04
Single-Parent Home Prior to Age 15 (BRKNHM)	-.00 (-.46)	-.03
Delinquency of Peers: Differential Association (DIFFASS)	.00 (.34)	.02
Constant	-.47	
R²	.069	
Adjusted R²	.050	
<p>The b's are the unstandardized regression coefficients, shown with their t-ratios in parentheses. The β's are the standardized regression coefficients.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">* p ≤ .10 ** p ≤ .05 *** p ≤ .01 **** p ≤ .001</p>		

of the controls in this reduced model has little impact on the relationship between these middle-class values and football hooliganism.

The final multiple regression model in this present study, presented in Table 10, includes all independent and control variables. This model uses all of the middle-class value scales and gang activities outside of the football context to predict football hooliganism while controlling for familial disadvantage, family structure, and delinquent peers. In this model there are only two highly significant independent variables, self-reliance ($b = .08$, $p = .019$) and gang activities ($b = .21$, $p = .009$). Success in school: hard work and striving is of limited significance ($p = .077$), yet is more significant than in the regression model of all independent variables without the inclusion of control variables (Table 7). The full model, incorporating all independent and control variables, explains 11.3 percent of the variance in football hooliganism. It is important to note that none of the control variables included in this model are significant, with the measure of differential association having the greatest effect ($p = .410$). So while few of the middle-class values remain significant with the addition of controls, the measure of differential association, or any other controls, cannot be said to be a better predictor of football hooliganism than a revised version of Cohen's middle-class values.

TABLE 10

Football Hooliganism Regressed on All Middle-Class Values, Gang Activities, and Controls

[On the middle-class values (cl, acb, acf, sr, ssp, and ssw) higher scores indicate a weaker adherence to middle-class values]

N = 270	Football Hooliganism (HOOLIGNS)	
Independent Variables (DATA NAME)	b	β
Constructive Leisure (CL)	-.01 (-.54)	-.03
Acceptable Conduct: Behavior (ACB)	-.00 (-.09)	-.01
Acceptable Conduct: Friendmaking (ACF)	.04 (1.57)	.10
Self-Reliance (SR)	.08** (2.37)	.16
Success in School: Performance (SSP)	-.00 (-.21)	-.02
Success in School: Hard Work and Striving (SSW)	.03* (1.78)	.12
Gang Activities Outside Football (GANG)	.21*** (2.64)	.17
Control Variables		
Familial Disadvantage (FAMDISAD)	.04 (.70)	.05
Single-Parent Home Prior to Age 15 (BRKNHM)	-.02 (-.17)	-.01
Delinquency of Peers: Differential Association (DIFFASS)	-.00 (-.83)	-.06
Constant		
	-.44	
R²		
	.113	
Adjusted R²		
	.079	
<p>The b's are the unstandardized regression coefficients, shown with their t-ratios in parentheses. The β's are the standardized regression coefficients.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">* p ≤ .10 ** p ≤ .05 *** p ≤ .01 **** p ≤ .001</p>		

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (CSDD) is an important, and high quality, longitudinal data set. The CSDD provides a wealth of information for the prediction of future delinquency, and by West and Farrington's own admission, the design of the study was to provide measures that correspond with a number of theoretical propositions rather than a detailed examination of any single theory (West 1969; Farrington 1995). While the CSDD is not designed for a comprehensive test of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency, it provided a large number items which could be used to represent each of the modified middle-class values originally proposed by Cohen. Even though the study proves challenging when trying to find measures of certain concepts, the breadth of the study's information, the willingness of others to rely upon these data, and the existence of questions inquiring about self-reports of football hooligan activities provide highly attractive reasons for utilizing the CSDD in the present study.⁶⁶

Upon an initial review, the statistical results appear meager, if not disappointing, with respect to the ability of Cohen's theory of middle-class values to predict youthful involvement in football hooliganism. In actuality, the results, while modest, are encouraging. The nine middle-class values originally proposed by Albert Cohen in his

⁶⁶Even though the items on football hooliganism were lacking on detail, they do provide an opportunity to do one of the few, large scale and detailed quantitative studies of the phenomenon in England at the beginning of the modern era in 1966/7. Further, the data set is broad enough to try and predict football hooliganism from a number of criminological perspectives.

1955 theory of subcultural delinquency underwent significant revision with the consolidation of these concepts into four more distinct, and more readily testable dimensions of middle-class expectations about appropriate behavior and lifestyles. Together, these four revised middle-class values - constructive leisure, acceptable conduct, self-reliance, and success - explain slightly less than 10 percent of the variance in football hooliganism, even when subject to controls (see Table 5 and Table 8). Multiple regression analysis reveals that only three of the six middle-class scales developed for this study are significant at a level of $p \leq .10$, with the scale of self-reliance having significance higher than the generally accepted standard of $p \leq .05$. At the bivariate level, using independent samples t-tests, hooligans and non-hooligans are found to be significantly different ($p \leq .05$) on the middle-class constructs of self-reliance and success in school: hard work and striving.

The addition of gang activities outside football as an independent variable improves the multiple regression prediction equation, without adversely affecting the significance of the middle-class values scales. Table 7 reveals that the gang activities variable is a highly significant predictor of hooligan behavior ($p = .013$), and this variable improves the amount of explained variation in football hooliganism from 8.8 percent (middle-class values only) to 10.9 percent (middle-class values and gang activities). There is also a significant relationship between the gang activities variable and football hooliganism at the bivariate level. T-tests reveal that hooligans are significantly more likely to engage in gang activities unrelated to football than their non-hooligan counterparts ($p \leq .01$).

Taken at face value the results initially fail to provide strong support for Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency as a predictor of football hooliganism. Yet when taking a closer look at what is uncovered and the normal difficulties experienced when using secondary data,⁶⁷ it is fair to say that the project yields some encouraging and significant

⁶⁷The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development was invaluable for trying to quantitatively predict football hooliganism with Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency, yet there were instances where the data set did not have items which accurately represented the middle-class constructs that were created.

results. Although the middle-class values scales did not perform as well as expected, especially in terms of levels of significance, all but one of the scales, constructive leisure, ran in the predicted direction – hooligans were found to be more working-class in their orientation to Cohen’s middle-class values and were also more likely to be engaged in gang activities outside the context of football than non-hooligans. The results also provide support for the conclusions reached by Kelly and Balch (1990), finding that school and status influence youthful involvement in delinquent activities, in this case football hooliganism.

A second important result of this study deals with the issue of theoretical comparison. The measure of differential association used in this study was designed to be a control variable, in order to try and modify or nullify the relationship between Cohen’s theory of subcultural delinquency and football hooliganism. But ultimately, this variable had little impact. Even when looking at the bivariate relationship between differential association and football hooliganism, the results were non-significant. On independent samples t-tests, hooligans were slightly, but not significantly ($p = .294$) more likely to have delinquent peers than their non-hooligan counterparts ($\bar{x}_{\text{hooligans}} = 39.85$ and $\bar{x}_{\text{non-hooligans}} = 37.09$) (Table 3). The correlations presented in Table 4 also acknowledge the lack of a significant relationship between hooliganism and differential association $r = .06$. While it would be premature to state that Sutherland’s theory of differential association is an unsuitable predictor of football hooliganism, the present inquiry reveals that it is an inferior predictor of hooligan behavior, when compared with Cohen’s theory of subcultural delinquency.

The other two control variables, familial disadvantage and single-parent family, each had a negligible impact on the prediction of football hooliganism. The lack of significance of these controls implies that in the prediction of football hooliganism the influence of spending time in a single-parent family and the relative socio-economic status within the working-class are inconsequential.

7.1 Present Considerations and Future Research

While the findings of this study provide limited statistical support for Cohen's subcultural theory of delinquency as a predictor of football hooliganism, there are a few possible difficulties which should be taken into account when using this theory. Time is one of the issues which should be considered when evaluating the findings of this study. Cohen identified the existence of these middle-class values in the 1950s. Over the next 10 to 15 years the emphasis placed on these values may have diminished in favor of other, more current standards for living.

A second factor which may impact the results stems from the applicability of the middle-class values Cohen identified. These middle-class values, and their subsequent modification, were based on guidelines that Cohen found in the United States and may not readily parallel those found in England. For all of the similarities between England and the United States, there are still vast cultural differences which could mitigate the effectiveness of these values in cultures outside the United States. It could well be that the respondents were feeling strain at the inability to meet existing English middle-class standards and subsequently joined together to engage in delinquency and hooliganism, as would be predicted by Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency.

Consideration of these chronological and cross-cultural variations may be of value when engaging in future research on football hooliganism, especially as they relate to Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency. When looking at the future of football hooliganism from a criminological perspective, there are two areas that appear encouraging based on present findings. One need is further comparisons between English football hooliganism and gang behavior in both the United States and England. It would be valuable to know what similarities and differences exist in all of these subcultural forms. These comparisons may yield information which would facilitate further theory testing in football hooliganism based on the predictive models that have proven effective with respect to gang behavior. This research may also help identify similarities and differences in value orientations and the importance of status between these groups, allowing for better tests of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency in the future.

On another front, one of the important results from this study is the importance of the revised middle-class value of self-reliance when attempting to predict football hooliganism. The findings continually indicate that football hooligans are less self-reliant than their non-hooligan counterparts which indicates that reliance and support from peers has a significant effect upon hooligan behavior. The value of Sutherland's theory of differential association as a predictive framework for football hooliganism should be addressed in greater detail because of the role self-reliance played in this study, and the existence of research which reinforces the fact that football hooliganism almost always requires group, rather than individual, involvement.

7.2 Concluding Remarks

Finally, as one of the first quantitative studies to research the feasibility of using criminological theory to predict and explain football hooliganism, the findings may seem relatively meager. In actuality, these modest results are promising, and they do provide an important starting point for future endeavors. I would encourage the continued use of the CSDD for the purpose of trying to explain football hooliganism criminologically, as this aspect of the phenomena is relatively pristine territory that could benefit from further exploration. While the modified version of Cohen's middle-class values did not realize initial expectations, it would be premature to call the modification a complete failure. As indicated in previous sections, further research and testing may yet demonstrate that this modified version of Cohen's theory of subcultural delinquency, especially differential adherence to middle-class values, is a useful and significant predictor of both football hooliganism and delinquency in general.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1998 English hooligans make mockery of alcohol ban. *The Daily Mail* [online]. 26 June.
<http://worldcup.soccernet.com/u/soccer/worldcup98/covers/general/alcohol62698.htm>
- 1998 Fan charged after confessing to stabbing Frenchman. *Reuters* [online]. 4 July.
<http://worldcup.soccernet.com/u/soccer/worldcup98/covers/england/birch7498.htm>
- 1998 Security chiefs say World Cup a success despite police attack, fan violence. *SportsLine Worldwide wire reports* [online]. 9 July.
<http://worldcup.soccernet.com/u/soccer/worldcup98/covers/general/success7998.htm>
- 1998 Violence breaks out among soccer fans around the world. *SportsLine Worldwide wire reports* [online]. 23 June.
<http://worldcup.soccernet.com/u/soccer/worldcup98/covers/general/violence62498.htm>
- 1996 Arrests fall by 10 per cent at soccer games. *Electronic Telegraph* [online]. 8 August.
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk:80/et?ac=000616798646865&rtmo=p1hlehle&atmo=99999999&pg=/et/96/8/8/nyob08.html>
- Agnew, R.
1992 Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology* **30**,1:47-87.
- Agresti, A. and B. Finlay
1997 *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Akers, R.L.
1994 *Criminological Theories: Introduction and evaluation*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

- Allan, J.
1989 *Bloody Casuals: Diary of a football hooligan*. Glasgow: Framedram.
- Archetti, E. and A. Romero
1994 Death and violence in Argentinian football. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Armstrong, G.
1994 False Leeds: the construction of hooligan confrontations. In R. Giulianotti and J. Williams' (eds.) *Game Without Frontiers: Football, identity and modernity*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Co.
1998 *Football Hooligans: Knowing the score*. Oxford: Oxford International Publishers Ltd.
- Armstrong, G. and R. Harris
1991 Football hooligans: theory and evidence. *Sociological Review* **39**,3:427-458.
- Armstrong, G. and D. Hobbs
1994 Tackled from behind. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Bale, J.
1991 Playing at home: British football and a sense of place. In J. Williams and S. Wagg's (eds.) *British Football and Social Change: Getting into Europe*. Leicester, England: Leicester University Press.
- Beecher, C.
1994 Crowd control: when sports fanatics turn violent. *Illini Quarterly* **6**,6:22-25.
- Blalock, H.M. Jr.
1972 *Social Statistics* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Block, R.
1977 *Violent Crime: Environment, interaction and death*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Bromberger, C.
1993 Fireworks and the ass. In S. Redhead's (ed.) *The Passion and the Fashion: Football fandom in the new Europe*. Aldershot, England: Avebury.
- Bryant, C.D.
1990 Becoming deviant. In C. Bryant's (ed.) *Deviant Behavior: Readings in the sociology of norm violations*. New York: Hemisphere Publishing Company.

Butler, B.

1996 Comment: against all odds the crowd call out for more. *Electronic Telegraph* [online]. 21 February.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk:80/et?ac=000616798646865&rtmo=Q3mLOHkR&atmo=99999999&pg=/et/96/2/21/fbutla21.html>

Canter, D., M. Comber and D. Uzzell

1989 *Football in its Place: An environmental psychology of football grounds*. London: Routledge.

Carmines, E.G. and R.A. Zeller

1979 *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Carroll, R.

1980 Football hooliganism in England. *International Review of Sport Sociology* **15**,2:77-92.

Chambliss, W.J.

1969 *Crime and the Legal Process*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Clarke, J.

1978 Football and working class fans: tradition and change. In R. Ingham et al.'s (eds.) *Football Hooliganism: The wider context*. London: Inter-Action Inprint.

Cloward, R. and L. Ohlin

1960 *Delinquency and Opportunity*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Coalter, F.

1985 Crowd behavior at football matches: a study in Scotland. *Leisure Studies* **4**:111-117.

Cohen, A.K.

1955 *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

1965 The sociology of the deviant act: anomie theory and beyond. *American Sociological Review* **30**,1:5-14.

1983 Sociological theories, pp.342-353. In S.H. Kadish et al.'s (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice, Volume 1*. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, A.K. and J.F. Short, Jr.

1958 Research in delinquent subcultures. *Journal of Social Issues* **14**:20-37.

1966 Juvenile delinquency, pp.84-135. In R.K. Merton and R.A. Nisbet's (eds.) *Contemporary Social Problems*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

- Cohen, S.
1973 *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. London: Paladin.
- Dal Lago, A. and R. De Biasi
1994 Italian football fans: culture and organization. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Decker, S.H.
1996 Deviant homicide: a new look at the role of motives and victim-offender relationships. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* **33**,4:427-449.
- Duke, V.
1991 The sociology of football: a research agenda for the 1990s. *Sociological Review* **39**,3:627-645.
- Duke, V. and L. Crolley
1996 Football spectator behavior in Argentina: a case of separate evolution. *Sociological Review* **44**:272-293.
- Dunning, E.
1986 Sport as a male preserve: notes on the social sources of masculine identity and its transformations. *Theory, Culture and Society* **3**,1:79-90.
1990 Sociological reflections on sport, violence and civilization. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* **25**,1:65-82.
1994 The social roots of football hooliganism: a reply to the critics of the 'Leicester School'. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Dunning, E., J. Maguire, P. Murphy and J. Williams
1982 The social roots of football hooligan violence. *Leisure Studies* **1**,2:139-156.
- Dunning, E., P. Murphy and I. Waddington
1991 Anthropological versus sociological approaches to the study of soccer hooliganism: some critical notes. *Sociological Review* **39**,3:459-478.
- Dunning, E., P. Murphy and J. Williams
1986 Spectator violence at football matches: towards a sociological explanation. *British Journal of Sociology* **37**,2:221-244.
1988 *The Roots of Football Hooliganism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Elias, N. and E. Dunning
1986 Folk football in medieval and early modern Britain. In N. Elias and E. Dunning's (eds.) *Quest for Excitement*. Oxford, NY: Basil Blackwell.

Elliott, D.S.

- 1962 Delinquency and perceived opportunity. *Sociological Inquiry* **32**,2:216-227.
1966 Delinquency, school attendance and dropout. *Social Problems* **13**,3:307-314.
1978 Delinquency and school dropout. In L.D. Savitz and N. Johnson's (eds.) *Crime in Society*. New York: Wiley.

Elliott, D.S. and H. Voss

- 1974 *Delinquency and Dropout*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Empey, L.T.

- 1967 Delinquency theory and recent research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*:28-42.

Farrington, D.P.

- 1982 Longitudinal analyses of criminal violence. In M. Wolfgang and N. Weiner's (eds.) *Criminal Violence*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
1994^{ca} Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (Great Britain), 1961-1981(computer file) (2nd ICPSR ed.). Conducted by D. Farrington, Cambridge University. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Science Research (producer and distributor).
1994^{ch} Childhood, adolescent, and adult features of violent males. In L.R. Huesmann's (ed.) *Aggressive Behavior: Current perspectives*. New York: Plenum Press.
1995 The development of offending and antisocial behavior from childhood: key findings from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* **36**,6:929-964.

Farrington, D.P., B. Gallagher, L. Morley, R.J. St.Ledger and D.J. West

- 1986 Unemployment, school leaving, and crime. *British Journal of Criminology* **26**,4:335-356.

Finn, G.

- 1994 Football violence: a societal psychological perspective. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.

Gibbons, D.C.

- 1994 *Talking about Crime and Criminals: Problems and issues in theory development in criminology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Giulianotti, R.

- 1993 Soccer casuals as cultural intermediaries. In S. Redhead's (ed.) *The Passion and the Fashion: Football fandom in the new Europe*. Aldershot, England: Avebury.
- 1994_k 'Keeping it in the family': an outline of hibs' football hooligans' social ontology. In R. Giulianotti and J. Williams (eds.) *Game Without Frontiers: Football, Identity and Modernity*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Co.
- 1994_s Social identity and public order: political and academic discourses on football violence. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- 1994_t Taking liberties: hibs casuals and Scottish law. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- 1995 Participant observation and research into football hooliganism: reflections on the problems of entree and everyday risks. *Sociology of Sport Journal* **12**:1-20.

Glaser, D.

- 1974 The classification of offenses and offenders. In D. Glaser's (ed.) *Handbook of Criminology*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Hall, S.

- 1978 The treatment of "football hooliganism" in the press. In R. Ingham's (ed.) *Football Hooliganism: The wider context*. London: Inter-Action Inprint.

Hanushek, E. and J. Jackson

- 1977 *Statistical Methods for Social Scientists*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Harrington, J.

- 1968 *Soccer Hooliganism*. Bristol: John Wright and Sons.

Haynes, R.

- 1993 Every man (?) a football artist: football writing and masculinity. In S. Redhead's (ed.) *The Passion and the Fashion: Football fandom in the new Europe*. Aldershot, England: Avebury.

Hobbs, D. and D. Robins

- 1991 The boy done good: football violence, changes and continuities. *Sociological Review* **39**,3:551-579.

Horak, R.

- 1991 Things change: trends in Austrian football hooliganism from 1977-1990. *Sociological Review* **39**,3::531-548.

Igbinovia, P.

- 1985 Soccer hooliganism in black Africa. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* **29**:135-146.

- Ingham, R.
1978 Introduction and forward. In R. Ingham's (ed.) *'Football Hooliganism': The wider context*. London: Inter-Action Imprint.
- Jarjoura, G.R.
1993 Does dropping out of school enhance delinquent involvement?: results from a large-scale national probability sample. *Criminology* **31**,2:149-172.
- Johansson, M.
1987 Soccer hooliganism-some theoretical views. *Scandinavian Journal of Sport Sciences* **9**,3:97-104.
- Jones, N.
1986 Hooligans: the forgotten side. *New Society* **77**,29 August:16-18.
- Kelly, D.H. and R.W. Balch
1990 Social origins and school failure: a reexamination of Cohen's theory of working-class delinquency, pp.246-256. In D.H. Kelly's (ed.) *Criminal Behavior: Text and Readings in Criminology*. New York: St.Martin's Press.
- Kerlinger, F.N.
1986 *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Kerr, J.
1994 *Understanding Soccer Hooliganism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kim, J. and C.W. Mueller
1978 *Introduction to Factor Analysis: What it is and how to do it*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- King, A.
1995 Outline of a practical theory of football violence. *Sociology* **29**,4:635-651.
1997 The lads: masculinity and the new consumption of football. *Sociology* **31**,2:329-346.
- Lanier, M. and S. Henry
1998 *Essential Criminology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lewis, J.
1982 Crowd control at English football matches. *Sociological Focus* **15**,4:417-423.

- Lewis, J. and A. Scarisbrick-Hauser
 1994 An analysis of football crowd safety reports using the McPhail categories. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Maguire, J.
 1986 The emergence of football spectating as a social problem 1880-1985: a figurational and developmental perspective. *Sociology of Sport Journal* **3**:217-244.
- Marsh, P.
 1977 Football hooliganism: fact or fiction? *British Journal of Law and Society* **4**,2:256-259.
 1978 *Aggro: The illusion of violence*. London: Dent and Sons.
 1982 Social order on the British soccer terraces. *International Social Science Journal* **34**,2:247-256.
- Marsh, P., E. Rosser and R. Harre
 1978 *The Rules of Disorder*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Mason, T.
 1988 *Sport in Britain*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd.
- Mathias, P.
 1991 Football fans: fanatics or friends? *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* **1**:29-32.
- Maxfield, M. and E. Babbie
 1995 *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Melnick, M.
 1986 The mythology of football hooliganism: a closer look at the British experience. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* **21**,1:1-21.
- Menke, F.
 1975 *The Encyclopedia of Sports* (5th ed.). New York: A.S. Barnes and Company.
- Merton, R.K.
 1938 Social structures and anomie. *American Sociological Review* **3**:672-682.
 1995 Opportunity structure: the emergence, diffusion, and differentiation of a sociological concept, 1930s-1950s, pp.3-78. In F. Adler & W.S. Laufer's (eds.) *The Legacy of Anomie Theory*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Miethe, T.D. and R. McCorkle

1998 *Crime Profiles: The anatomy of dangerous persons, places, and situations*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Mignon, P.

1994 New supporter cultures and identity in France: the case of Paris Saint-Germain. In R. Giulianotti and J. Williams (eds.) *Game Without Frontiers: Football, identity and modernity*. Aldershot, England: Arena.

Miller, W.B.

1958 Lower-class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues* **14**:5-19.

Moorhouse, H.F.

1984 Professional football and working class culture: English theories and Scottish evidence. *Sociological Review* **32**:285-315.

1986 It's goals that count? football finance and football subcultures. *Sociology of Sport Journal* **3**,3:245-260.

1991 Football hooligans: old bottle, new whines? *Sociological Review* **39**,3:489-502.

Morrison, W.

1995 *Theoretical Criminology: From Modernity to Post-Modernism*. London: Cavendish Publishing Ltd.

Murphy, P., E. Dunning and J. Williams

1988 Soccer crowd disorder and the press: processes of amplification and de-amplification in historical perspective. *Theory, Culture and Society* **5**,4:645-673.

Murphy, P., J. Williams and E. Dunning

1990 *Football on Trial: Spectator violence and development in the football world*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Norušis, M.J.

n.d. *SPSS 6.1 Guide to Data Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Nunnally, J.

1978 *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Phillips, J.C. and D.H. Kelly

1979 School failure and delinquency: which causes which? *Criminology* **17**,2:194-207.

Polk, K.

1984 The new marginal youth. *Crime and Delinquency* **30**,3:462-480.

- Portelli, A.
1993 The rich and the poor in the culture of football. In S. Readhead's (ed.) *The Passion and the Fashion: Football fandom in the new Europe*. Aldershot, England: Avebury.
- Pratt, J. and M. Salter
1984 A fresh look at football hooliganism. *Leisure Studies* **3**,2:201-230.
- Redhead, S.
1991 Some reflections on discourses on football hooliganism. *Sociological Review* **39**,3:479-486.
- Reiss, A.J. Jr. and A.L. Rhodes
1963 Status deprivation and delinquent behavior. *Sociological Quarterly* **4**:135-149.
- Riedel, M.
1987 Stranger violence: perspectives, issues and problems. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* **78**,2:223-258.
- Roadburg, A.
1980 Factors precipitating fan violence: a comparison of professional soccer in Britain and North America. *British Journal of Sociology* **31**:265-276.
- Roversi, A.
1991 Football violence in Italy. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* **26**:311-330.
1994 The birth of the 'ultras': the rise of football hooliganism in Italy. In R. Giulianotti and J. Williams' (eds.) *Game Without Frontiers: Football, identity and modernity*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Co.
- Rushin, S.
1995 Biff, bang, wallop! *Sports Illustrated* **83**,23:60-74.
- Shoemaker, D.J.
1996 *Theories of Delinquency* (3rd edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Short, J.F., Jr. and F.L. Strodtbeck
1965 *Group Process and Gang Delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sirkin, R.M.
1995 *Statistics for the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Stott, C. and S. Reicher

1998 How conflict escalates: the inter-group dynamics of collective football crowd 'violence'. *Sociology* **32**,2:353-377.

Sugarman, B.

1967 Involvement in youth culture, academic achievement and conformity in school: an empirical study of London schoolboys. *British Journal of Sociology* **18**:151-164.

Taylor, I.R.

1971 Soccer consciousness and soccer hooliganism. In S. Cohen's (ed.) *Images of Deviance*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Taylor, R.

1992 *Football and its Fans: Supporters and their relations with the game, 1885-1985*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

1995 No surrender by the beast that barks its national pride. *Electronic Telegraph* [online]. 16 February.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk:80/et?ac=000616798646865&rtmo=koY1Zkep&atmo=99999999&pg=/et/95/2/16/rogan16.html>

Thornberry, T., M. Moore and R. Christenson

1985 The effect of dropping out of high school on subsequent criminal behavior. *Criminology* **23**,1:3-18.

Trivizas, E.

1980 Offences and offenders in football crowd disorder. *British Journal of Criminology* **20**,3:276-288.

1981 Sentencing the 'football hooligan'. *British Journal of Criminology* **21**,4:342-349.

1984 Disturbances associated with football matches. *British Journal of Criminology* **24**,4:361-383.

Tunnell, K.

1992 *Choosing Crime: The criminal calculus of property offenders*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

van der Brug, H.H.

1994 Football hooliganism in the Netherlands. In R. Giulianotti et al.'s (eds.) *Football, Violence and Social Identity*. London: Routledge.

Velben, T.B.

1953 [1899] *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An economic study of institutions*. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.

- Waddington, I., E. Dunning and P. Murphy
1996 Research note: surveying the social composition of football crowds. *Leisure Studies* **15**:215-219.
- Wagg, S.
1984 *The Football World: A contemporary social history*. Brighton: The Harvester Press Ltd.
- Wallace, R.A.
1994 Football hooliganism: a human zoo of criminal activity or moral depravity? Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. Boston, MA.
1996 Proscribed behavior in a situational context: the criminological import of football hooliganism. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, IL.
- Walvin, J.
1986 *Football and the Decline of Britain*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Ward, C.
1989 *Steaming In: Journal of a football fan*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- West, D.J.
1969 *Present Conduct and Future Delinquency: First report of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.
1982 *Delinquency: Its roots, careers and prospects*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- West, D.J. and D.P. Farrington
1973 *Who Becomes Delinquent?: Second report of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
1977 *The Delinquent Way of Life: Third report of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. New York: Crane Russak and Company, Inc.
- Williams, F.P. and M.D. McShane
1994 *Criminological Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Williams, J.

- 1980 Football hooliganism: offences, arrests and violence—a critical note. *British Journal of Law and Society* 7,1:104-111.
- 1991^h Having an away day: English football spectators and the hooligan debate. In J. Williams and S. Wagg's (eds.) *British Football and Social Change: Getting into Europe*. Leicester, England: Leicester University Press.
- 1991^w When violence overshadows the spirit of sporting competition. Italian football fans and their sports clubs. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 1:23-28.

Williams, J., E. Dunning and P. Murphy

- 1986 The rise of the English soccer hooligan. *Youth and Society* 17:362-380.
- 1989 *Hooligans Abroad*. London: Routledge.

Williams, J. and J. Woodhouse

- 1991 Can play, will play? Women and football in Britain. In J. Williams and S. Wagg's (eds.) *British Football and Social Change: Getting into Europe*. Leicester, England: Leicester University Press.

Winter, H., C. Davies and T. Butcher

- 1995 English thugs stop Dublin game. *Electronic Telegraph* [online]. 16 February. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk:80/et?ac=000616798646865&rtmo=Q3mLOQ9R&atmo=99999999&pg=/et/95/2/16/socth.html>

Wolfgang, M. and F. Ferracuti

- 1967 *The Subculture of Violence*. London: Tavistock.

Yablonsky, L.

- 1970 *The Violent Gang* (revised edition). Baltimore: Penguin.

Zani, B. and E. Kirchler

- 1991 When violence overshadows the spirit of sporting competition: Italian football fans and their clubs. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 1: 5-21.

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF MEASURES⁶⁸

Dependent Variable

Football Hooliganism. The dependent variable is an ordinal level measure comprised of four individual items asked at age 18/19. The responses for each item were coded 0=not known or ascertained; 1=yes; and 2=no.

FIGHTS (includes those taking place inside and outside the grounds)

In fight at football match - last year

In fight at football ground - previous two years

APPREHENSIONS (includes those taking place inside and outside the grounds)

Apprehended at football match - last year

Apprehended at football match - previous two years

Independent Variables

Middle-class value of constructive leisure. This scale is comprised of three items asked at the age 16/17 follow-up, which were derived from a set of eight items that were identified as reflecting an aspect of this middle-class value. Those items marked by an asterisk (*) were included in the final scale.

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (age when asked)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Combined teacher rating of truancy taken at age 12/13 and 14/15	TRTRNTC2
Attendance of youth, non-sports and sports clubs (age 16/17)	*CLUBS
Involvement in individual and group (team) (age 16/17)	*SPORTS
Involvement in officially organized sports (age 16/17)	*ORGSPRT
Combined level of self-reported delinquency at age 14/15 and 16/17	LVLDEL
Self-reported del. measure of underage betting at 14/15 and 16/17	DEL33
Universal measure of four types of drug use at age 16/17	DRUGS
Official record of the number of convictions as a juvenile	JUVCVT#

Middle-class value of acceptable conduct. Of the initial 16 items identified as relating to acceptable conduct, only 13 were used in factor analyses because of difficulties with

⁶⁸The one difficulty with describing the questions is that the specific form of the question is not provided in the code book or in any of West and Farrington's reports on the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development.

the other three items (see section 5.2.2). This middle-class value was focused on the use of appropriate behavior in all situation and the ability to “make friends and influence people”. The asterisked (*) items are those which make up the sub-component focused on behavior, while those marked by a plus sign (+) represent the items making up the final sub-dimension of friendmaking.

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (age when asked)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Dichotomous measure of whether the boy acts out (is difficult) (8/9)	*ACTOUT
West and Farrington’s combined measure of conduct disorder (8/9)	*CDCOMB
Parental estimation of the boy’s ability to make friends at 8/9	FRIEND#
Measure of youth’s temperament from interviewer evaluation (8/9)	OUTGNG
West and Farrington’s comb. measure of the boy’s daringness (10/11)	DARECMB
West and Farrington’s peer ratings of popularity scale (8/9 and 10/11)	PRPOPC
Primary school rating of troublesome behavior - West and Farrington	*TRUBLC
West and Farrington’s measure of the primary school teacher rating	*TRCMB
Additive measure of popularity from teacher ratings (12/13 and 14/15)	+TRPOPLR
Comb. teacher rating of boy’s ability to make friends (12/13 and 14/15)	+TRFRDMK
West and Farrington’s teacher rating of boy’s aggressiveness (12/13)	TRAG1213
West and Farrington’s teacher rating of boy’s aggressiveness (14/15)	TRAG1415
Respondent’s adjustment at home as of age 16/17	ADJHM

Middle-class value of self-reliance. The seven items listed below were perceived to address some aspect the youth taking individual responsibility for themselves or their behavior. The items marked by an asterisk (*) are those which compose the final self-reliance scale.

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (age when asked)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Parental estimation of how adventurous their child is (8/9)	*ADVENT
Quality of the discipline provided by the father (8/9)	FDISCQ
Quality of the discipline provided by the mother (8/9)	MDISCQ
Rigidity of parental rules and their enforcement (8/9)	*PRULES
Measure of watchfulness and supervision of the parent(s) (8/9)	*PVIGLNT
Measure of how easily the boy may be led into trouble by others (14/15)	EZLYLD
Identification of whose decision it was to leave school (14/15)	LEVSCWO

Middle-class value of success. All of the following items were identified as possible components of a success construct, and were asked at any point from 8/9 to 16/17. Items marked with an asterisk (*) were combined into the sub-dimension performance, while those marked with a pound sign (#) make up the sub-dimension of hard work and striving in secondary school. One last group to identify, marked with a plus symbol (+), are those that make up the hard work and striving in primary school that was not used in the present study.

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (age when asked)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Combined primary school teacher rating of hard working behavior	+LAZY811
Combined secondary school teacher rating of hard working behavior	#LAZY1215
Overall primary school teacher rating of trying to be a credit to parent(s)	+CRPRNT1
Secondary school teacher rating of trying to be a credit to parent(s)	#CRPRNT2
Tracking (streaming) level in school as of age 10/11	*TRCKNG
West and Farrington's overall teacher rating from primary school	+TRCMB
Test attainment results - math, English, and verbal reasoning (age 10/11)	*JRSCMBAT
Overall measure of the youth's class position (age 12/13 and 14/15)	#POSCLASS
Boy's level of school performance at age 14/15	PERFSCH
Participation in apprenticeships at age 16/17	APPSHIP
Taking university classes at age 16/17	UNIVRSTY
Engaged in job training at age 16/17	TRNJOB
Final age at which the respondent left school (18/19)	*LFTSCH2

Gang activities. This independent variable is made up of an item asked at successive data collection points (14/15 and 16/17). While it is the same question at both intervals, no time frame was identified, and by combining the items concerns about inconsistency are avoided. The final item is a dichotomous variable identifying whether or not the respondent had ever engaged in hooliganism, with 0=never and 1=at least once.

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (age when asked)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Belonging to a gang (of ten or more people) who go around together, making a row, and sometimes get into fights or cause a disturbance	GANGACT
Belonging to a gang of ten or more people who go around together, making a row, and sometimes get into fights or cause a disturbance	GANGACT2

Control Variables

Familial Disadvantage. This variable is a composite measure developed by West and Farrington designed to measure each family's relative position within the working-class based on a locus of items about family problems. The final coding of the level of familial disadvantage is based on the existence of 7 specific deprivations of condition 0=none (no

conditions present); 1=moderate (1 to 3 conditions present); and 2=severe (4 or more conditions present).

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (original item used in the measure)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Social handicap is derived from:	FAMDISAD
1. family being supported by social agencies (FAMAGEN)	
2. family has the lowest socio-economic status (V - manual) (FAMSES)	
3. family housing is not satisfactory (HMCOMF)	
4. interior condition of family housing is identified as neglected (HMCARE)	
5. family income is considered inadequate (FAMINC)	
6. the respondent is determined to be physically neglected (PHYNEG)	
7. the respondent lives in a large family (FAMSIZE)	

Single-parent family. As identified in section (5.2.4), this item identifies whether the boy spent any time in a single-parent home up to age 15. The original items asked at 8/9 and 14/15 separated the reason for the permanent separation, death or other reasons. The end product of these items is a single dichotomous measure of family structure up to age 15 (BRKNHM), with 0=no time in a single-parent family and 1=time spent in a single-parent home.

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (original item used in the measure)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Broken home before age 10	BRKHM10
Broken home before age 15	BRKHM15

Measure of differential association. This control variable is designed to provide an estimate of the level of delinquency in which the respondent's friends and acquaintances are involved based on the responses to an item about the delinquency of each group. The outcome of the two items (DIFFASS) is a continuous item with a range of 0 to 76, with 0=no friends or acquaintances involved in delinquent activities and 76=friends and acquaintances involved in the full range of 38 delinquent activities inquired about at age 14/15. After initially asking about whether the respondent engaged in 38 different forms of delinquency it was asked if they had friends or acquaintances involved in these behaviors. The two items reflect the responses.

<u>ITEM DESCRIPTION</u> (original item used in the measure)	<u>DATA NAME</u>
Reported delinquency of the respondent's acquaintances - raw scores	DELACQRW
Reported delinquency of the respondent's friends - raw scores	DELFRDRW

APPENDIX B

FOOTBALL, AN INTRODUCTION TO THE WORLD'S SPORT

FOOTBALL / SOCCER / FUTEBOL / VOETBAL / CALCIO / FUSSBALL

Soccer, the world's game, is a fluid game of both intricacy and power, requiring a team to work effectively as a unit in order to be ultimately successful. Teams challenge one another for 90 minutes (2 - 45 minute halves), working continually to gain superiority, both offensively and defensively over their opponents. Soccer is not a difficult game to understand as long as you are provided with some of the basics - playing the ball and possession; scoring; players and positions; the field and in-play v. out-of-play; fouls; and a basic glossary and phraseology.

PLAYING THE BALL & POSSESSION

Players can legally play the ball with any part of their body except the hands and arms. This means that a player can use their head, chest, thigh, foot, and even shoulder to legally play the ball.

There is no limitation on how long a player can hold the ball, but it is unusual to find a single player playing the ball continuously for more than a few seconds before passing it along to a teammate (hopefully).

Fortunately only one ball is in play at any given time. This means that players have to put themselves into positions that will enable them to both receive the ball and distribute it to others. It also means that it is easier to follow the progress of play.

No team is guaranteed possession of the ball, nor are they limited in the amount of time they have the ball in their possession. This means that the opposing team can take the ball at any opportunity and begin to attack the other team's goal. Having, and keeping, possession of the ball requires both skill and teamwork.

Possession of the ball does not require that the ball moves continually forward. In fact, sometimes the best and smartest passes will be made sideways and backwards, allowing the team to regroup and begin to attack again.

SCORING

While teams may play a beautifully flowing game and others will play a choppy, if somewhat disorganized, game, the desire is to beat your opponent by outscoring them.

Scoring is done by legally playing the ball into the opposing team's goal (an area 8 yards wide and 8 feet high). This means that a player can kick, head or even chest the ball into the goal. As you will come to see, scoring may be accomplished through any number of scenarios - free-flowing play, set plays, and even by a player accidentally putting the ball into their own goal.

Each goal is worth 1 point, regardless of where or how the goal was scored. Scoring a goal has also created a unique argot often referring to putting the ball into the back of the opponent's net.

Part of what makes soccer such a scintillating sport is that players are expected to both defend their own goal and offensively attack the other team's goal.

PLAYERS & POSITIONS

Soccer begins with 11 players on the field for each team.

One player on each side, readily identifiable as unique, stands out from the rest of the team in uniform as they're the designated goalkeeper. The goalkeeper has the ultimate responsibility of being the final line of protection of the goal s/he is defending. Because of the goalkeeper's special role they are allowed to use their hands inside the penalty area to more resourcefully protect the goal they are defending. (They can also play the ball like a field player, but are more effective when using their hands). If the keeper gains possession of the ball they must distribute the ball in a short period of time and are limited to 4 steps (but rarely does anyone count). They pass the ball to their teammates by rolling, throwing, kicking or punting the ball up the field.

The other 10 players on each team are referred to as field players and are divided into different ranks - defenders, midfielders, and forwards (attackers). Defenders are those who traditionally line up in front of their goalkeeper and tend to remain in their half of the field for the majority of the game.

Generally they do not push into the other team's half of the field very often. The primary responsibility of these players are to defend against the other team's attacks of their goal.

Midfielders line up in front of the defenders and are expected to fulfill both offensive and defensive responsibilities. Generally midfielders run the length of the field and provide support for the offense and the defense as the situation demands.

In many cases it is within the ranks of the midfielders that a "field general" can generally be found. The "field general" (often wearing the number 10) is often the center of the team's possession of the ball and directs other players about position, movement, and direction.

The forwards (attackers) line up at the front of the team and have the primary responsibility of attempting to put the ball into the other team's goal. These players will spend the majority of the game in the opposing team's half of the field. Generally midfielders and defenders will provide forwards with the ball for attempts to attack the other team's goal.

The number of players through the ranks of defenders, midfielders and forwards will vary from team to team. One of the most common formations is the 4-4-2; 4 defenders, 4 midfielders, and 2 forwards (the goalkeeper is a given in formations).

One other important thing to mention is that at times defenders will take up offensive positions and forwards will come back to help out on defense. This is acceptable, and often expected. Teams function more effectively on both offense and defense if players cover and support one another in a cohesive and interrelated fashion.

A final point on players is that a certain number of players can be substituted or exchanged during the course of the match. At the higher levels, including professional, the substituted player cannot return to the match later.

THE FIELD & IN-PLAY V. OUT-OF-PLAY

The field is made up of 2 identical halves, with a total length of 100-120 yards and a width of approximately 70-75 yards. The game is started at the center of the field with a kick-off by the team who wins the coin toss. The second half is started by the other team in the same manner. The game is also restarted after goals in this manner, with the team who gets scored upon getting the kick-off.

The ball is out of play at any time when it is completely beyond the outer borders of the field (the end lines and the sidelines), regardless of whether the ball is on the ground or in the air. Depending on where the ball goes out of play there are different methods for putting the ball back into play.

The line on which the goal sits is referred to as the end line. When the ball goes over the end line, but not in the goal, there are two possible outcomes. If the offensive team puts the ball over the end line the other team puts the ball back into play through a goal kick. For a goal kick the ball is placed inside the edge of the goal box (the first small box at the end of the field) and is kicked outside of the penalty area (the larger box that subsumes the smaller goal box). If the defense puts the ball over the end line the offensive team puts the ball back into play through a corner kick. The corner kick occurs within the small semicircle at the corner of the field closest to where the ball went out of play.

The left and right borders of the field are referred to as sidelines or touchlines. When a ball goes over the sideline the team who touched the ball last loses possession to the opposing team. They put the ball back into play by engaging in a throw-in. A throw-in is done by a player who holds the ball in both hands, brings it behind their head and releases it around the crown of their head into the field, attempting to play the ball to a teammate.

FOULS

When it comes to discerning legal from illegal behavior on the field there is a great deal of controversy always generated, with the referee inevitably becoming the center of discontent. Generally matches will provide one center referee who has primary control of the match and is the only one with a whistle. There are normally 2 assistant referees who run the sidelines and assist with flags rather than whistles. Their job is to back-up the center official, call fouls to the center official's attention, and make determinations of when the ball is in- and out-of-play.

Once a foul has been called play is restarted by the victimized team through the use of a direct or in-direct free kick. The type of foul will determine which type of free-kick is awarded to the fouled team. The person who takes the free kick can only touch the ball once, and someone else must touch the ball before they can touch it again.

Contact is a normal part of a game, and only under certain conditions will such behavior be determined a foul. Foul contact includes pushing, elbowing, tripping, kicking, and holding. In order to avoid fouling a player in these ways the opposing player must make an attempt to play the ball - playing the wo/man rather than the ball is considered foul contact.

These contact fouls, and illegal use of the hands (arms), result in a direct free kick. A direct free kick is where the team who has been fouled gets to have an unmolested touch of the ball, and if close enough can score a goal directly from the free kick.

There are a number of minor fouls, such as; high kicks, dangerous play, and offsides which result in in-direct free kicks. In-direct free kicks are similar to direct free kicks, except that a person cannot score directly off of an in-direct free kick.

If the referee or their assistants feel that the foul conduct was especially rough or malicious they have the ability to sanction the offender beyond the calling of the foul. The center referee can issue the offending player a yellow or red card.

A yellow card, sometimes referred to as a warning, can be issued for any of the above direct free kick fouls. This card serves to tell the player that the behavior will not be tolerated and that further behavior of the same sort will see them removed from the game.

On the other hand, a red card is an automatic ejection for the player who receives it. A red card is issued to a player who continually engages in foul behavior or has acted extremely maliciously in a specific circumstance. An important aspect of the red card is that the player cannot be replaced, so the removal means that the team plays a person short (or more if multiple red cards are handed out).

One final note, any ball that requires a second touch, does not have to be touched by a teammate, it can be touched by a member of the opposing team.

BASIC GLOSSARY & PHRASEOLOGY

BICYCLE KICK - an unusual and dangerous type of kick that is done by the person throwing their legs up to kick the ball in an inverted style. When done, it looks sort of like riding a bicycle on your back

CORNER KICK - a direct-free kick from the corner arc for an offensive team when the defensive team puts the ball over their end line

CROSS - a pass on the ground or in the air from one side of the field to the other in an attempt to find a teammate in open space (sometimes referred to as a switch or switching fields)

DEFENDER - a player whose main responsibility is to thwart the offensive attacks of the other team. They try to keep the ball out of their own goal

DIRECT FREE KICK - a free kick provided to a team for pushing, holding, tripping, handball, etc. where a goal can be scored directly from the restart

DRIBBLE - when an individual player uses his/her feet to bring the ball up the field without passing it to a teammate

END LINE (aka GOAL LINE) - the line at each end of the field. If the ball completely crosses this line it results in either a goal kick or a corner kick

FORWARD (aka ATTACKER, STRIKER) - person(s) who play the most offensive roles on the team and have primary responsibility for scoring goals

HEADER (aka HEADBALL) - when a player uses their head to pass, shoot, or clear the ball

GOAL BOX - the first small box at the end of the field. It is within this box that goal kicks are taken

GOAL KICK - a free kick for the defensive team when the offensive team puts the ball over the end line

GOALKEEPER - the one player on each team dressed in a different uniform who has the ability to use their hands when the ball is in the penalty box

IN-DIRECT FREE KICK - a free kick that requires at least one additional touch before a goal can be scored

KICK-OFF - the specific activity of putting the ball into play after a goal, at the beginning of the game, and to start the second half

MEG (aka SALAT) - to nut "meg" someone is to push the ball between their legs during a pass or dribble. It is unusual to see because it is a difficult move to pull off

MIDFIELDER - a player who plays offensively and defensively over the length of the field and links the defensive players with offensive ones

OFFSIDE - this is often a call that results in controversy and is little understood by spectators (probably by players and referees as well). Don't worry about this one now

OWN-GOAL (aka AUTOGOAL) - this occurs when a defensive player accidentally puts the ball into their own goal and scores for the other team

PASS - a ball that is kicked, headed, or otherwise played from one teammate to another in an attempt to advance the ball

PENALTY AREA - the larger of the two boxes which defines where a goalkeeper can use their hands

PENALTY SPOT - this spot is used when the defensive team commits a direct free kick foul inside the penalty area. It provides a one on one situation where an offensive player gets to take a shot at the goal from 12 yards out with only the goalkeeper to beat

PITCH - sometimes the field of play (soccer field) may be referred to as the pitch

PUNT - after the goalkeeper picks up the ball they often kick it down the field in an attempt to quickly get the ball to their forwards and midfielders

REFEREE - ultimate judge of legal and illegal action on the soccer field, often referred to in unflattering terms like the bind man or the incompetent

SAVE - when the goalkeeper (or possibly a defender) keeps the ball from going into their own goal

SHOT - when an offensive player attempts to score a goal

SIDE LINE (aka TOUCH LINE) - the lines running the length of the field. When the ball completely crosses this line it results in a throw-in for the opposing team

TACKLE - an attempt to gain possession of the ball from an opposing player. This is done primarily with the feet and can sometimes be done through sliding

THROW-IN - the action taken by the team who gains possession after the ball crosses the side line

VOLLEY - a shot that is attempted while the ball is in the air rather than on the ground

UNLUCKY - a phrase used to refer to a play that doesn't work out or a shot that misses or is saved

VITAE

Rich A. Wallace

Rich A. Wallace, a native of the Quad Cities in Illinois, attended Millikin University from 1987 - 1991, where he graduated cum laude with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in sociology and a minor in psychology.

In the fall of that same year he enrolled as a Master of Science candidate in the Department of Sociology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The requirements for this degree were completed in November of 1993, with the submission of a thesis entitled *Regional Differences in the Treatment of Karl Marx by the Founders of American Academic Sociology*. Once the master's degree was completed he began work on the present degree, Doctor of Philosophy in sociology. During his tenure at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Rich worked as a graduate teaching assistant, initially in support of Dr. William E. Snizek, and later teaching Criminology, Deviant Behavior, Social Problems, and Sociology of the Family courses on an independent basis.

In August of 1997 Rich became assistant professor of criminal justice in the Department of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin - River Falls, having sole responsibility for the criminal justice program. In addition to teaching courses in the criminal justice curriculum, he also teaches core sociology courses. In addition to academic responsibilities, Rich is also a member of the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects.

Professionally Rich is involved in the American Society of Criminology and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. He has presented several papers on the topics of the criminological nature of football hooliganism and the future value of correctional clients from ethical and biological standpoints. Currently Rich is doing further research on the causes of English football hooliganism.