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Abstract

The aim of this research is to create a clearer understanding of the modern English football hooligan and the crime of football hooliganism. This will be accomplished through an in-depth study, looking at alternative criminological theories used by academics to explain the phenomenon, as well as its surrounding history and identity. More specifically, the research will arrive at a definition which summarises particular characteristics that constitute the modern football hooligan - as there is currently no consensus or legal definition regarding this crime - as well as creating a model showing football hooliganism's evolution over time. A secondary research method utilising an amalgamation of both qualitative and quantitative data will be used to collate a broad depth of information suitable for answering the question. The study concludes with a contemporary definition and model of football hooliganism, which strongly recommends the need for more research into this type of crime, placing emphasis on the need to legally decide the precise definition of this phenomenon, avoiding future uncertainty and scepticism.
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1.0 An Introduction to Football Hooliganism and the Football Hooligan

‘Football is generally accepted as the world’s most popular spectator sport’, (Goddard and Sloane, 2014:351) and carried alongside the worldwide obsession of the sport, known by many as ‘the beautiful game’, (Conn, 2005:2) is the football hooligan.

Football hooligans commit acts of football hooliganism. However, previous research and academia conducted on football hooliganism has failed to arrive at a contemporary, national definition of what the phenomenon comprises. The lack of clarity surrounding the definition may involve the uncertainty encompassing the etymology of the phenomenon. Hobbs and Robins (1991) suggests it ‘derived from the surname of the infamous criminal Patrick Hooligan’ (see Wallace, 1998:57).

Dunning (2000:142) expressed the absence of a ‘precise definition of football hooliganism’ stating that ‘it lacks legal definition, precise demarcation of membership and is used to cover a variety of actions’. Frosdick and Marsh (2005:25) see striking similarities arguing it is ‘difficult to name, let alone define’, suggesting ‘there is a wide range of behavioural and other variables involved in football hooliganism’. The Oxford English Dictionary (2016) defines a football hooligan as ‘a violent troublemaker whose behaviour is associated with or motivated by their support of a soccer team’ – this is a very simplistic definition, unlikely to be used by academics in criminology to describe football hooliganism.

Early evidence of football hooliganism was seen in the early 14th century when ‘football was officially banned by Edward II’ (Macintosh, 2010:13) - he believed that social consequences would occur due to the disorder involved with football matches. A further dated example was in 1881, when ‘two railway officials were knocked unconscious by a group travelling to a Newton Heath versus Preston North End game’ (Frosdick and Marsh, 2005:20-21).
The media have attempted to demonstrate the environment of football hooliganism through film adaptations such as 'The Football Factory' and the 'Green Street Hooligans' (Kuhn, 2011:242) series, illustrating to the public, who may have little knowledge on the phenomenon, a brief indication of what may be involved in football hooliganism. This research will exhibit the complexity of football hooliganism, showing that there is far more than fighting and the cockney Danny Dyer persona, typically associated with the hooligan.

Some may question why it is important to understand what makes the modern English football hooligan. Understanding the scale and characteristics of the football hooligan are essential if society is to fully combat the negative consequences football hooliganism can create. A contemporary, national definition of what characterises the football hooligan would therefore be vital in the battle against eliminating any crime associated with this broad label. As a result of this absence, much confusion has been created relating to the English law.

This research will demonstrate that, whilst there have been noticeable 'changes in the extent and nature of football hooliganism' (Spaaij, 2006:347) over time, it is still an existing problem in modern society, as suggested by current crime statistics, and not 'dead and buried' (Zuberi, 2001:57), showing its relevance. As 'criminology is the discourse concerning crime and the methods by which society deals with crime' (Morrison, 1995:5), it is extremely alarming that no agreed national definition on football hooliganism exists. Society cannot efficiently tackle or prevent a crime if it does not know what it is facing.

The aim of this research is to look at the evidence regarding the characteristics, change and adaption of the modern English football hooligan, concluding with a contemporary, multi-dimensional definition on what makes the modern English football hooligan – thus addressing the 'widespread faults in the analysis of hooliganism' (Moorhouse, 1991:489) of the past. Also, a model will be created
displaying the change of football hooliganism over the past thirty years. It is with hope that this research will contribute positively to the criminological sphere and potentially be used or referenced from in the future. The research itself is of interest because there is a huge gap to be exploited in both criminology and social science surrounding this phenomenon, and therefore is seen as an opportunity. The topic of football and crime in general are of huge interest, and therefore the research has been completely fascinating and thoroughly enjoyable.

The focus specifically on English football hooligans, seems pertinent as England is, ‘the brand leader for football hooliganism’, (Moorhouse, 2006:257) and ‘has long been viewed as an exclusively English disease not only by journalists, or the general public but also by academics’ (Spaaij, 2006:9). Additionally, ‘the gender of football hooligans is strikingly homogeneous’ (ibid:334), in terms of a highly disproportionate male presence, and therefore the nucleus of this research will be male centred.

The structure of the research is broken up into a number of sections. Following the introduction, the methodology will demonstrate the different steps involved in the acquisition of research, and will be branched into three parts: the research approach used, the data collection, and the positive and negative implications of the research approach.

The following section is on criminological theories that will be interpreted to explain football hooliganism. These will be split into subsections of: hooliganism is inevitable, hooliganism is a choice, and finally hooliganism is neither explicitly inevitable nor a choice.

The next part of this research will study the history of football hooliganism with subsections consisting of legislation and crime statistics. Following this, the identity of the football hooligan will be examined, with subsections embodying fashion, masculinity and hegemony, violence within the hooligan firm subculture, and drugs and alcohol.
The next segment will conclude and finalise the definition of what makes the modern English football hooligan, as well as illustrating ‘The Cycle of Football Hooliganism’ model produced.

The research will finish with vital recommendations to future practice and policy, to reduce the presence of the modern football hooligan, with appendices and references at the close.
2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Approach

The research approach used is an amalgamation of both qualitative and quantitative secondary data - qualitative, through a large number of literature resources, and quantitative, through past and contemporary crime statistics collected. Collins (2010:120) describes secondary research as ‘using information that other people have gathered through primary research’. The secondary data used contains a mixture of both contemporary and mature literature completed by academics as a means to provide a balanced view. This is due to the change of football hooliganism over time, and therefore it is necessary to seek diverse research to ensure high representation. As a result of the vast range of secondary literature gathered, attempts to answer the question of ‘what makes the modern English football hooligan?’ will derive from a fresh, contemporary viewpoint, providing theory new to criminology.

2.2 Data Collection

The secondary data was collected through a large variety of different resources, all of which proved invaluable. The variety of literature and data resources acquired ensured that there was no bias or emphasis towards any one particular resource type, ensuring optimum representation.

A number of books purchased, mainly published within the criminological sphere, proved useful: Newburn’s ‘Criminology’, Hopkins-Burke’s ‘An Introduction to Criminological Theory’ and more specifically relating to football hooliganism, Frosdick and Marsh’s ‘Football Hooliganism’. Additional books, borrowed from the university’s library, including Hall’s ‘Hate Crime’, were also beneficial.
Digital books and journals were acquired online from sources such as ‘Google Books’ and ‘Jstor.org’, proving to be of a great importance. Newspapers were purchased frequently, including ‘The Telegraph’ and ‘The Guardian’, with the aim of collating information on football hooliganism. Whilst the information gathered from these newspapers was not great in abundance, it did prove of some use. The online newspaper for both ‘The Telegraph’ and ‘The Guardian’ demonstrated to be richer in data. A variety of online websites deemed to be effective - ‘http://www.bbc.co.uk/news’ and ‘www.footballhooligans.net’ were particularly rich in data.

Contemporary legislation was also gathered online, mainly through ‘www.gov.uk’ and ‘www.parliament.uk’, exhibiting great importance when needing to look into changes of legislation on football hooliganism.

Finally, the Nottingham Trent University Online Workspace (NOW), proved crucial. The hub of all university work, since arriving in 2013, includes past lectures, seminars and workshops from previous and current modules, proved to be a useful link to this research. Furthermore, the ‘LibraryOne Search’, accessed through NOW, contains a number of useful databases perfect for substantial literature and data collection - Westlaw and Lexis Library databases have been very helpful.

2.3 Positive and Negative Implications of my Research Approach

The utilisation of a secondary research approach to collect literature and data resulted in both positive and negative implications.

As a university student, the quantities of academic resources available have been vast. Many books, borrowed from the library, or research acquired from NOW and
its online databases, would not be available if not in the presence of a university environment.

The relatively short time span, in which the conduction of research took place, signified the strengths of using a secondary research method. The use of the academic’s primary research previously conducted on football hooliganism saved huge amounts of time. It allowed for sole concentration on the question, thus being far more representative of the target population of football hooligans, than would have been possible to acquire with the resources and time available to a university student.

A further advantage of using secondary research is that it ‘can be very cost-effective’ (Johnson-Morgan and Summers, 2005:110). Some research costs millions of pounds and takes considerable amounts of time to complete. The only expected purchases were books, journals and newspapers to aid research, and with extensive academic resources available as a university student, utilising the academic luxuries available made complete sense.

Negatives have also resulted from the use of the secondary research method. The quality and quantity of the research previously carried out cannot be controlled, and as a result, questions can arise over whether a source is ‘reliable, relevant and/or valid’ (Groucutt, Leadley and Forsyth, 2004:163) to the overall research. It must be taken into account whether it is suitable to use certain literature or data.

A large downfall from conducting secondary research, and something critically considered prior to choosing the research method, is that the criminological community may see ‘less value’ (Alon, 2003:77) in work carried out that contains no primary research – however primary research was not deemed suitable for a university student, where time, resources and ethical considerations may all prove to be of a hindrance.
Secondary research has the ability to cause ethical dilemmas, something which has ‘been encountered in many areas of social research and have at times been the subject of much controversy’ (Gallagher, Creighton and Gibbons, 1995:295). Although all research conducted by other academics has been referenced meticulously to the best possible standard throughout, as not to take credit for other’s research, in the form of citations and a reference list at the close of the dissertation, no consent was given from the academics whose work was used. Although it would be almost impossible to notify every single academic of the utilisation of their work for academic purposes, this could still prove problematic if the academic becomes aware of the use of their work and is not pleased about the lack of consent.

Furthermore the ‘subjective interpretation’ (Popper, 2008:164) of an academic’s work can be taken incorrectly, and as a result, references to their work may not be completely accurate and representative, potentially causing ethical issues. In hindsight, the utilisation of the secondary research approach has proved effective. It would not be feasible or realistic to fully conduct a representative primary research approach, and therefore full use of secondary research has been employed. However, if more time and financial resources were available, then a primary research approach may have been utilised instead.
3.0 Criminological Theory

Criminology constitutes a very diverse branch of social science, and therefore a huge number of studies have been conducted on the occurrence of crime - thus creating conflicting opinions. Criminological theories can be utilised to help explain why crimes, including football hooliganism, occur in society. These theories are essential, as considerable amounts of research and later policies implemented derive from theory. Whilst it is impossible to mention every criminological theory used to explain crime, it is important to examine different fundamental viewpoints, to provide suggested answers, to help answer the question of ‘what makes the modern English football hooligan?’ The ‘inevitable versus choice’ argument will be the forefront to the research on criminological theory and football hooliganism, and may help explain why acts of football hooliganism occur.

3.1 Hooliganism is Inevitable

Through a biological positivist theory of deviance, ‘which proposes that an individual deviates from social norms largely because of their biological make up’ (Boundless, 2015), ‘Lombroso categorised criminals into four major categories’. The football hooligan would fit the category of: ‘criminals of passion, who commit crimes because of anger, love, or honour and are characterised by being propelled to crime by an irresistible force’ (Lilly, Cullen, and Ball, 2010:24) – these are typical characteristics of the hooligan, who demonstrate this behaviour through anger towards the opposition, love of football and honour of representing the club through it’s notorious football firm. Furthermore, Lombroso theorised that certain characteristics present in an individual would suggest a criminal make up – coined criminal atavism. ‘Tattooing is common with criminals’ (British
Medical Journal, 1890:1204) and is something that is demonstrated frequently by hooligans who often exhibit their team’s crest on their body. Lombroso’s theory helps to illustrate that, whilst the criminal related behaviour demonstrated by the hooligan is against the law, it is due to the biological make up of these individuals, and therefore is expected and foreseeably inevitable.

The predestined actor model, popularised by Hopkins-Burke, focuses on the ‘doctrine of determinism which claims to account for criminality in terms of factors – either internal or external to the individual – which cause them to act in ways over which they have little or no control’ (Hopkins-Burke, 2016:141). Therefore, under this theory, internal factors such as the biological make up of an individual, or external factors such as their social environment, for example in a largely football orientated environment such as a public house, are reasons as to why an individual may resort to football hooliganism. These people are unable to control their biological characteristics that, as a result, will influence their behaviour. Due to this apparent lack of control, these people are predestined to commit crime.

Freud’s psychodynamic approach also focuses on a centrality of determinism, arguing that ‘our behaviour and feelings as adults are rooted in our childhood experiences’ and ‘therefore all behaviour is determined’ (McLeod, 2007). This theory suggests that perhaps an individual’s father or older brother’s involvement in football hooliganism may transfer to them without any obvious realisation. A young individual generally does not have the capability of making rational choices and may therefore see any football-related behaviour displayed or referred to as the norm. This may then be demonstrated by their feelings and actions later on. Based on this theory, hooliganism is inevitable, as the child does not choose their upbringing or surroundings.
‘Goring (1913) was convinced that criminality was passed down through inherited genes’ and searched for ‘a criminal gene’ (see Hopkins-Burke, 2013:107). He proposed that these people should not be allowed to reproduce, as the criminal gene would then not be passed down a generation. Therefore, under this theory, if an individual’s biological parent had a history of criminal related behaviour, then any offspring produced would show characteristics of this in their conduct. As a result, this could explain why individuals may resort to football hooliganism, and, in fact, show that they were always destined to, due to the presence of a criminal gene.

From a Marxist’s perspective, it is proposed that ‘capitalism causes crime’ (Akers, 1999:174) and in fact capitalism, in itself, is a crime. Consequently, the poverty that can result from capitalism, due to unemployment, ‘causes many social problems’ (Thio and Taylor, 2011:10) including crime. A Marxist believer is adamant that capitalism is inefficient and unequal; creating crime problems – a characteristic that would be reduced in a Marxist society. Therefore, in light of this theory, any crime including football hooliganism, in a capitalist run society, such as England, is inevitable.

3.2 Hooliganism is a Choice

Developed ‘during the late 18th century with the work of Cesare Beccaria’ (Wright, 2009), a utilitarian belief is adopted in which ‘rational choice theories define human behaviour as resulting from calculated reasoning’. Through this process, ‘individuals must anticipate the outcomes of alternative courses of action and calculate that which will be the best for them’ (Goodson, 2009:110). Under this theory, the hooligan would weigh up the cost-benefit analysis of getting
involved in act of football hooliganism, and the final decision would be based on the one with the most rewards. If the negatives outweigh the positives, then football hooliganism would not occur. For example, if a rival firm looked like they had far more numbers in terms of their firm populous, under this theory, the disadvantaged firm would refrain from getting into a violent altercation due to the likelihood of failure. This theory demonstrates complex cognitive processes that occur in the minds of the hooligan, showing a choice of action.

The routine activities theory, ‘introduced by Cohen and Felson (1979)’, (see Branic, 2015) requires a number of elements present for an act of football hooliganism to occur. These include ‘a motivated offender’, ‘a suitable victim or target’ and ‘the absence of a capable guardian’ (Ministry of Children and Youth Services, 2010). Should these all occur, the football hooligan is likely to strike. This helps to explain the thought and choice processes behind the minds of these offenders. The motivated offender is a result of chance. If, on a particular day, the hooligan is looking to commit acts of crime under the football hooliganism label and there is the presence of a suitable victim and the absence of a capable guardian, such as a vulnerable looking rival firm, small in numbers, then this chance is increased.

The deterrence theory, very similar to the rational choice theory, also emphasises a choice of action. Under this perspective, it is believed ‘that people choose to obey or violate the law after calculating the gains and consequences of their actions’ (Bosworth, 2005:233). Consequently, hooligans who choose not to offend have thus deterred, identifying the negatives of executing a crime as outweighing the positives. It is impossible to know exactly how many individuals deter from crime, as the act of crime itself has not occurred and therefore not explicit to criminal law. This theory could link with retributivism to explain why football
hooligans may choose the alternative and commit a crime. This theory ‘claims that it is in some way morally right to return evil for evil, that two wrongs can somehow make a right, if people are to be punished, [it is] because they deserve it’ (Cavadino, Dignan and Mair, 2013:41). Therefore, if a hooligan has been subjected to a form of violence, from another, then this may cause the adoption of the characteristics of violence themselves – typical of the hooligan – returning whatever they receive: a form of revenge and ‘just desserts’ of people getting what they deserve.

3.3 Hooliganism is neither Explicitly Inevitable nor a Choice

Gottfredson (1990) believed in ‘the notion that crime and delinquency are the products of low impulse-control, but argued that adequate self-control can be learnt and internalized in the individual psyche during early socialization in the family’ (see Hall and Winlow, 2015:20). As a result, behaviour involving football hooliganism, under this theory, would focus on the social environment that individuals are brought around. If this self-control is learnt, or taught by the family, the chance of a demonstration of hooligan behaviour in later life would be decreased. However, if the individual’s family, with whom they live with, display a lack of self-control, through crime or acts of football hooliganism, then the likelihood of a low impulse-control leading to hooliganism is increased. Subsequently, this theory does not explicitly state inevitability or choice, but suggests the circumstances of the social environment determine this.

Durkheim takes a very unique stance on crime, suggesting that it forms ‘an integral part of all healthy societies’, and therefore ‘it must be performing some necessary, positive function or else it would disappear as societies progress’ (Hamlin, 2009). Under this theory, it can be inferred that Durkheim would believe
that football hooliganism serves a social function in society, and as a result would be expected and normal. Therefore, at its peak, football hooliganism created a state of anomie in society – ‘a breakdown and fragmentation of meaning and moral guidance about what is right and wrong and an ensuring culture of normlessness or disregard for society’s rules and norms’ (Hall and Winlow, 2015:9). Durkheim suggests the normative behaviour of crime in society and culture, which is considered abnormal by many, to be completely customary to the world we live in. He moves away from inevitability or choice of crime, and suggests that in fact it is the construction of society that creates crime.

The diversity of criminological theories regarding crime occurrence is evident, and can be interpreted to show why football hooliganism may occur. It is clear that many of the theories show staunch links in terms of why it is believed crime occurs – and therefore football hooliganism. The inevitability that hooliganism will occur is shown by biological theories including Lombroso’s positivist theory on deviance and Goring’s criminal gene. However, theories that refute the nucleus of crime on inevitability include Beccaria’s rational choice theories and Cohen and Felson’s routine activities theory – placing the emphasis on choice, through complex cognitive processes and calculative reasoning. Gottfredson’s theory on self-control and Durkheim’s theory on the normative of crime move away from either a choice or inevitability explicitly, suggesting that crime is far more complicated.

It is highly improbable that there will ever be a unified explanation for crime, and these theories mentioned may help explain why individuals resort to football hooliganism; potentially showing that everyone has the ability to commit crime.
4.0 History

4.1 Legislation

Football hooliganism is known for the broad and diverse number of crimes in which this phenomenon can fall under. Due to a collaboration of dedicated teamwork and research involving football clubs, the Football Association (FA) and the government and police, legislation has been passed to reduce the prevalence of the modern hooligan. Allen and Naylor (2009:ix), both members of Sheffield Wednesday’s Owl’s Crime Squad, described the passing of this perceived draconian football-related legislation as having ‘afflicted every football firm in the United Kingdom’. Due to the frequent involvement in the operation of firms, punishment under joint enterprise is likely for the hooligan.

Frosdick and Marsh (2005:169) explain that ‘there is a whole raft of criminal legislation which is solely football-related’; this is unusual considering ‘there is very little legislation’ applying ‘directly to sport’ (Siekmann and Soek, 2012:373). However, Damian Green, former Minister for Policing and Criminal Justice, whilst recognising the presence of modern legislation to tackle football hooliganism, said in 2014 ‘the risk of spontaneous alcohol-fuelled incidents, especially at high-risk and high-tension matches, remains’ (House of Commons, 2014).

Early legislation introduced against the hooligan, created a domino effect for changes in modern law, in the aftermath of the Heysel disaster of 1985. ‘A charge by Liverpool fans at rival Juventus supporters caused a wall to collapse, resulting in 39 deaths’ (Politics UK, 2012). Subsequently, the 1986 Public Order Act was introduced, ‘that allowed courts to make restriction orders’ (Miller, 2013:236) to those fans whose behaviour was deemed unacceptable, along with the ban of ‘all English clubs from competing in Europe’ (Kerry-Ward, 2009:142) until 1990. This was a very dark moment for the English hooligan because, as a direct result of
their actions, football fans could no longer go and watch their team play abroad in Europe for the foreseeable future. This was a serious warning on future conduct for the hooligan.

After the passing of further hooliganism related legislation, including The Football Offences Act 1991 and The Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the Football (Disorder) Act 2000 was introduced which ‘drastically increased police and court powers to prevent suspected hooligans leaving the UK when the English national team, or their own side, was playing abroad’ (Greenfield and Osborn, 2005:101). A sign is now prominently placed outside Wembley (see Appendix A), the stadium of the English national football team, displaying the ground’s regulations prohibiting acts of hooliganism, including the use of fireworks or flares, weapons and illegal substances.

In a bid to completely eradicate any modern football hooliganism, ‘the Government has established the Football Banning Orders Authority to maintain a register of all banned persons’ (The Football Association, 2012). Established in 2005, examples of behaviour, which in 2016, the hooligan could be arrested for, and thus put on the register, include ‘throwing an object at or towards the pitch or spectator area, ticket touting and possession of alcohol on trains/and or coaches when travelling to a football match’. As a result, this ‘prevents the offender from attending any football match at home or abroad for a minimum of three years’ (ibid). Attending a football match without a match-day ticket, pitch invasions, breach of banning orders, battery, assault, breach of the peace and theft are other crimes that should be widely recognised as football hooliganism.

The UK Football Policing Unit can be seen as a large contributor in the reduction of activity by the modern hooligan, mainly due to the vast number of connections it encompasses in its problem orientated method of reduction: ‘Crimestoppers, British Armed Forces, ACPO, Home Office, all police forces in England’ (UK Football Policing Unit, 2011) and many more.
As well as legislative measures carried out by the Government, football clubs have taken their own initiative in a bid to reduce potential violence from the modern hooligan, attempting to centre the attention solely on the football match – the main reason why the majority of football supporters go to the games. Modern ‘all-seater stadiums and family enclosures’ (BBC, 2002) have been introduced in an attempt to segregate violent and peaceful supporters. This is a positive shift from the old-school standing terrace, where trouble was more easily created (see Appendix B).

The implementation of early kick-offs and midweek games, for large-scale football matches, is likely an attempt to decrease the length of time of those engaging in the consumption of alcohol - a potential deterrent against the modern hooligan.

Furthermore, ‘Old Trafford was the first ground in England to install perimeter fences to keep fans from invading the field’, (Brewin, 2015) proving an effective mechanism against the hooligan.

The issue of the relationship between racism and the hooligan was most recently legislatively addressed by the ‘Football Offences and Disorder Act in 1999’ (Hall, 2013:36) and anti-racism initiatives have corroborated alongside to combat this issue that is a characteristic of the modern hooligan. Highly racist, derogatory songs have been administered directly towards black supporters - ‘Stand by Union Jack, Send those niggers back, if you’re white, you’re alright, if you’re black, send ‘em back’ (Zirin, 2007:94).

A contemporary example of racism by the hooligan was ‘when a black commuter was pushed off a carriage’ by Chelsea fans that were shouting ‘we’re racist, and that’s the way we like it’ (Davies, 2015).

Partnerships have been created between supporters, clubs and organisations to eradicate incidents such as these. They include the ‘Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), the Football Supporters Association (FSA)’, (Frosdick and Marsh,
2005:142) as well as the highly successful ‘Stand up Speak Up’ – created in 2005 - this was Nike’s campaign ‘to empower football fans to show their opposition towards racism’, (Fanning, 2014) and was promoted by footballers Thierry Henry and Rio Ferdinand.

4.2 Crime Statistics

As a direct result of the legislation passed against football hooliganism, the prevalence of the phenomenon is now lower than it has been in recent decades – although not as low as the public has been led to believe. In the season of 1988/1989, there were ‘2,389 football-related arrests’ (Chester, 2001:3) in the top division of English football – known then as Division 1 as opposed to the Premier League - leading to a ‘moral panic in the press’, (Holt, 1990:326) with some fearing it could become an epidemic. It is important to mention that resources and knowledge on the phenomenon of football hooliganism has vastly increased from the 1970s and 1980s. Whilst it may be later observed that the number of football-related arrests has decreased, deterrence measures put in place to stop the football hooligan must also be appreciated, as these figures are impossible to measure – as previously mentioned by the deterrence theory. If these deterrence measures were not administered, then it is highly probable that the prevalence of football hooliganism would be very similar to the figures of 1988/1989.

Contemporary crime statistics, based on the 2014/2015 football season, clearly exhibit a reduction in football hooliganism, but also prove that the phenomenon is still alive and not dead as some academics have suggested. Prior to the start of the 2015/2016 football season, ‘there were 2,181 banning orders in force’, representing ‘a decrease of 4% (-92)’ (Home Office, 2015) of the number of banning orders at the same point last year. Also from this same time period,
'there were 1,873 football-related arrests’, representing ‘a decrease of 18% (-400)’ (ibid) of the number of football-related arrests at the same stage last year. However, these figures concludes that modern hooliganism is in fact very much still a problem, with only 516 less arrests than the figures from 1988/1989.

Comparing football-related incidents and other violent crimes is a useful method to put the crime into perspective in modern society and discover how the modern football hooligan compares to other criminals. In Great Britain, ‘there were 65 arrests in 2014’ (Anderson,2015) under the Terrorism Act – a far lower prevalence than the recent arrest figure for football-related crime at 1,873. Whittaker (2004:3) even goes as far to suggest that terrorism can be used ‘to describe a wide range of protests such as football hooliganism’. Robbery accounts for a far larger prevalence than both terrorism and football hooliganism under the same time frame, with ‘the number of robbery offences’ accounting for ‘51,022’ (Office for National Statistics, 2015). This shows that robbery is in fact a far more serious and prevalent issue of the make up of modern society.

Attempts have been made to recognise a radius in which the modern hooligan operates. A longitudinal study over the course of six years, conducted by the West Yorkshire Police and the British Transport Police, ‘provided crime-type, time-stamped and geo-coded details for all crime incidents that occurred within a three-kilometre radius of the centre of Elland Road football ground’ (Hopkins and Treadwell, 2014:27). It was concluded that it is impossible to recognise an exact radius for football-related behaviour due to the multitude of incidence and crime types; however, this type of primary research is vital for the continued coherent and efficient law enforcement against the modern hooligan.

The fact that a large proportion of those who commit football hooliganism see it as ‘a lifestyle that for many has lasted a life time’ (Slaughter, 2013), suggests that recidivism rates may be frequent amongst this broad type of crime.
Whilst it is recognised that there is a new breed of hooligan, Naggin, Farrington and Moffitt (1995) describe how ‘very active offenders tend to continue offending as they get older’ (see Felson and Santos, 2010:9). This can be used as evidence that very active hooligans from past generations will continue to partake in this criminal phenomenon throughout their life.

A number of reasons can be observed as to why the modern hooligan may not be as active as in the past, aside from the legislation implemented, deterrence measures and intelligence.

Whereas in the past, especially during the decades of the 1970s and 1980s, the majority of football supporters and hooligans ‘grew from traditionally working class roots’ (Smith, 2012:14), the modern football supporter has moved towards an emphasis on the middle class. ‘Drastically increased prices’ (Horine and Stotlar, 2013:101) on rail travel, and excessive prices for match day tickets have contributed to this transition. ‘Arsenal are the most expensive team to watch in Europe’ with their most expensive match day ticket ‘at £97’ (ESPN, 2014) – a rise of ‘1,000% in just two decades’ (Hartley-Parkinson, 2011), clearly displaying economic activity which would not be realistic for the working class. A shift has therefore taken place, ‘with trouble more focused on the lower leagues where ticket prices are cheaper and there may be fewer resources to steward and police games’ (Bridge, 2010). This can be illustrated through statistics on the Football League Conference, representing the fifth tier of English football, contributing to the most football-related arrests per 100,000 attendees (see Appendix C). However, with the recent agreement of Premier League clubs ‘to limit away ticket prices to a maximum of £30’ (O’Callaghan, 2016), a new resurgent wave of football hooliganism could result in the Premier League, due to affordable means. However, currently it can be concluded that the majority of modern football hooligans, who are from working class backgrounds, focus their attention at lower league football grounds – supported by the fact that ‘most criminals are working
class’ (Newburn, 2012:855).

Furthermore, a recent study by the Premier League found that ‘fans are getting younger’, with ‘a 26% increase in junior season ticket sales’ in the past decade, and the average fan being ‘41 years old’ (Premier League, 2015). The increase of juniors is likely to deter some hooligans, as well as the unlikely capacity or willingness of juniors to commit football hooliganism. As well as this, the fans are now the ‘most ethically diverse it has ever been’ (ibid) which is shown by roughly half of Manchester United’s fans living in Asia - ‘325 million’ (Kantar, 2012). It is highly unlikely that these fans, many of whom may travel from other continents, where football hooliganism prevalence is extremely low in comparison, to observe a football game, are interested in engaging in acts of football hooliganism. As a result, they are very unlikely to have affiliations with football firms in this country. This increase in cultural diversity is likely to have contributed to the fall in football hooliganism crime rates.

Considering that ‘crime is committed disproportionately by males’, (Braithwaite, 1989:44) the increased presence of females at football matches has potentially contributed to the reduction of football hooliganism. This is illustrated by the fact that ‘female attendance is at an all time high’ with ‘26% of match attenders’ in the Premier League being female.
5.0 Identity

5.1 Fashion

A statement demonstrating the importance of fashion to the identity of the hooligan is that ‘fashion was one way of gaining the upper hand, at least superficially’ (Thornton, 2003:12), which created a division from the mainstream football supporter. A dedicated cult, consisting of a typically bourgeois fashion style concerning what you wear, what you look like and how you wear it, are fundamentals to the hooligan – clothes are ‘worn in pride’ (Knight, 1982:37).

The term often used within the subculture of football hooligans to describe them, and ultimately a description of their fashion, is ‘casuals’ (Thornton, 2003:16) or ‘dressers’ (Smith, 2012:1).

‘Smart, but casual clothing, with no club colours in order to not advertise themselves as football fans to the police’ (Murphy, Williams, and Dunning, 1990:91), can be seen as a basic rule for the hooligan. No club colours is a must, especially on ‘away days’ (Nesti, 2010:71), as the likelihood of being vastly outnumbered by home supporters is high.

Stone Island is often seen as the ‘king of the casual brands’ and ‘regularly spotted in the 80s, it wasn’t long before every self-respecting casual had one or more pieces from the brand. Now part of the Stone Island family, C.P Company seems to be the more favoured of the two brands these days’ (Football Casuals, 2016). A brand notorious for their jackets, C.P Company is a popular choice for the modern hooligan, as a method for the inability of detection due to the goggle styled hood (see Appendix D). As time evolves, fashion must adapt to the current market and that’s exactly what has happened in the hooligan scene. Some now believe that C.P Company is the ‘better quality successor to the former king of the casual brands – Stone Island’ (Football Casuals, 2016). Many modern
hooligans, who previously wore Stone Island, now tend to remove the demountable compass badge on Stone Island clothing, leaving ‘the two buttons still attached’ in which ‘those in the know are still able to recognise other casuals’ (Casual Hooligan Brands, 2010). ‘Peaceful Hooligan’ is another common modern hooligan brand, and is widely worn in the hooligan subculture. Unlike the name falsely suggests, the brand aims ‘to survive the things we do, from misbehaving down the pub, to following our colours around the country’ (Peaceful Hooligan Limited). Appendix E demonstrates some of the labels typically associated with football hooligans, both in the past and the present, including Stone Island and C.P. Company.

Wearing these labels can be risky due to the stigma attached with football hooliganism and violence; potentially attracting unwanted attention. Therefore, this clothing is rarely seen outside subcultures that associate themselves with violence. As a result, some ‘casuals have adopted a more subtle and underground look, ditching now popular and mainstream brands for independent clothing labels such as Albam, YMC and APC’ (Casual Hooligan Brands, 2010).

In terms of footwear, ‘Doc Martens, the hooligans’ favourite shoe’ (Burstyn, 1999:192), are seen as a popular choice due to their ‘steel toed’ design which comes in useful when ‘kicking the crap out of somebody’ (Leyden and Cook, 2008:29), with leather gloves also worn to prevent fingerprint detection.

A significant factor that has noticeably changed in the identity of the football hooligan, is that ‘any item can be ordered online in a few clicks’ meaning that ‘no longer do you need to plan a shopping trip to London or Europe to buy the latest designer gear’ (80s Casuals, 2016), which used to be integral to the football hooligan and one many looked forward to. O’Kane (2012:234) refers to this modern change as the birth of the ‘internet casuals’ where the purchase of counterfeit items is observed and consequently, the ‘one-upmanship associated with designer labels worn by the first football casual has gone forever’ (80s
Two separate worlds collided to join as one when the music culture combined with the football hooligan subculture in the 1980s. It began with the ‘Teddy Boys, Mods, Rockers, Punks and Skinheads’ – all of whom were associated with different types of clothing - and were all ‘bound together by a love of music’, (Smith, 2012:14) as well as their passion for football and violence. The ‘madchester’ and ‘acid house’ scene (Luck, 2002:68) of the 1980s vastly expanded and diversified the music scene within the hooligan subcultures, with mixtures of rock, house and hip-hop music. Whilst the club scenes are not elements associated with the modern hooligan, this era has influenced their music tastes. Favourite modern hooligan artists include musicians from that era: ‘Stone Roses, The Jam, Pink Floyd, Oasis, Tupac, Madness’, (Thornton, 2003:283) as well as modern hip-hop artists ‘Eminem’ and ‘Dr Dre’ (Austerlitz, 2008:185).

Hairstyles within the hooligan subculture have seen a change over time. The former popular ‘pony-tail’ (Pearson, 1983:18) and ‘wedge haircut’ (Weight, 2013:355) are now rarely adopted by the modern hooligan; today, large emphasis is placed on a thug like ‘modern skinhead’ (McAllister, 2009:n.p.) style; almost identical to the original skinhead. However, much less emphasis is placed on specific hairstyles in the modern hooligan.

The use of the acronym CHAV – sometimes labelled as council house and violence – has often been associated with hooligans due to the typically working class backgrounds hooligans are perceived to derive from, as well as the violence frequently displayed. Whilst this is true to some extent, as previously explained, it can be argued that the hooligan supporters within the Premier League are likely to be from middle class backgrounds, whereas in the lower leagues, where violence occurs more frequently, offenders are far more likely to be from a working class background.

It is clear that fashion has changed within the hooligan subculture realm, but
many distinct features still exist. It is inevitable that fashion will continue to adapt as society changes, but it is likely that the hooligans will continue with their initial principles of ‘casual’ clothing for the foreseeable future.

5.2 Violence Within the Hooligan Firm Subculture

Violence associated with modern football hooligans is well known. However, Pennant and King (2005:1) exclaim that ‘violence and hooliganism have been part and parcel of football since the advent of the game, but it wasn’t sensationalised until the press decided to jump on the bandwagon and report trouble at matches’, therefore promoting the phenomenon to the height it is today.

Football hooligans have their own subculture, and in a way, their own ‘hard-core’ (Guilianotti, 1994:43) football affiliated gangs. The arguably sexist structure of the hooligan subculture, typically absent of female presence, is evident by the strong relationship between males and gangs as ‘boys are often part of gangs from an early age, a subculture in which some forms of crime are a way of life’ (Giddens and Birdsall, 2001:226).

Gangs, in the hooligan subculture, are known as firms, and are associated with the majority of English football teams, who operate independently from the football club itself. ‘The violent hooligan element associated with any football club is different from its main body of fans’ (Gardner and Pennant, 2006:i) – the main body of fans being the majority. These football fanatics can be observed as intertwining their love for football and violence, into a unique religiously football-related subculture. Firms prepare for up and coming matches by collating as many hooligans together as possible, in anticipation of the imminent arrival of an opposition firm. The opposition will affect the number of firm members present, with local derby matches likely to attract notable attention.
Rookwood and Pearson (2010:149) say it has been suggested in the past ‘that non-hooligan supporters disapprove of their hooligan counterparts and their activities’. However, they reject this, claiming ‘a significant proportion of match-going fans who consistently express positive attitudes towards the hooligans who follow their team’ and even coined the word ‘hoolifan’ to describe this. Self-identification in football hooliganism is key as hooligans are proud to be affiliated with a particular firm and will often go out of their way to demonstrate this allegiance – most commonly through violence and fighting.

Cowens, of the Sheffield United firm, recalls an incident with a Manchester United fan that exemplifies the ‘any reason to have a fight’ attitude within many hooligans, who thrive on violence: ‘look at him, he’s got longer hair than me… get the cunt’ (Cowens, 2009:259).

O’Neil, the former leader of the Red Army firm, recalled the presence of ‘the biggest mass following British football has ever seen’ (O’Neill, 2005:vii). Affiliated to Manchester United, this is perhaps not surprising considering it is the ‘richest club in the world’ and most supported, with ‘659 million fans’ (BBC, 2016).

However, massive fan bases do not necessarily have massive firms. The reduction of football hooliganism presence is likely to have seen a decrease in firm numbers throughout the country.

Tommy Robinson, activist and former prominent member of the ‘Men in Gear Football Crew, followed Luton Town Football Club’ and was also ‘ex EDL leader and founder’ (Copsey and Richardson, 2015:134). He has influenced his former firm to continue, and they are known today for their high level of violence towards other hooligans. ‘The EDL evolved from a coalition of several football hooligan firms’ (ibid) and has striking similarities with the subculture of football hooliganism through it’s ‘powerfully patriotic sense of English nationalism’ (Jackson 2011:13) and high ‘levels of racism’ (Lavalette and Penketh, 2013:260).

The Birmingham Zulu’s, affiliated with Birmingham City, were described by Sir
Alex Ferguson as ‘turning St Andrews into an intimidating arena’ (Tattum, 2010). The racist and derogatory term ‘Zulu’ has been used in the past as a form of racism, and therefore this firm’s name is ironic considering the known racist traits of the hooligan.

Frosdick and Marsh (2005:25) claim a shift in modern hooliganism, with much emphasis on violence ‘displaced away from the stadium’ in a bid to avoid arrest and absence of CCTV cameras. Currently, there are ‘up to six million CCTV cameras across the UK’, making it ‘the world leader in the use of CCTV’. (Rowe, 2013:241) Therefore a large proportion of violence is demonstrated through ‘organised fighting’, out of sight of these CCTV cameras. A contemporary example of organised fighting is the ban a hooligan ringleader is completing for ‘organising a punch up between 70 fans of Nottingham Forest and Derby County’ (Pritchard, 2015). The individual was seen organising the punch-up outside the notorious Nottingham Forest affiliated public house, ‘The Royal Children’, known for hooligans to attend prior to matches. Close in proximity and known for its affiliation with football hooliganism, The Rose of England public house has affiliations with ‘Nottingham Forest’ and ‘Notts County’ (Match Pint, 2016) hooligans – the latter being ‘the world’s oldest football league club’ (Vincent, 2012), still capable of displaying elements of football hooliganism.

A further example of recent organised fighting was in 2009 when ‘fighting between Millwall and West Ham football fans was planned a fortnight before the match’ (Lee, 2009). Proposed to be rooted from the gangster lifestyle ‘in London of gang warfare between the Kray’s in the East End and the Richardson’s in the South East’ (Brown, 2009), it is perhaps no surprise these are two of the most notoriously violent English football firms.

This increased emphasis towards organised fighting is likely to continue to prove popular within the hooligan firm subculture in the future, as constraints upon modern hooligans are far more rigorous than thirty years ago.
Although notoriously known for their violent characteristics, this does not prevent the hooligan from being reasonable under certain circumstances. ‘Regular football hooligans tend to abide by a set of unwritten rules determining when it is legitimate to confront an individual or group, and when it is appropriate to desist’ (Waddington, 2007:167). This may include individuals who are not affiliated with a hooligan firm or those who have no interest in fighting.

However, violence inflicted on those who do partake in football hooliganism may succumb to the Chelsea Grin: ‘deliberately slashing a face from mouth to ears’ (Dalzell and Victor, 2012:997) – a ferocious method of violence that gained its title due to the permanent scars left to the victim’s face, in the shape of a grin. This is still demonstrated by the Chelsea Headhunters firm who ‘ambush rival fans and would leave upon their victims calling cards which stated you have just been nominated and dealt with by the Chelsea Headhunters’ (Fijnaut and Marx, 1995:181).

It is clear that the hooligan firm subculture involves a complex construction of factors that characterise and explicit football hooliganism as a unique phenomenon.

5.3 Hyper-Masculinity and Hegemony

A common characteristic of a male dominated hooligan subculture is ‘the hyper-masculine subculture of football hooliganism’ (Lumsden and Winter, 2014:77). ‘Masculinity is always individual and personal’, (Messerschmidt and Connell, 1993:81) and ‘hyper-masculinity – the belief that ideal manhood lies in the exercise of force to dominate others’ (Burstyn, 1999:192) - commonly displayed as an authoritarian identity of the hooligan, inputs a general ‘fear of hooliganism’ (Manzenreiter and Spitaler, 2011:109) into the mind sets of those outside of the immediate firm. With this force of domination, hegemonic traits develop. Leading
a hooligan firm into a confrontation with a rival firm emits the attributes of one who is a ‘testosterone-induced’ (Halberstam, 1998:5) fighter, prepared to do whatever it takes to gain ‘the respect among their peers that they hope their hooligan involvements will bring’ (Smith, 2009:22). The excessive violence, sense of pride and sovereignty involved in the hooligan identity seems an essential characteristic, inputting elements of uncertainty and vulnerability into the mind sets of rival firms.

The hyper-masculinity identity of the hooligan has been at the forefront of some barbaric incidents.

A particular incident can be exemplified through the long-standing and vicious rivalry between Manchester United and Liverpool. The tragic incidents of the Munich Air Disaster of 1958 and Hillsborough of 1989, causing mass death to member affiliations of both teams, led to the development of horrific chants at football matches. Liverpool, as well as Manchester City and Leeds United, are known for chants directed specifically at Manchester United regarding the Munich Air Disaster: ‘Who's that dying on the runway, who's that dying in the snow? It's Matt Busby and his boys, making all the fucking noise because they can’t get the aeroplane to go’ (Mitten, 2016:2). Alternatively, Manchester United fans often respond to fans of Manchester City by singing: ‘what we like most is kicking a blue’ and ‘if you’re a city fan surrender or you’ll die’ (Marsh, 2016).

However, the majority of supporters ‘retain some sense of moral decency and will realise that singing obscene songs about the deaths of others is absolutely unacceptable, regardless of the tribal rivalry often associated with football or their supposed passion for the game, which is sometimes pathetically used to mask offensive chanting’ (Smith, 2011:208). The minority, who do not abide to these simple rules of moral righteousness, are likely to derive from the hooligan subculture due to infamous characteristics of rebellion and violence. The hyper-
masculinity of these individuals can therefore be seen as a dominant feature in the hooligan personality.

The removal of the terraces in the vast majority of football grounds throughout England, especially in the higher tiers of English football, has proved to reduce some of these derogatory chants, but has not completely eradicated them. ‘The terrace provided an open space in which it was easy to create an ecstatic solidarity’ which is now ‘hard for the lads to gain’ (King, 2001:161).

Regarding the leadership of the hooligan, conflict can emphasise ‘people working together to identify their own needs, nurture their own leadership skills and knowledge and organise their own strategies’ (Robinson and Green, 2010:16). Hooligans work together to identify rival firms, and through time, the leadership of certain individuals will develop and become prominent, potentially later organising their firm’s strategic planning. This display of solidarity is a noticeable characteristic of the hooligan due to a common goal of unity and gaining respect, but also inducing fear into rival firms.

However, this element of strategic and organised planning is not always successful – ‘the reason for the failure of many co-operative attempts at criminality is that the individuals lack self control’, and hooligan firms often ‘consists of unstable temporary alliances’ (Bernard, Snipes and Gerould, 2010:217). A hooligan’s lack of self-control, coupled with a love for malicious disobedience, can be seen in some incidents to be a self-induced downfall of the hooligan.

A documentation of this lack of self-control is the hooligan’s naivety towards the police. ‘You don’t attack the police – unless, it follows, you are able to beat them up so effectively that it is then impossible to get arrested’ (Buford, 1992:184). The realistic chance of committing such a crime, and not paying the consequences is extremely slim. The hooligan may possibly defend these types of actions down to elements of police brutality and prejudice. However, perhaps if
hooligans displayed improved self-control and leadership skills, resisting to engage in violent behaviour in particular instances, then the subculture may not have risen to such high exposure as it is today. Nevertheless, it can be argued that, due to the large element of pride involved within the hooligan, this is not in the best interest of the subculture.

5.4 Drugs and Alcohol

Both the use of illicit and legal drugs, most notably alcohol, are infamously identified with the football hooligan. Deriving initially from the Madchester and Acid House scene of the 1980s, illicit drugs gives a sense of ‘euphoria and energy’ (Vick and Rhoades, 2010:37) to the hooligan. Ecstasy usage among hooligans is common, with red and black ecstasy capsules, ‘known as Manchester United or Dennis the Menace’ (Forsyth, 1997:245), or blue pills, known as ‘Blue Adidas’, (Pill Reports, 2015) being a common choice of consumption. Cocaine is also a popular option as it helps individuals ‘to perform as better and more ferocious fighters, while providing the courage and clarity of mind needed to engage in confrontation’ (Ayres and Treadwell, 2012:90).

However, the modern hooligan places far more attention to the consumption of alcohol, with a ‘local tradition of spectators drinking freely in pubs near the ground’ (Dickens et al., 1968:17). Being ‘readily available’ (Hopkins-Burke, 2013:101) makes the ‘heavy alcohol consumption prior to the football matches’ (Gartner, 2013:4) a common occurrence, as well as on the way, during, and after a match. Often, the consumption of large quantities may help explain the anti-social behaviour that is characteristic of the hooligan. This is demonstrated by Parker and Auerhahn (1998:291), who claim that ‘there is substantial evidence to suggest that alcohol use is significantly associated with violence of all kinds’.
The ‘traditional English public-house’ (Monckton, 1969:129) has its own unique sense of nationalism behind it. Whilst some consider it to be a ‘dying breed’ (Johnstone et al., 2004:276), ‘it’s centrality in football culture certainty hasn’t changed’ (Martinez and Mukharji, 2008:23) in England, with the pub providing a place ‘where the holy trinity of alcohol, football and male bonding com[e] together’ – characteristics of which strike distinct resemblances with the hooligan.

The most popular choices of alcohol for hooligans are ‘Carlsberg, Heineken and Stella’ (Wenner and Jackson, 2008:68), preferred as cheaper alternatives to Italian imports Peroni or Birra Moretti. Stella Artois later acquired a stigma and became known as a ‘wife beater’ (Wenner and Jackson, 2008:68) due to the supposed relationship between its consumption and violence – a typical trait of the hooligan, which may have contributed to this label. This later transferred itself into football stadiums in the form of derogatory chants: ‘would you like another stella Georgie Best, would you like another stella cos your face is turning yella’ (Bremner, 2004:133), directed at footballing legend George Best who was known for having alcohol problems.

Although it has been proposed that there is a strong link between alcohol consumption and violence - alcohol is known to ‘temporarily increase aggressive behaviour’ (Blucher, 2003:11) - this can be questioned as not all football hooliganism involves alcohol. The majority of research conducted in the past has focused on the football supporters being the hooligans. However, as a result of the lack of clarity surrounding the definition of football hooliganism, it can be proposed that football hooliganism could involve football players and coaching staff themselves, and therefore not uniquely a supporter phenomenon. Incidents include John Terry racially abusing Anton Ferdinand in a match between Chelsea and Queens Park Rangers in 2011, calling him a ‘fucking black cunt’ (Davies, 2012). Further examples include the 2006 World Cup final between France and Italy where Zinedine Zidane ‘head butted Marco Materazzi’ (Football Bible, 2016)
and also Luis Suárez’ multiple conflicts, known for ‘biting opponents’ (The Telegraph, 2014) on three separate occasions, as well as racially abusing fellow footballer Patrice Evra. Finally, Jose Mourinho, during the 2015/2016 Premier League season, was heavily fined and had a number of stadium bans due to ‘misconduct regarding his language and/or behaviour towards the match officials’ (Todd, 2015). These incidents show elements of violence, anger and testosterone induced individuals, all of which characterise the stereotype and stigma associated with football hooligans, insinuating ‘the value of winning may become such a seductive goal that all thoughts of moral behaviour are temporarily put aside’ (Woods, 2011:180).

It is clear there are strong links between the hooligan and alcohol, with illicit drugs also being prevalent. These relationships may help to explain the link that football hooligans possess towards violence.
6.0 What makes the Modern English Football Hooligan? The Final Definition And Model – The Conclusion

In conclusion, it is transparent that the phenomenon encompassing football hooligans consists of multiple dimensions, and is not something that can easily be defined. Football hooliganism is continuing to evolve and adapt to the many constraints that modern day society faces - exemplified by the world we live in – as time passes, opinions and situations on entities continue to change.

As of April 2016, no legally, national accepted definition exists of football hooliganism in England. As well as producing a wide range of confusion and uncertainty to the immediate public regarding which crimes are characteristic of the football hooligan, these elements of doubt are sure to transcend to criminal justice agencies working on behalf of the country, such as the police and the government. Indecision and hesitancy is highly probable due to this substantial crack in the Criminal Justice System and it must therefore be noted as to how a country can efficiently and effectively reduce a crime to the best of its ability if the country itself does not know explicitly what it is trying to tackle and reduce.

Although football-related crime statistics have appeared to reduce, as a result of the lack of clarity regarding these undefined crimes, how can one be sure that, in fact, football hooliganism has reduced, if there is uncertainty as to what this even is? While it is highly likely, documented by evidence in this research, that football hooliganism is in fact a decreasing phenomenon, this can only be reliably concluded if clear criteria are defined and produced.

Previous attempts to analyse and explain what characterises the football hooligan are weak and insufficient in depth. Few have attempted to create a contemporary definition for football hooliganism, with some describing the phenomenon as dead or in the past. It is clear from this research that this is not the case and therefore seems to be an excuse as a result of its publicly perceived decline.
Whilst well-respected academics on football hooliganism have recognised the absence of a precise definition, acknowledging that there is a wide range of behavioural and other variables involved, Dunning, Frosdick and Marsh have failed to create their own definition as to what this comprises. Therefore, this noticeable crack within the armour of the Criminal Justice System will continue to expand until this issue is adequately addressed. Consequently, the core of this research has been to create a contemporary definition and model of what modern football hooliganism embodies in April 2016, whilst recognising its transition over time.

Before arriving at these conclusions and ultimately the final definition of football hooliganism, however, it must be appreciated as to the complexity of this crime and how it is completely necessary to rigorously scrutinise the phenomenon to ensure a representative viewpoint. Therefore the definition is highly extensive.

After taking everything into consideration, football hooliganism can be defined as:

“A convoluted phenomenon that embodies a multiplex of dimensions; criminological theories differ as to why this circumstance occurs, with emphasis being placed on the biology of the individual, calculated reasoning and many more alternative hypotheses. Characterised by the incapacity of desistance and the cult and ideology of a football-centred religion, the philosophy of the football hooligan, who is almost exclusively male and from a mixture of both a working class and middle class background, is an individual who engages in prolonged consumption of alcohol, often coupled by the embodiment of cold blooded violence - violence of which can be exhibited by the players on the football pitch as well as the coaching staff, and not just predominantly a supporter phenomenon that has been formerly customary associated; although this encompasses a significant part of the sensation. Arriving at a stadium when intoxicated or in the possession of alcohol, the projection of object stimuli, the
ignition of pyrotechnics, pitch invasions, abusive and immoral chants, racist insults, ticket touting and the possession of alcohol on coaches or trains on the way to a football match, all encapsulate the modern football hooligan football-related offences. Although a phenomenon largely in decline, its prominence can be demonstrated by the substantial numbers still existing on the Football Banning Authority Order’s register and statistics on football-related arrests - displaying the influence of the UK Football Policing Unit. The fashion of the hooligan places high emphasis on clothing, with brands such as C.P Company and Peaceful Hooligan showing strong bonds towards the modern hooligan. Cocaine and ecstasy are commonly used illicit drug substances; however emphasis has moved away from the club scene and hairstyles, with a rejuvenation of the skinhead haircut as standard procedure. Expressing a hyper-masculine personality, the hooligan encompasses the vitality of recognising the solidarity and strategic planning in the unity of leadership. This is expressed through a subculture in the form of hooligan firms that demonstrate their juggernaut, savagery and sadistic behaviour through ferocious confrontations with rival firms. It is clear that the football hooligan is a unique brand of entity.”

This definition of football hooliganism can be incorporated into its own interchanging model, demonstrated by Appendix F. ‘The Cycle of Football Hooliganism’ illustrates how football hooliganism has changed over time, and therefore can be corroborated alongside the definition of football hooliganism to create a representative contemporary visual of the phenomenon.

The model illustrates an overview of the past thirty years of football hooliganism and how, as the years have progressed, football hooliganism has decreased, and in the past, football hooliganism was more prominent. In the present day, a positive domino effect in reducing football hooliganism can be seen. Football-related legislation, increased policing with emphasis on problem orientated
policing, increased surveillance – largely in the form of CCTV cameras, and football club initiatives, such as the removal of terraces and installation of perimeter fences, have all been utilised to combat the modern hooligan. Previous awareness regarding hooligan behaviour in the government and football clubs was low, and therefore created a negative domino effect in terms of the resources available to the police – vast abundance of support and resources are not given to the police if the issue is perceived to be small. This, coupled with the lack of technology for modern CCTV cameras, ensured that the hooligan thirty years ago had a much greater possibility of committing acts of football hooliganism, without having to face the consequences.

The definition of football hooliganism, combined with ‘the cycle of football hooliganism’, is desired to address the underlying crux of the question over ‘what makes the modern English football hooligan’, as these represent the broad spheres over which the phenomenon encapsulates. It is clear that, while the phenomenon has significantly changed and adapted, for some, the nostalgic thrill and onus of being a football hooligan is a lifestyle rather than just a short-term interest.
7.0 Recommendations

It is with expectation and ambition that this research has contributed to addressing the crack within the Criminal Justice System and criminological theory surrounding football hooliganism. Although it is unlikely that the definition and model provided on contemporary football hooliganism will be utilised by policy makers, it is hoped that this research has provided a contribution to the criminological sphere. A gap has been addressed and, if recognised, this research can be seen as ‘a breakthrough’ in some sense.

Carroll (1980:77) suggests that ‘both a number of short-term preventative measures and longer-term societal changes need to be carried out’ to help eliminate football hooliganism. This combination of shorter-term measures, such as problem orientated policing, and longer-term measures, such as legislative changes, tackle the phenomenon from different angles.

An essential recommendation is the arrival of a legislative definition clarifying football hooliganism, its root causes and what exactly makes the modern football hooligan. Confusion will be avoided for academics, policy makers and the public, as well as providing clarity regarding the criminal law.

As a result, the government, the police and football clubs could further eradicate hooligan behaviour by efficiently implementing policy and practice, continuing to contribute to the decline of the phenomenon. Additional research into the subject could further reduce the current 2,181 banning orders in force prior to the 2015/2016 season. Although, like any crime, the overall aim is to eradicate the occurrence completely, this is highly improbable, as there will always be ‘risk takers’ in society, willing and thriving on breaking the rules. However, if an increase of research was conducted, then further implementations and policies could be put into practice, alongside current deterrence measures such as CCTV.
cameras. The crime has the potential to become something that is so infrequent, that it is ‘barely visible’.

Although substantial amounts of research have been orchestrated in the history of football hooliganism, with some even suggesting ‘that football hooliganism has been over searched’ (Forsyth and Copes, 2014:347), little research has been conducted in the modern day, in comparison. Ethic’s committees in the modern day often prevent the utilisation of the qualitative data paradigm, and therefore this ‘rich’ data has been neglected over recent years, with much more emphasis placed upon numerical quantitative data. Although quantitative data can be useful, it cannot provide the same breadth of data in terms of quantity, and therefore modern research on the topic has been over-simplistic.

Government funded and ethically approved initiatives, working with academic experts studying modern football hooliganism, would be an appropriate method for continuing research - potentially contributing to a national definition of modern football hooliganism and the characteristics of the football hooligan. By interviewing past and current football hooligans, some of which may be in prison, covert surveillance operations and participant observation experiments could supply a large amount of primary data encircling football hooliganism, perhaps providing a fresh insight of information of which is yet to be studied in great depth.

Self-funded initiatives, independent from the government, are unlikely to have the financial resources, capability or ethical guidelines in practice to take part in such research, and therefore this can be seen as a vital recommendation.

The continued research into football hooliganism could have a vital influence on society, as football hooligans are not the only victims of their acts - their influence in society transcends to others outside their immediate locality.
It is distinctly and unambiguously explicit from this research that the phenomenon of football hooliganism is on the decline. However, as of April 2016, the football hooligan is still considered a relatively ordinary sensation, and will continue to be until further research, time and wealth are undertaken towards a continued speculative and indefinite crime.
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