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Abstract

For more than 15 years we can witness a growing influence of the European Union on the governance of football in Europe. We argue that Europeanization processes in the area of sport have also set in motion processes of change on the level of identities and thus constitute a new reality in European football.

Several drivers have tentatively been identified in that respect, such as the influence of a more ‘European’ nationality regime across the (major) European leagues, with the best players often stemming from other European/EU countries, or the success of the Champions League brand (e.g. in terms of match attendance, broadcasting rates, and general prestige attached to it), which is the result of transnational Europeanization processes. We argue that such Europeanizing mechanisms have also left their mark on sports fans, i.e. the main consumers sport. In many respects, sport is an ideal carrier of identity change because it draws on the emotional level/investment of the supporter, which has been regarded as important in socialization and norm/value changing processes.

In contrast, however, sports as a medium for identity change has so far largely been ignored in the field of European Integration Studies. Although the wider public has already been subject to research on European-wide identity change, it is most often political opinions, knowledge of political institutions, values held as well as evaluations of the European integration process which have formed the base of empirical analysis within such identity-related research frameworks. Our project in turn is to tackle football supporters as a specific public within Europe. The paper constitutes a pilot study of a larger project and tentatively hints at two things. First, it wants to shed some light on the possibilities to research the extent to which the Europeanization of football has also affected supporters’ identities. Second, it attempts to sketch a framework which relates such research to the wider questions of European identity change.
The past two decades have been marked by a growing influence of the European Union on the governance of football (Garcia 2011; Parrish 2011), be that in the form of an actor or as policy venue through which various stakeholders have sought to further their respective and specific interests. Based on that observation, we have labeled some of the concomitant dynamics the “Europeanization” of football (e.g. Niemann/Brand 2007; Brand/Niemann 2011; Niemann, Garcia and Grant 2011; Brand/Niemann/Spitaler 2012).

As by now a widely used concept, “Europeanization” back then mostly referred to domestic change as regards “policy substance” (here: the contours of sports policy through ECJ rulings for instance), instruments, institutions as well as processes of interest representation (stakeholders within the field of sports policy, how they pursue their agendas, e.g. regards broadcasting rights) as a result of EU-level legislation and political decision-making (cf. Radaelli 2000; Ladrech 1994). Hence, such a more traditional take on Europeanization concerned itself primarily with questions of where, how, why, and the extent to which EU integration and governance at the European level precipitates domestic change in the area of football. We argued that it is necessary to transcend (not to wholly abandon) such a narrow conception on two grounds. First, Europeanization should not – neither exclusively nor primarily – be regarded to be purely unidirectional. Rather it can be seen as a two-way-process developing both from the bottom up as from the top down. Hence, bottom-up accounts which highlight the influence of actors at the national levels, action from and within various national contexts may have exerted considerable influence on European-level developments as well. It is in that sense, that Europeanization should be conceptualized as a mixture of downloading and uploading, also with regard to sports and football as distinct policy fields. Second, the Europeanization of football resembles a two-track process (Brand/Niemann/Spitaler 2012) which means that next to EU-level developments there is also a sphere of change that is related to European integration in a very wide understanding, but not reducible to what happens at the EU level. Thus, we directed the attention to a transnational dimension in which actions of societal actors such as football clubs, football associations or the media (undoubtedly within the context of EU regulation) have contributed to the constructing of transnational spaces. Such dynamics can be labeled crossloading, also referred to as the ‘transnational’ dimension of Europeanization (e.g. the emergence of the Champions League and the eventual formation of transnational networks of clubs, supporters etc.).

In our analyses of of German football (e.g. Brand/Niemann 2011) and Austrian football respectively (Brand/Niemann/Spitaler 2011), we have thus singled out five distinct Europeanization dynamics with different mixtures of up-, down- and crossloading:
1) Bosman I (the ‘nationality issue’), i.e. the formative influence of the ECJ ruling – and subsequent rulings (Simutenkov etc.) – on the composition of the respective national players’ markets and the composition of the squads, mostly in professional football;

2) Bosman II (the overhaul of the transfer regime), i.e. the impact of the second provision of the Bosman ruling which led to a process of political debate and re-regulation at the level of global football governance entailing a lot of activism on behalf of football stakeholders as well as national political actors, especially in the case of Germany;

3) Broadcasting Rights, i.e. a somewhat similar process in which some impetus at the EU level – here, the Commissions’ investigation into the practice of selling broadcasting rights collectively at the beginning of the 2000s – led to political haggling, lobbying, the formation of policy coalitions etc. and, in the end, to the closure of the case by the Commission itself (partly because various stakeholders had been successfully presenting their arguments, partly because some concessions had been made to introduce elements of competition);

4) the establishment of the Champions League and, by that, the evolution of European club competition towards the formation of a de facto pan-European league\(^1\); as this constitutes a qualitative break with the former format of European club competition given the fairly high level of continuity, we argued transnational forces had created a space of relatively dense and regular interaction among top clubs;

5) parallel to that, the evolution of new forms of European transnational sports lobbying groups (in which, e.g., top German clubs were heavily involved); as we argued, this created an additional layer of Europeanization dynamics not least since frequent interaction led to a gradual/temporary convergence of the agendas of top club officials (G-14 from 2000-08, to a lesser degree its successor ECA since 2008).

Through our analyses, another theme at some points surfaced which captured our attention but could not really be substantiated. As we compiled some tentative evidence that the frequent interaction of club officials as well as other high ranking football functionaries might have altered their perspectives and viewpoints we asked ourselves whether such by-products of the ongoing Europeanization of football were restricted to the elite level or could be detected at the level of spectators and fans alike. That would not be a trivial phenomenon given the degree of emotional involvement of fans on the one hand as well as the sheer size of football spectatorship and fandom on the other. Hence, a promising future avenue of research would be to inquire whether the ongoing Europeanisation of governance structures of football and

\(^1\) The mechanism is aptly explained by Pawlowski et al. (2010: 199): “Successful clubs obtain ever-increasing payouts from persistent CL appearances, which allow them to further dominate domestic league competitions, in turn increasing the probability of appearing in the CL again in the future.”
concomitant processes of down- up- and crossloading has also effected changes at the level of fans’ perceptions and supporters’ and spectators’ identities.

The main underlying idea in this is that “identities” as projections of self also entail perceptions of membership (of a certain community), criteria for oneself and others to belong to this in-group (who is regarded as alien, exotic, outside etc., who not) as well as spatial concepts (what is the primary a/o preferred sphere of action, what is the main frame of reference). In that sense, it might not be trivial when German fans cheer Dutch players and accept them as “theirs” or when, as one colleague once remarked, it might be of more relevance for a Liverpool supporter what happens at Barça than what is going on in Stoke. Gradually changing perception patterns might also be indicative of an emerging collective European identity, at least the Europeanization of such identities, anchored in cultural and lifeworldy practices.

**Europeanization and drivers of identity change**

We argue, then, that Europeanization in the area of football might also have set in motion processes of change at the level of identities and thus constitutes a new reality in European football. Of the five processes sketched above, we have, in a first step, identified two which might be of predominant importance in this regard: the influence of a more ‘European(ized)’ nationality regime across the (major) European leagues, with the best players often stemming from other European/EU countries, and the Champions League as a European-wide competition with a quasi-league format. Hence, it is the relatively stable pattern of competition of top teams at the European level, also a success in terms of brand popularity and therefore match attendance, broadcasting rates, and general prestige, which interests us. In what follows, both phenomena are taken to be drivers of identity change.

On the one hand, to hypothesize about the impact of how squads are composed regarding the emergence of a more cosmopolitan “consciousness” is not novel. In their path-breaking article, Levermore and Millward already in 2007 pointed to the plausible idea that “[t]he arrival of non-national heroes potentially creates cosmopolitan Europeanization of elite local teams” (Levermore/Millward 2007: 151). If that effect really holds, we suggest that the Europeanization of players markets might also Europeanize the mindsets of the respective spectators. Note that this is somewhat different from fancying a foreign player which has of course been not unusual at European football grounds prior to the Bosman ruling as well. What we have in mind is that there could have set in some kind of a ‘normalizing’ effect with regard to other European players precisely in such a way that they are less likely to be regarded as foreigners/exotic players anymore. If, as we have demonstrated in the German case, the internationalization post-Bosman has effected, to a considerable degree, a “Europeanization” of players markets in terms of countries of origin, this might also
have altered the way “we-ness” and “other-ness” is defined in the eyes of the spectators/fans.

On the other hand, it seems hard to overlook the success of the Champions League not only in economic and business terms (broadcasting revenues, advertisement revenues, the clubs’ income structure, branding effects [Holt 2007] etc.) but also with regard to match attendance, broadcasting rates and general prestige attached to it. The latter issues being of course, interesting from our angle, phenomena related to practices and lifeworlds of spectators. In that sense, the establishment of a de facto European League (as against a cup competition format) should also have left its mark on the spectators’ minds. What we focus on is whether their respective frames of reference (reputational issues, national vs. European-wide competition, why is it important to qualify, where do fans look for competitor/peer clubs etc.) have been changed. Any Europeanization of identities in this case would certainly result in a ‘de-privileging’ of national frames.

In 2000, King hypothesized that “[t]he growing connections between the big city clubs of Europe and the increasing frequency of their encounters on the pitch, which are watched on television by millions across Europe is an important factor in European integration” (King 2000: 423). Although we generally share this impression, we would like to put a question mark behind the statement and instead ask first, how and in what ways European integration is affected. It seems to be the case that fans and spectators throughout Europe assign a high level of attractiveness to the Champions League. In a (non-representative) poll in 2011, more than 50,000 readers of the German sport magazine “Kicker” rated the Champions League of comparatively very high attractiveness: It got a 1.47 on a 6-point scale with “1” being the highest score possible (interestingly, the ascribed attractiveness has not always been on that level, in the first season, the respective value was 2.81!). For the British context, again Levermore and Millward have analyzed viewpoints of Liverpool supporters in the mid-2000s. Their findings indicate that at that point Liverpool fans not only stated that their “aim” for the club was to qualify for the Champions League, but that such articulations were occasionally coupled with comments that only competition at the CL-level would mean to be among the ranks of the “big clubs” (Levermore/Millward 2007: 151). Hence, in terms of reputation, to be on board in the European club tournament is regarded as a must, being one of the European (not “just” the British) powerhouses is deemed important. Although one should be careful not to attach too much weight to such statements they might nevertheless be indicative of the trend that the Champions League might also have an impact on how fans (of top teams, to be precise) perceive their club and the game in general, but also how they approach the wider social context (“Europe” might be, from the standpoint of such a British fan, more acceptable, albeit in a fuzzy manner, if club competition at the European level is deemed a must in terms of reputation as well).
Last but not least, our hypothesis that the aforementioned Europeanizing mechanisms have also left their mark on sports fans, i.e. the main consumers of sport, is grounded in the assumption that such developments are hardly trivial or politically of lesser importance. To the contrary, it is precisely the context of such ordinary, lifeworldly activities, in which identity dynamics occur, often with lasting repercussions. In many respects, sport and especially football seems to be an ideal carrier of identity change because it draws on supporters’ emotional investment, which has been regarded as important in socialization and norm/value changing processes. As fandom research states: “[f]andom matters because it matters to those who are fans... [it is] more than the mere act of being a fan of something: ... it is a collective strategy, a communal effort to form interpretive communities” (Gray et al. 2007, 1p.).

Identity change, Europeanizing identities and European identity

“Identity change” gains political importance against the background of the nowadays burgeoning research on European identity formation. The difference of our approach taken here is that it is not the formation of – in a stricter sense – transnational political identities or identities that are geared towards the political institution or the political integration project of the EU which are of interest.

Inquiry into European collective identity has become another growth industry, not least in the wake of the constitution process, growing levels of euroskepticism and diverging elite and popular conceptions about the course of European integration. Although there have been several forays into such identity dynamics in Europe, different strands of research share a commitment to rather traditional political questions:

- research into the potentials for a common European identity grounded on shared values, normative ideas and convictions (see the discussion in Kaelble 2010:

---

2 A somewhat related recent strand of research looks into the phenomenon of foreign, or better: transnational fandom, i.e. what it means to be a fan of a team in another country, especially in terms of motivations and identity-related questions. Thus, data of the Institute for Sports, Business and Society ISBS on favorite foreign clubs among Europeans hints to the fact that fandom in the ranks of top clubs is hardly confined to local or national “home bases”. 29% of non-Spaniards polled named Barça as their preferred club in Europe indicating that it is a club that is widely acclaimed throughout whole Europe. Likewise, Millward (2011: 79) in his analysis of data on overseas Liverpool supporters makes clear that transnational fandom is not a diaspora phenomenon as one could think at first. Motivations such as “media coverage available”, “style of play” and “success” were far more often given than “my family used to support” or “have a personal connection”. Transnational fandom is, as has been said, related to our approach, especially in case transnational fan communities across Europe are subject to research. In a very general sense, the questioning of what it means to fancy and support a team in another country might also be employed to underscore the identity dimension; transnational fans might be seen to act, consciously or not, as sort of identity entrepreneurs. (Not in the sense of enforcing a certain “politics of identity”, see on that concept of identity entrepreneurship e.g. Reicher et al. 2005 and Thomas et al. 2005.)
203pp.) or shared ethical self-understandings (Kantner 2006) nevertheless focus on *immediately politically* relevant aspects such as: who belongs to the community, on which values shall a European legal and political framework be constructed;

- explorations of the public identification with Europe are more often than not directed at the “identity potential of the EU” (Gillespie/Laffan 2006: 143pp.; Fligstein 2010; Sackmann 2011), i.e. they usually seek to determine the degree to which publics *do identify with the political project*, institutions and symbols of the Union on the base of Eurobarometer data;

- examinations of the eventual emergence of a European(-wide) public sphere as an infrastructural base for a collective identity have tended to look for the convergence of *news agendas, political coverage and frames* that are covered by mass media throughout Europe (Koopmans/Staham 2010; Risse 2010: 113-119, 127-156).

Against this background it is not too far-fetched to state that explorations of a European identity so far focus predominantly, if not exclusively on perceptions, knowledge and evaluations of rather strictly political issues. In contrast, our focus is on changing spatial orientations, notions of inside/outside, frames of reference etc. in a field of *leisure-time* activities, ‘low politics’ in that sense. Another asset in this regard is the fact, established through a body of research in Sports Studies and History, that “football cultures” usually exhibit heavily nationally pillarized structures, especially regarding the cognitive dimension. If the emergence of pan-European tournaments of top clubs, of competition patterns in the European realm and of networks as well as organizations at the European level has a “normalizing effect”, i.e. if it has become *normal* to watch competitors at the European level, to be interested in sports policy at the *European* level and to *form networks* at the European level etc., we could have detected identity change under rather adverse circumstances, i.e. a hard, or least-likely case (cf. Odell 2001).

To summarize, the task is to overcome a paradox:

First, although the actual ‘micro’ level of individual lives is arguably of decisive importance for identity dynamics, it remains under-researched in the context of studies aimed at exploring a collective European identity. Even if aspects of the everyday life of Europeans are deemed important in such works on European identity formation, in the end, most attention is given to sentiments among the citizens of Europe concerning any support for a *European nation* (see Fligstein 2010: 154pp.) etc. Hence, the micro level, if it is subject to investigation, is reduced to specific thematic issues which usually do not figure prominently in the lives of many Europeans. There may be attempts at a “politicization of European identities” (Checkel/Katzenstein 2010); but one could always question, which issue happens to be more in the minds of Europeans – constitutional patriotism towards the Community Treaties or Champions League finals. Consequently, cultural, seemingly non-political practices and
interactions within societal fields arguably play a fundamental role – however under-researched. In turn, the formation of perspectives and changes in perceptions effected in such day-to-day contexts might have a politically relevant impact.

If one takes a very wide notion of identity with non-contested features of any identity definition such as: identity is a form of self-understanding which is social, relational and continuously (re-) constructed and narrated (e.g. Gillespie/Laffan 2006), certain conclusions follow. For instance, it is important, in which wider social network/community the self is seen as embedded, what the prevailing conceptions of community is and who belongs to it, which sphere of agency, attention and belonging is defined. Hence, our idea of “identity change” in the direction of more Europeanized identities through football would emphasize the following dynamics:

- has there been a change of cognitive frames articulated in how spectators/fans approach football in general as well as the situation of their club;
  - in terms of nationalities (communities of belonging): have alterations of the players market left its mark on perceptions of being “foreign” or has a normalization effect set in, i.e. is the foreignness of European players a topic; how do they approach the structure of the players’ market in general;
  - in terms of spatial frames of reference: which significance is attached to European-level competition as against national competition and what reasons are given for the respective appreciations; how do they perceive the situatedness of their club; is football governance at the European level a topic, how is it addressed (if at all), and what is the perception of Europeanization in the downloading mode;
  - in terms of communities of belonging: is there an increased level of interaction and networking among fans/spectators across European borders (which parallels the developments at the level of club officials); how do protagonists reflect on such forms of networking.

Remainder: Researching identity change – methodological issues and methods

How to research identity? How to research identity matters (not to speak of dynamics) among football spectators and fans alike? As we approach the issue as one of perceptions and self-understandings, we have to focus on instances of articulation. Mainly two types of data spring to mind (on their combined use in analysing identity dynamics, see Risse 2010: 34p.): discourse analysis (here, of chat forums) and survey/interview research (among selected fan groups).

The general argument of their usefulness regarding the football/identity nexus has already been established. As Millward’s account (2011: 76pp.) underlines, analysing chat forum contributions might offer valuable clues on how supporters perceive
themselves in relation to the club, the game in general and the wider social context. Levermore and Millward (2007: 153) have even made clear that the examination of messages in e-message boards might be helpful in elucidating whether “forms of European(ized) consciousness” have already seeped into fan discourse. This is, as our preliminary research informs us, a very rosy view of things which cannot easily be generalized. There is, for instance, far less discussion of either EU-legislation and -policymaking (ECJ rulings, not least Bosman which otherwise seems to have become part of common sense folklore) in such chat fora than we had expected. Also, European-wide developments such as the Financial Fairplay-Debate hardly seem to spur debates online. (In one chat forum of Bayern Munich, the German team with the most continuous attendance at CL-level, Financial Fair Play has a small thread with 7 entries throughout the last 1,5 years; ECJ’s Murphy ruling, hotly debated in the quality press last October, seems almost a non-topic (according to our research so far)).

In the wider context of debates on Champions League-related issues, only meagre results turned out as well. What is more, they need to be interpreted and contextualized heavily. Hence, if we find in one chat forum (of Man City supporters) a thread on the attractiveness of the Champions League, title “Do we really want Champions League” and the first entry starts with the utterance:

“What is the attraction [sic] of being involved with those cheating bastards from mainland Europe?”

– what to do with this? On one level, it completely contradicts our expectations (a result, nevertheless), but again, it is only a single utterance. Others respond:

“Money, recognition, best players in world playing for your team, but I get your point it is sad to watch at times and pure money driven.”

Again, a heavy dose of contextualization would be necessary to relate such utterances to identity questions.

---

3 A counter hypothesis might be that increasing levels of commercialization, part of which we dubbed elements of “Europeanization”, have led to more localized, more de-internationalized (=criticism of the “modern football” as some ultras would say) forms of support. However, as Kuper and Szymanksi put it in their famous book “Soccernomics”: “Spectators vote with their feet. It’s certainly not the case that millions of them are abandoning the Premier League because the money offends them. Based on the evidence of what they go to watch, they want to see the best players competing against each other. Many people will say they find Manchester United evil. Not many seem to find them boring” (2009: 177). In that sense, it appears to us that counter movements so far have not gained enough momentum to outweigh Europeanization/commercialization.

4 See http://www.rekordmeister.org/forum/viewtopic.php?f=33&t=250. This might not be the most popular a/o frequented chat forum but other venues such as http://www.bayernkurve.de display even less results.

5 http://smf.citymancs.com/forum/index.php?topic=20994.0
It is in this sense that we have come to the point where we consider survey/interview data generated by a pilot survey among football supporters of (two) selected football clubs probably a more fruitful approach. Interviews should allow for more in-depth explorations of perceptions and self-understandings. Supporters may hold opinions, think about issues etc., but these are not necessarily the *hot topics* to post in chat forums.\(^6\) Hence, in terms of researching identity dynamics and change, interviews may present us with the opportunity to get more of a grip on identity *repertoires* (see on that e.g. Risse 2010: 34) on behalf of the supporters.

In case the pilot study produces relevant material, we strive for widening the research across several national contexts/cases in order to have enough scope for comparison. Our sample would be formed according to the following parameters and different specifications on each axis across the cases:

- Europhile publics vs. Eurosceptic publics (controlling for the effect of the wider social context);
- long-standing EU-membership of home country vs. newcomer (controlling for the effect of EU socialization);
- size of the country/league within Europe (standing in political as well as sports terms);
- participation in top level European club tournaments (depth, frequency of interaction);
- internationalization/Europeanization of players market.
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\(^6\) The same is the case with „too“ controversial issues where semi-structured interviews have been found a promising way to uncover perceptions among football supporters (Havelund et al. 2011).


