

ISSN 2040-5847

SPORT & EU
REVIEW

the Review of the Association
for the Study of Sport & the European Union

Volume 7 — Issue 1 — June 2015

Sport&EU Review

Copyright © 2015 by Sport&EU, The Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union: <http://www.sportandeu.com>. ISSN 2040-5847.

Sport&EU Review is indexed in EBSCOhost and International Platform of Sports Law Journals.

Co-Editors: Alexander Brand and Arne Niemann

Editorial Assistant: Lukas Prinz

Editorial contact information and book review correspondence: review@sportandeu.com.

Sport&EU Review is published two times per year, in Spring/Summer and Autumn/Winter.

Guidelines for contributors

Sport&EU Review invites submissions for peer-reviewed articles, legal commentaries, forum contributions and proposals for themed special issues for publication. Contributions should reflect the general interests of the Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union.

* Sport&EU Review aims to provide coverage of the full range of issues relevant to the study of sport and the European Union. These will include, but are not limited to governance, social and policy studies, communication, economy, sociology, legal and management issues in European sport. Sport&EU Review also welcomes work with comparative or international perspectives.

* Sport&EU Review publishes two forms of longer articles: research articles and legal commentaries. Research articles should be up to 7,000 words in length while legal commentaries should normally be about 5,000 words in length. Research articles may represent research in progress, discussion of research methodologies, or other scholarly work that is of interest to the readership. Legal commentaries present a legal issue pertinent to European sports law in a concise and accessible manner. Contributions from postgraduate research students are also welcome.

* Papers intended for peer review (research articles and legal commentaries) will be reviewed by at least two anonymous referees. In order to facilitate the review process, manuscripts must have been proofread by a native speaker before submission. They should be written in British English. In terms of referencing, authors of research articles should follow the [APA Formatting and Style guide \(6th edition\)](#), while legal texts should – especially regarding cases, legislation and statutes – follow the [OSCOLA style](#). Authors are welcome to include relevant hyperlinks into their contributions, though such hyperlinks shall not substitute accurate citation and references lists at the end of the manuscripts. Each paper should have an abstract of 200 words and a maximum of five key words.

* For the two issues per volume, the following deadlines apply concerning research articles and legal commentaries:

	Spring/Summer issue	Autumn/Winter issue
Deadline for submissions	30 November	31 May
Deadline for revised submissions (after review)	1 March	1 September
Publication	April-June	October- November

* Forum contributions are shorter, usually up to 1,000 words including references. They are not peer-reviewed, but are intended as short items of general interest to the readership of Sport&EU Review. These include, but are not limited to debate/opinion pieces, conference reports, calls for papers, brief updates on key developments in the field and reviews of publications. Concerning language standards and style of referencing, the same guidelines as for longer contributions apply. Forum contributions, however, follow a slightly different schedule; they have to be submitted by 31 January (Spring/Summer issue) and 31 July (Autumn/Winter) to allow for eventual smaller revisions.

* Sport&EU Review anticipates that a considerable proportion of papers first presented in Sport&EU Review will subsequently be developed for publication elsewhere and that its review process will be used as a step towards publication of a final paper elsewhere. This is to be encouraged. Whilst Sport&EU Review will retain the right to publish contributions in their original form, authors remain free to develop their contributions further in other forms, provided Sport&EU Review is acknowledged.

1. EDITORIAL

As we are witnessing *interesting* times concerning the governance of sport (especially football these days), this issue of the Sport&EU Review seems to have been put together with some degree of foresight in terms of the recently culminating developments. Not that SEUR does not always attempt to be at the cutting edge of research and commentary; yet the contributions to this issue were *not* orchestrated with a view to the growing allegations and turmoil surrounding FIFA practices. Be that as it may, the submissions we received for this issue are all topical and timely.

In their research article, Arnout Geeraert and Edith Drieskens focus on EU control of FIFA and UEFA. Borrowing from principal-agent approaches, their paper indicates that the EU has the capacity to limit the autonomy of both organisations. Their study offers original insights into the EU's control over both these organisations by mapping the actors and instruments that mark EU control of FIFA and UEFA and by considering their activation and mitigation. Geeraert and Drieskens argue that theory-informed research constitutes a stepping-stone for the development of a scientific yet policy-supporting research agenda for European and international sport.

Also related to the broad issue of improving sport/football governance, Dawn Aquilina and Angelo Chetcuti deal in their forum contribution with the aftermath of the Norway-Malta match-fixing case concerning the UEFA Euro qualifier between the two national teams in 2008. They outline the measures taken in both countries to combat match-fixing and argue that the success of efforts to prevent match-fixing depends on the involvement of all major stakeholders and their level of proactivity. They argue that promising measures could involve opening up communication channels among the relevant actors, updating legislation (e.g. in terms of the Council of Europe's Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competition), and strengthening the network of professionals supporting integrity officers.

As a welcome (and perhaps necessary) counterbalance to the first two papers, Karen Petry's contribution problematises the strong focus on football by looking at the development of academic research related to sports and Europe at universities. She argues that the academic discourse on European sports policy, the effects of the European unification process on sport, and the analysis of the international comparison of sport systems has increased considerably. Petry criticises the phenomenon of 'footballism' that dominates the whole European research community, finding that it may result in a monoculture. She argues that the increasing differentiation of Europe-related aspects has moved Europe-based sports research from marginalisation to fragmentation. She suggests that some kind of coordination structure would be helpful for the further development of academic research on European sport policy.

Therefore, even without the well-established and widely read Free Kick- section – the probably last Free Kick will appear in the next SEUR – this is one of richest issues that we have managed to put together as editors.

On a personal note, after three years in office this is the last issue of the Sport&EU Review co-edited by us. We look back upon six issues as co-editors – on five of which we were privileged to work alongside Simon Ličen – that have been both rewarding and instructive. It goes without saying that we will both remain connected to, and hopefully also active within, the Sport&EU community, and also to the good work that emanates from it. A call for aspiring editors willing to fill the role left vacant has been circulated recently through the Sport&EU mailing list. See also: <http://www.sportandeu.com/2015/06/call-for-editors-for-the-sporteu-review/>.

What are the main challenges for the Sport&EU Review at this point? In our view, a central question has not yet been answered. What sort of format is the SEUR aiming at, and what level of ambition should the Review strive at in the medium term? Of course, this is a recurrent issue that we touched upon in the past, most explicitly in our editorial 1/2014. To make a long story short, we are sceptical that the Sport&EU Review can make the transition into a full journal, as some have suggested SEUR should try. In a way we did try, especially by working on one essential precondition for such a step: namely, increasing the number of quality research articles and forum contributions. Editors are restrained in taking the Review to the next level (e.g., pursuing the indexing of the Review in online article databases beyond EBSCOhost and the International Platform of Sports Law Journals) without a constant stream of submissions for publication. And during our stint we did not manage to substantially raise submissions, despite attempts at encouraging authors to choose SEUR as a publication outlet. However, there are already numerous outlets for publishing research on both sports and European integration, while the still limited nexus between the two fields may not justify a professional journal on its own. As long as the Review somewhat lacks in ‘prestige’ and standing, especially outside the inner ranks of the Sport & EU community, people will flock elsewhere to publish their latest commentary, research, and review essays.

We do not mean to exit on a dire note. And there is no reason for it: in the survey we conducted last year, a large majority of readers (75%) have rated the Review’s quality as good or excellent, and many seem to be happy with the format of SEUR the way it is. The conclusions to be drawn from this should, of course, not be pre-judged (too far) by the outgoing editorial team. Instead, we wish the new team of editors much success in steering the Sport & EU Review in the right direction.

Alexander Brand and Arne Niemann
Co-Editors
review@sportandeu.com

2. ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Theorising the EU and International Sport: The Principal-Agent Model and Beyond

Arnout Geeraert & Edith Drieskens*

Illustrating the added value of theorising the relationship between the European Union (EU) and (international) sport, this paper builds upon on a recent study on EU control of FIFA and UEFA (Geeraert & Drieskens, 2015). Borrowing from principal-agent modelling, the study demonstrates that the EU has the capacity to curb the autonomy of both these organisations. It offers novel insight into the EU's control over both these organisations by (1) mapping the actors and instruments that define EU control of FIFA and UEFA and (2) discussing their activation and mitigation. Taking the argument further, this paper summarises and contextualises these findings. It explains their significance by critically examining the research choices made. Pointing the way forward, it identifies theory-informed research as a stepping-stone for the development of a scientific yet policy-supporting research agenda for the EU and (international) sport.

Keywords: control, EU sports policy, FIFA, principal-agent, theory, UEFA

1. Introduction

It goes without saying that these are exciting times for researchers of good governance in international sport. Indeed, recent developments in relation to the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) suggest that the autonomy of sport may no longer be sacred and sacrosanct. Friends and foes of football seemed to breathe a collective sigh of relief as FIFA President Sepp Blatter resigned on June, 2. Among those advocating a new beginning was Michel Platini, the President of the

* Arnout Geeraert is post-doctoral fellow at Leuven International and European Studies (LINES) at Leuven University, Belgium. Edith Drieskens is an assistant professor of international relations at Leuven International and European Studies (LINES) at Leuven University, Belgium; Twitter: @lineskuleuven. *Address for correspondence:* Arnout Geeraert, LINES, Parkstraat 45 Box 3602, 3000 Leuven, Belgium. E-mail: arnout.geeraert@kuleuven.be.

Union of European Football Associations (UEFA). Yet both FIFA and UEFA have long been thought of as untouchable, constituting a different world, one without accountability and regulation (e.g. Dupont, 1996; Pieth, 2014). It seems fairly easy to explain why, when commenting upon Blatter's exit, few have focused on the potential role of the EU to remedy the status quo in FIFA. EU law has had a substantial impact on sports governance (Parrish, 2003; Weatherill, 2006), but instruments beyond law have had a much more limited impact, largely due to limited formal competences. In fact, from a policy perspective, the relationship between the EU and FIFA/UEFA seems to be a classic version of the David versus Goliath story.

In a recent study, we challenge this broad consensus by analysing the EU's control over FIFA and UEFA from a principal-agent (PA) perspective (Geeraert & Drieskens, 2015).¹ We demonstrate that EU control of FIFA and UEFA takes place through two distinct but ultimately interconnected routes: *the EU law route* and the *EU sports policy route*. Instruments present in both these routes, and particularly the activation and mitigation of these instruments, define the EU's control. Taking the argument further, this paper summarises and contextualises these findings. It explains their significance by critically examining the research choices made. Pointing the way forward for researchers and practitioners, it illustrates the added value of theorising the relationship between the EU and (international) sport. Setting the scene, the first part points at the historical connection between the notion of theory and the practice of sport. It also explores the state of the art in relation to theory-informed research on the EU and sport. The second part discusses the methodological challenges as well as the findings and relevance of our study. The third part marks a first step towards the development of a theory-informed research agenda for the EU and sport.

2. Background

Theoroi and Theorists

We start this contribution by traveling back in time. Like a small story shedding light on the bigger picture, a glimpse into the world of *theoroi* and theorists confirms that our choice for theory-informed research on the EU and/in international sport is a rather logical one. Visiting ancient Greece, we see an intimate connection between theory and sport, a connection rooted in the etymological origins of the notion of theory and the historical background of the practice of theorising. In this era, sport events like the Olympic Games were an important part of political life, notably of city-

¹ The study is available through Open Access: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13501763.2015.1022206>.

state diplomacy (Murray & Pigman, 2014). Important figures within this context were the *theoroi*, who acted as travelling ambassadors for their city-state (Scanlon, 2014; Wilson Nightingale, 2004). These envoys were sent to religious festivals and sacred places. They also participated in the Olympic Games, not for sportive glory but for the sake of *theorising*. The latter notion is derived from the Greek words *thea* (outward look) and *horao* (to look attentively) and refers to the act of seeing (Heidegger, 1954). Gradually, however, these envoys became more active; they had to describe what they had seen as well as interpret their observations (Lebow, 2010).

These envoys inspired how fourth century B.C. philosophers thought about wisdom, stressing the importance of “seeing truth” (Wilson Nightingale, 2004, pp. 6-7). This analogy was put forward by Plato and described by Heraclides, who drew an explicit link between the activities of a *theoros* at the Olympics and the role of a philosopher: “The life of man resembles the festival [at Olympia] celebrated with the most magnificent games before a gathering collected from all of Greece. For at this festival some men trained their bodies and sought to win the glorious distinction of a crown, and others came to make a profit by buying or selling. But there was also a certain class, made up of the noblest men, who sought neither applause nor gain, but came *for the sake of spectating and closely watched the event and how it was done*” (cited in: Wilson Nightingale, 2004, p. 17; emphasis added). This small story also points at the importance of theoretical pluralism when defining an agenda for future research. After all, as Wilson Nightingale notes, a *theoros* was sent to events that exemplified and even celebrated the common Greek identity. As a representative of a city-state, he came into contact with colleagues from different parts of the country. As a result, he returned home with new information and ideas, culminating in a “broader, more encompassing perspective” (Wilson Nightingale, 2004, p. 35).

State of the Art

A review of the literature shows that theory-informed research on the EU and sport remains scarce. Theoretically valuable insights are available in five strands of literature: studies (1) that map governance shifts towards a more networked governance, which arise due to the empowerment of stakeholders in sports (Holt, 2006; García, 2008); (2) that describe how European forces influence the governance of football at the national level (Europeanisation) (Brand & Niemann, 2007; Niemann & Brand, 2008; Niemann, García and Grant, 2011); (3) that map how the EU became involved in sport (agenda-setting) (García, 2007a); (4) that explore the core beliefs between the two advocacy coalitions operating within the EU sports policy subsystem (Parrish 2003, 2011); and (5) that analyse interest contestation by international sports organisations (García & Meier, 2012; García & Weatherill, 2012). However, and perhaps inevitably so, there is variation in the extent to which these studies are theory-informed and thus analytical in nature.

Importantly, the lack of theoretical underpinning is not limited to the literature on the EU's functioning in international sport, but is a characteristic of the literature on politics and sport more generally. Various scholars have explored the link between politics and sport. The (theoretical) notion of 'soft power' has become a popular research angle, particularly for analysing the behaviour of emerging countries like China and Russia (Nye, 2008). Yet theory-driven research remains the exception. This is particularly puzzling when looking from a Realist perspective, "given that sport as a political source has a long history both externally in inter-state relations, and internally, *inter alia*, as part of an attempt to create a sense of statehood among citizens" (Grix & Houlihan, 2014, p. 574). The state is a core feature in Realist writings - even though this tradition comes in many shades. That being said, it is only recently that political scientists have turned attention to the EU's functioning in the world of international sport. More broadly, the theoretical study of the EU as an international actor also remains very much a work in progress (Drieskens, 2015a).

At the same time, the benefits of theory-informed research are well documented and far-reaching. Few will deny that theorising may be challenging; in fact, it has been defined as "the hardest of intellectual tasks", requiring "sustained, disciplined, and inhibited work" (Rosenau, 1980, p. 37). However, believers will stress that theory comes with important advantages for both knowledge and practice. Jørgensen takes an inventory of theory's benefits for the study of international relations, and several elements of this list are also relevant for the present purposes (Jørgensen, 2010, pp. 6-9). Probably the most important of these is that theory simplifies reality, functioning as a *coloured lens* (Dunne *et al.*, 2010). In doing so, it serves as a road map to research both in terms of design and execution. In addition, theory is important for the accumulation of knowledge, for moving from description to analysis. Thus, the "ultimate criterion" for evaluating a theory is "whether it expands our understanding of substantive issues" (Snidal, 1985, p. 55). Indeed, in order to be useful, a theory must pose interesting questions about these issues and suggest fruitful directions for empirical elaboration (Ibid.). In doing so, theorising sharpens analytical skills by challenging existing views and inspiring new questions (Jørgensen, 2010). Finally, theoretical reflections can also be relevant outside of the academic world; they may contribute to policy(-making) through *diagnosis*, *prediction*, *prescription*, and *evaluation* (Walt, 2005). In what follows, we put these advantages to the test by discussing the benefits and challenges of using the PA model to theorise about the EU's control over FIFA and UEFA.

3. Case Study

PA Model

The PA model is not a theory in itself but a model that mostly relies on the theoretical assumptions of rational choice theory. Rational choice theory assumes that actors behave instrumentally so as to maximise the attainment of their (fixed) preferences and, thus, “individual actions and collective outcomes are understood in terms of actors' strategic pursuit of self-interests” (Snidal, 1985, p. 40). Rational choice theory finds resonance with the *new institutionalists*, a group that distances itself from once-dominant theoretical approaches in political science that considered institutions merely epiphenomenal, treating institutions instead as “political actors in their own right” (March & Olsen, 1984, p. 738; Drieskens, 2015b). For *rational choice institutionalists*, institutions are organisational forms that structure the behaviour of actors, and these actors hold a fixed set of preferences and behave instrumentally. Since the mid-1980s, a rich body of PA analyses emerged from these scholars, who adapted the model from new institutional economics. Its flexibility – the model is applicable to virtually every instance where one (set of) actor(s) acts on behalf of another – enabled a wide variety of applications.

More specifically, the PA model has been applied to analyse different forms of *contractual* relationships between “two (or more) parties when one, designated the agent, acts for, on behalf of, or as a representative for the other, designated the principal, in a particular domain of decision problems” (Ross, 1973, p. 134). The core (rational choice inspired) assumption of the model is that this relationship is inherently problematic: conflicting interests and access to information that is unavailable to the principal, it goes, will induce the agent to exploit its autonomy and minimise its efforts on behalf of the principal. The agent will even pursue its own interests at the expense of the principal, resulting in imperfect agent behaviour.

The rational choice assumptions that underpin the model enable the formulation of general and abstract hypotheses about principal and agent behaviour. For instance, PA analysis suggests that principals can prevent and reduce the problem of imperfect agent behaviour by installing control mechanisms before or after delegating tasks to agents, though several factors may complicate this (see, e.g., McCubbins & Schwartz, 1984; Pollack, 1997; Huber & Shipan, 2000; Nielson & Tierney, 2003). From these observations, a “theoretical language” has emerged that allows for “problematizing and generating testable hypotheses about the sources and the extent of agents' autonomy and influence” (Pollack, 2007, p. 6). These hypotheses are always “true” in an abstract setting because they flow logically from the rational choice assumptions that underpin the model. In order to put the model to use, however, the empirical context of the case at hand must be assessed and general hypotheses must transition

to “specified” or “context specific hypotheses” (Tallberg, 2003, p. 35). So, if the general hypotheses formulated by the PA model hold true within the context of our case, the model succeeds in correctly isolating the most important features of EU control of FIFA and UEFA (*Ibid*, p. 5), while also expanding our understanding of and leading to new insights into EU control of FIFA and UEFA (Snidal, 1985, p. 56). If not, then it fails to approximate reality and we have to turn to other theoretical perspectives for understanding our case.

Challenges

Given its focus on agency autonomy and principal control, the PA model seems particularly suited to analyse the marked tension between the long-standing, vast autonomy FIFA and UEFA claim and enjoy, and the control the EU exerts over them, particularly since the mid-1990s. Employing a PA analysis of the governance network of European football, however, is no easy feat. Linking the deductive logic of the model to the empirical reality raises questions that are challenging, but far from insurmountable.

A first challenge in applying the PA model to our case involves coping with the *diffuse and implicit nature of contractual relationships*. This challenge can be easily overcome by rebutting some common critiques of the PA model (cf. Pollack, 2007). We argue that FIFA and UEFA can be conceptualised as two agents who represent two distinct groups of principals: football principals (including national football federations, clubs, players, fans and players’ agents) and political principals (namely national public authorities). Some authors conclude that the PA model “fits sports governance only with difficulty”, because sport bodies like FIFA and UEFA do not demonstrate much “binding behaviour” in relation to their (alleged) principals (Forster and Pope 2004, p. 107-8). Such reasoning perhaps stems from the idea that PA models assume perfect representation, an assumption that may link to agency theory in psychology (cf. Milgram, 1974). Nevertheless, the PA model does not assume that agents “slavishly follow the preferences of their principals” (Pollack, 2007, p. 6). In fact, it assumes imperfect agency behaviour. What is important is that FIFA and UEFA clearly fulfil a range of (specialised, co-ordinating, collaborating, agenda-setting and arbitrating) tasks on behalf of the actors we define as principals (Hawkins *et al.*, 2006). In some cases, the principals have explicitly delegated these tasks, and in others, they demonstrate “a tacit or explicit tolerance” of the agents’ regulatory activities on their behalf (Héritier & Lehmkuhl, 2008, p. 5). This proves that contracting, albeit implicit, has actually taken place and justifies the use of the PA model (cf. Hawkins *et al.*, 2006, p. 6). Indeed, the fact that there are no explicit contracts between principals and agents “actually determines the characteristics of specific principal–agent relationships” (Niemann & Huigens, 2011, p. 421).

The second challenge is more complex and requires some analytical concessions. The *complex web of actors* involved in defining EU control of FIFA and UEFA appears to complicate PA analysis. In such settings, myriad PA relationships can be found and “actors concurrently play principal and agent roles” (Shapiro, 2005, p. 271; see also Tallberg [2003, p. 25] and Waterman and Meier [1998, p. 178]). Thus, we cannot simply focus on a single dyadic relationship but have to take account of “externalities” (Waterman & Meier, 1998, p. 178) and “exogenous factors” such as “external coercion” (Coen & Thatcher, 2008: 53). Involving actors like the football stakeholders and the EU member states in our analysis allows for a more realistic set-up and is necessary to correctly isolate the most essential features of EU control of FIFA and UEFA (García, 2008; Holt, 2006). However, “because of the difficulty involved in performing multiple-level PA analysis in a systematic manner, it is still rare for studies to engage in this form of analysis” (Tallberg, 2003, p. 25).

So, how do we go about integrating the most essential actors in our PA model? There is a clear need for careful “contextual mapping” (Cohen, 2009, p. 11). The CJEU and the Commission are core actors in our study because these institutions are involved in directly exercising control (as principals) of FIFA and UEFA (as agents). The Commission acts both as the executive branch of EU policy and as the enforcer of competition law; the CJEU enforces EU law via (prejudicial) rulings. Yet the Commission never truly operates autonomously from the member states, who are united in the (European) Council and (to a lesser extent) the Parliament. Indeed, it is itself an agent of these institutions, which act as its principals. Football stakeholders, too, can delegate the task of controlling FIFA and UEFA to both the Commission and the CJEU. We therefore integrate these actors into our model as principals of the Commission and the CJEU. This allows us to bring order and structure to the often-confusing web of actors involved in EU control of FIFA and UEFA. More importantly, installing this structure underscores the value of the PA model as a heuristic framework (Elgie, 2002; Moe, 1984; Tallberg 2003).

Yet the involvement of a complex array of principals and agents also raises important questions in relation to the explanatory value of the PA model in respect to both the degree of autonomous agency behaviour and the degree of control exercised by principals (cf. Damro 2007). Control is exercised within multiple, dyadic PA relationships, and this makes it nearly impossible to assess the extent to which control is exercised, certainly when the focus is not on a single instance of EU control on FIFA/UEFA. This urges us to focus on actors and instruments of control rather than *degrees* of control. The benefit of this focus is that it circumvents the well-known problem of observational equivalence, a problem that arises when the perceived absence of control or a conflict between principal and agent may (falsely) be explained as either a case of extreme agent autonomy or quasi perfect principal control (Weingast & Moran, 1983; Pollack, 2002). Moreover, it allows an analysis of

two organisations, FIFA and UEFA, within the same framework. While chances are high that they are subject to different degrees of EU control, the EU employs similar instruments to control both these organisations, and FIFA and UEFA use the same instruments to mitigate control.

Findings

By applying the PA model, we find that three main variables define EU control of FIFA and UEFA, namely the presence of control instruments, the activation of control and the mitigation of control by FIFA and UEFA. This is easily verified by conducting counterfactual analysis as a control strategy: the absence of any of these causal factors would lead to a completely different *status quo*. The absence of control instruments would render the EU powerless, but the activation of these instruments is also necessary in order to put them to work. Finally, EU control would be substantially more far-reaching without mitigation from FIFA and UEFA.

Control instruments When agents demonstrate actions undesired by principals, principals can wield control mechanisms to align the agents' actions with their interests. An exploration of the control instruments at the EU's disposal demonstrates that the CJEU and the Commission (as principals) indeed have the capacity to curtail FIFA and UEFA's (as agents) autonomy, namely through *monitoring*, *sanctioning* and *steering*. Our study reveals two routes for agency control, the EU law route and the EU sports policy route; each consists of the same control instruments, but the routes are nonetheless underpinned by different mechanisms and competences. Mapping EU control on the basis of these two routes reveals that, due to non-hierarchical instruments (i.e., steering) within the framework of EU sports policy, the EU has great potential to control FIFA and UEFA. The EU's limited formal sporting competence, and thus the absence of sanctioning options (in case of non-compliance), does not belie its influence on FIFA and UEFA, because non-compliance with EU actions under the EU sports policy route may lead to sanctioning under the EU law route. Put differently, FIFA and UEFA fear that non-compliance with EU policy measures will decrease the Commission's goodwill in the application of EU law specifically, and the EU institutions' respect for their autonomous regulation of football more generally.

Activating control Mapping the control mechanisms available to the EU highlights the Commission's role in sports governance since it can deploy more control instruments (monitoring, sanctioning and steering) than the CJEU (sanctioning). Unlike the CJEU, which (mostly) rules on prejudicial questions from national courts, the Commission can also autonomously decide to control. Yet, as mentioned, the Commission's autonomy is confined by its own principals' control: the Commission never truly operates autonomously of the member states and (to a lesser extent) the

European Parliament. By (not) encouraging the Commission to exert control, they play an important role in activating control. Football stakeholders, too, can delegate the task of controlling FIFA and UEFA to the Commission and/or the CJEU. Under the EU law route, this occurs because principals lodge a formal complaint on the basis of EU law. Under the EU sports policy route, football principals can induce the Commission to control FIFA and UEFA through less formal channels of influence like lobbying. All in all, four control scenarios can be distinguished in this regard (Geeraert & Drieskens, 2015, pp. 10-14).

Mitigating control By engaging in mitigation, FIFA and UEFA also play an important role in defining EU control. They engage directly with the Commission in order to influence its preferences regarding the exercise of control. Because the control of its own principals limit the Commission's leeway, FIFA and UEFA can also seek to mitigate control by influencing these actors' preferences. We find that FIFA and UEFA use different strategies to weaken the incentives of football stakeholders, the European Parliament and the EU member states, in order to exert control via the Commission and the CJEU. What's more, they can even influence the Parliament's and the member states' preferences such that they control the Commission and limit its control over FIFA and UEFA.

Contribution to Literature

Our study makes an original contribution to three strands of literature within the field of EU studies, namely the literatures on the EU and sport, PA approaches to EU governance, and PA theory in general. First, it contributes to the emerging literature on the EU as an actor in international sport governance, providing a more complete picture of the empirical reality of EU control, which has remained a black box. A PA perspective on control helps integrate the literature on lobbying (García, 2007b; García & Meier, 2012; García & Weatherill, 2013), EU sports regulation (Parrish, 2003; Weatherill, 2006), networked governance (Holt, 2006; García, 2008) and more recent contributions on policy interventions in sport (Geeraert, 2014) into a single framework. Beyond FIFA and UEFA, our study shows that the EU has a large set of instruments at its disposal for controlling international sport organisations. However, this control is determined by a dynamic interplay between actors and instruments at different levels. A better understanding of these dynamics gives a new insight into both the actual and potential role of the EU in international sports governance. Although the degree to which they are deployed certainly varies across other cases, the three variables that determine EU control of FIFA and UEFA (instruments, activation and mitigation) also determine EU control on other international sport organisations.

Second, contributing to the literature on PA modelling, our study introduced a new perspective (exogenous control and mitigation) and a new control instrument (steering) to the endogenously oriented PA literature. Traditional applications of the PA toolbox analyse control in a dyadic setting between a (set of) principal(s) and its (/their) agent(s). This endogenous model is extended to include control that goes beyond mechanisms intrinsic to dyadic PA relationships. It shows that, whereas football stakeholders and public authorities lack options for direct control over FIFA and UEFA, they may rely on the Commission and the CJEU to exercise control on their behalf, hence the notion of exogenous control. Yet FIFA and UEFA can mitigate this control by influencing the preferences of their principals. Activation and mitigation within this web of PA relationships dictates whether or not FIFA and UEFA can expect their autonomy to be curtailed by the EU. In order to fully comprehend the Commission's control of FIFA and UEFA, the notion of steering is introduced to the PA literature, constituting a third (next to monitoring and sanctioning), distinct *ex post* control mechanism. Bringing the PA literature into conversation with the more traditional governance literature (Geeraert, 2015) achieves this innovation. This is not to say that these literatures represent parallel worlds; both, for example, point at the importance of a credible threat of coercion in order to ensure compliance, including in more horizontally organised settings. In fact, "a principal delegating to an agent in a vertically integrated setting is an *extreme form* of a relational contract" (Williamson, Milgrom & Roberts, cited in Hawkins *et al.*, 2006, p. 7; emphasis added)

Finally, scholars almost exclusively adopt an inter-institutional perspective of control, building on Pollack's (1997) seminal work on how member states control EU institutions. Moving beyond existing applications of the PA model to European governance, our study shifts focus to the relationship(s) between EU institutions and external actors, scrutinising the EU's capacity to control third party organisations like FIFA and UEFA. Moreover, scholars generally neglect the EU's influence on international private actors, focusing more on the EU's actions in multilateral settings and towards foreign countries. Those that do focus on private actors suggest the EU's influence is confined to those policy areas where it has options for deploying a framework for hierarchical intervention. Even if the EU does not actually use this capacity, private actors may change their behaviour because they seek to avoid legislation (Börzel, 2010; Héritier & Rhodes, 2011). In this light, this research nuances the academic emphasis on strong formal competence and highlights the importance of interactions among and between actors and instruments in determining EU control of private actors.

Contribution to Policy(-Making)

Since the PA model is particularly useful for exploring and explaining policy-making realities, the findings of our study can also be relevant outside of the academic world (Wiener & Diez, 2009). PA analysis offers a “neutral theoretical language” that does not make normative claims about the appropriateness of EU interventions in sport (Tallberg, 2003, p. 6; see also Kassim & Menon [2003, p. 124]), thus its value in terms of policy(-making) lies more with *diagnosis* and *prediction* than *prescription* and *evaluation* (Walt, 2005). Indeed, the main added value of the PA model is its explanatory capacity. Our study contributes to policy(-making) by increasing our understanding of the processes defining EU control (cf. Snidal, 1985, p. 27). Simplification and abstraction may give policy officials in the public and the private (sporting) sphere a clearer view on reality, guiding them through the dense web of actors involved by focusing on the most fundamental issues of EU control.

The second contribution of the study is that it enables general predictions of actor behaviour. Our empirical testing of the PA model reveals that the actors involved in EU control of FIFA and UEFA act in a rational manner, seeking to maximise attainment of their relatively fixed preferences. The analysis implicitly confirms the general hypotheses derived from the PA model’s rational choice assumptions. For instance, it is clear that the Commission and the CJEU’s capacity to limit shirking by FIFA and UEFA depends on the control instruments at their disposal and the credibility of sanctions in the case of noncompliance, a hypothesis derived by the PA model. The model also rightly predicted that, when their autonomy (i.e., their key preference) is under threat, FIFA and UEFA have a strong incentive to develop strategies to influence their principals’ behaviour so as to reclaim autonomy. Finally, it is clear that the football stakeholders’ decision to delegate control to the CJEU and the Commission is determined by costs and heterogeneity of preferences, and FIFA and UEFA can capitalise on this reality.

The PA model succeeds in correctly isolating the most essential features of EU control and therefore leads to important insights, but it also leads to general predictions that can be translated into concrete policy advice. For the sake of parsimony, we limit ourselves to two observations. First, our research suggests that FIFA and UEFA will comply with (non-hierarchical) policy measures when the threat of sanctions (in case of noncompliance) is high. Certainly, FIFA and UEFA are more inclined to comply with the Commission’s steering activities on those topics where the EU holds a related competence; this is also the case when a particular rule or decision is under the Commission’s scrutiny, since there is a larger imminence of sanctions in such cases. Yet FIFA and UEFA will have the highest incentive to comply when the Commission acts upon a strong mandate from the EU member states, because noncompliance may change their preferences. The EU member states currently demonstrate a relatively stable preference that EU institutions respect FIFA and

UEFA's decision-making autonomy, but this may decline in case of noncompliance, increasing the likelihood of sanctions in the form of increased EU regulatory activity in football/sport in the long run. These observations, which reveal the EU's potential as an actor in international sport, indicate that there is certainly room for a more ambitious sports policy - devised and supported by the member states - directed at international sport organisations.

Second, FIFA and UEFA should act proactively to secure as much goodwill as possible from the Commission and its principals, notably the member states, to fulfil their preferences and to secure as much autonomy as possible. They should be accommodating towards EU sports policy to avoid sanctions in the form of increased regulatory activity. FIFA and UEFA can seek to influence the preferences of the Commission and its EU principals so as to divert attention away from 'harder' issues (for instance, the football transfer system and principles of good governance) towards 'softer' issues (for instance, the (joint) promotion of grassroots sport and female participation).

4. Further Research

There is sufficient room for further theorising about the EU's functioning in international sport on the basis of the PA model. Such studies could, for instance, focus on concrete episodes of EU control, hypothesising autonomous behaviour of the Commission or FIFA/UEFA and other sport organisations. In this light, the model may also be combined with insights from other theoretical perspectives (Pollack, 2007, p. 8). To be clear, we do not see PA analysis as a dogma or aim in itself. We acknowledge that the PA model is one of many theoretical lenses that simplify reality. For instance, our study black-boxes the internal workings of the EU institutions, football stakeholders, member states, and even FIFA and UEFA, and this necessarily leads to simplified assumptions about these actors and their preferences (Pollack, 2007, p. 8). As long as these preferences are relatively fixed (variation in intensity and between a set of preferences over time is possible), such simplifications are justified. Our study indeed shows that a rational-choice approach is a powerful tool for analysing EU control of FIFA and UEFA. This does not imply, however, that constructivist approaches, which explore the existence of informal norms that shape actors' identities and preferences within institutions, become obsolete. To the contrary, they can even be complementary to our approach. A good example is the work done by Parrish on the advocacy coalitions operating within the EU's sports policy subsystem (Parrish, 2003; 2011). Parrish demonstrates how actors' core beliefs shape varied preferences for EU intervention in sport. Giving a more detailed account of how the EU's preferences are shaped and formed, his observations are complementary with ours. We acknowledge that EU institutions' preferences may vary (although they are relatively stable, as Parrish demonstrates), and by engaging with pro-autonomy coalitions, FIFA and UEFA can influence the overarching

preference of a single EU institution. In fact, the PA model predicts that the presence of heterogeneous preferences for EU intervention in the affairs of FIFA and UEFA complicates EU control.

Opting for either a rationalist or constructivist epistemological approach (or a combination of both) is not the only methodological choice to make when theorising about the EU and sport; one also has to select from a wide variety of specific theories. The “mosaic of integration theories” compiled by Wiener and Diez (2009) may be a helpful guide in this regard. These authors map the dominant European integration theories on the basis of aims (explanatory, descriptive and normative) and areas (polity, policy, politics). Simplifying considerably, explanatory theories focus on explaining and understanding; descriptive theories on conceptualisation; and normative theories on prescribing reality. In addition, theories can focus on a “political community” (polity), on specific policy measures (policy) or on policy-making processes, including “the daily struggles and strategies of political actors dealing with each other” (politics) (ibid., pp. 18-9). As a result, the notion of theory means different things to different authors (ibid., pp. 17-8). Without doubt, this opens the door for progress through debate and discussion. Yet it has also created *dialogues of the deaf* in which “(f)ootball players are being criticized for not playing volleyball” (Jørgensen, 2010, p. 228).

As noted above, the governance approach has been the dominant approach to study sport politics in general and sport and the EU in particular. Although this approach is useful for developing definitions and concepts “with which to grasp particular developments, practices, and institutions” (Wiener & Diez, 2009, p. 18), the study of the EU and sport would benefit from moving beyond mere description. Normative approaches have the advantage of challenging existing views and practices and providing alternatives, but they are by definition anything but neutral; this holds true in relation to EU intervention in (international) sport, which is a highly contentious debate. Thus, in our view, the use of explanatory theories holds the most promise for understanding the EU and sport. More specifically, these theories can be used to explore and explain institutional structures (polity), the effects of concrete policy measures (policy) or the strategies and power relationships between and within EU institutions and sport stakeholders, including sport organisations (politics). Analysing these topics from a theory-informed perspective will contribute to our understanding of the relationship between the EU and sport. The opposite may also be true: the study of sport and the EU may lead to theory refinement, making it a better reflection of reality and, thus, increase its explanatory powers.

5. Conclusion

Following in the footsteps of the *theoroi* in Ancient Greece, this paper demonstrates that the PA model is a valuable guide for explaining and understanding the complexities of (sport) governance, including the EU's functioning within this context. Organising and simplifying reality, it shows that the EU is anything but powerless when it comes to controlling FIFA and UEFA, even though it only has limited formal competences in relation to sport. A PA perspective on the EU's control over these organizations reveals a complex pattern of monitoring, sanctioning and steering. Stressing the advantages of the PA model yet advocating theoretical pluralism, it identifies theory-informed research as the way forward for studying the EU and (international) sport, and for weaving this emerging field of study into the mainstream fabric of EU studies.

References

- Börzel, T. (2010) 'European governance: negotiation and competition in the shadow of hierarchy', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48(2), pp. 191–219.
- Brand, A. & Niemann, A. (2007) 'Europeanisation in the societal/trans-national realm: what European integration studies can get out of analysing football', *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 3(3), pp. 182–201.
- Coen, D. & Thatcher, M. (2008) 'Network governance and multi-level delegation: European networks of regulatory agencies', *Journal of Public Policy*, 28(1), pp. 49-71.
- Cohen, J. (2009) 'Application of Principal-Agent Theory to Security Sector Reform', *Journal of Security Sector Management*, 7(2), pp. 1-17.
- Drieskens, E. (2015a) 'Introduction: EU Actors', in Jørgensen, K.E., Aarstad Kalland, A., Drieskens, E., Laatikainen, K. & Tonra, B. (eds) *The Sage Handbook of European Foreign Policy*. London: Sage.
- Drieskens, E. (2015b) 'Introduction: State Actors', in Jørgensen, K.E., Aarstad Kalland, A., Drieskens, E., Laatikainen, K. & Tonra, B. (eds) *The Sage Handbook of European Foreign Policy*. London: Sage.
- Dunne, T., Kurki, M., & Smith, S. (2010) *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dupont, J. (1996) 'Le droit communautaire et la situation du sportif professionnel avant l'arrêt 'Bosman'', *Revue du Marché Unique européen*, 1, pp. 65-77.
- Elgie, R. (2002) 'The politics of the European central bank: principal-agent theory and the democratic deficit', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(2), pp. 186-200.
- Forster, J. & Pope, N. (2004) *The political economy of global sporting organisations*. Routledge: London.
- García, B. (2007a) 'From regulation to governance and representation: agenda-setting and the EU's involvement in sport', *Entertainment and Sports Law*

- Journal*, 5(1). [Online]. Available at <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/eslj/issues/volume5/number1/garcia/> [Accessed: 25 March 2015].
- García, B. (2007b) 'UEFA and the European Union: from confrontation to cooperation', *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 3(3), pp. 202-223.
- García, B. (2008) 'The European Union and the governance of football: A game of levels and agendas', PhD dissertation, Department of Political Science, Loughborough University.
- García, B. & Meier, H.E. (2012) 'Limits of interest empowerment in the European Union: The case of football', *Journal of European Integration* 34(4), pp. 359-378.
- García, B. & Weatherill, S. (2012) 'Engaging with the EU in order to minimize its impact: sport and the negotiation of the Treaty of Lisbon', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 19(2), pp. 238-56.
- Geeraert, A. (2014) 'New EU governance modes in professional sport: enhancing throughput legitimacy', *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 10(3), pp. 302-21.
- Geeraert, A. (2015) 'The governance of international sport organisations', in Houlihan B. & Malcolm D. (eds), *Sport in Society*. London: Sage.
- Geeraert, A., Drieskens, E. (2015) 'The EU controls FIFA and UEFA: a Principal-Agent perspective', *Journal of European Public Policy*, Published as IFirst.
- Grix, J. & Houlihan, B. (2014) 'Sports mega-events as part of a nation's soft power strategy: the cases of Germany (2006) and the UK (2012)', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 16(4), pp. 572-596.
- Hawkins, D.G., Lake, D.A., Nielson, D.L. & Tierney, M.J. (2006) *Delegation and agency in international organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1954). *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Héritier, A. & Rhodes, M. (eds) (2011) *New modes of governance in Europe. Governing in the shadow of hierarchy*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Holt, M. (2006) *UEFA, Governance and the control of club competition in European football*. London: Football Governance Research Centre, Birkbeck University of London.
- Huber, J.D. & Shipan, C.R. (2000) 'The costs of control: legislators, agencies, and transaction costs', *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 25(1), pp. 25-52.
- Jørgensen, K.E. (2010) *International Relations Theory. A new introduction*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Kassim, H. & Menon, A. (2003) 'The Principal-Agent Approach and the Study of the European Union: Promise Unfulfilled?', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(1), pp. 121-139.
- Lebow, R.N. (2003) *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1984) 'The New Institutionalism: organizational factors in political life', *The American Political Science Review*, 78(3), pp. 734-749.

- McCubbins, M.D. & Schwartz, T. (1984) 'Congressional oversight overlooked: police patrols versus fire alarms', *American Journal of Political Science*, 28(1), pp. 165–179.
- Milgram, S. (1974) *Obedience to authority: An experimental view*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Moe, T. M. (1984) 'The new economics of organization', *American Journal of Political Science*, 28(4), pp. 739–77.
- Murray, S. & Pigman, G.A. (2014) 'Mapping the relationship between international sport and diplomacy', *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 17(9), pp. 1098-1118.
- Nielson, D.L. and Tierney, M.J. (2003) 'Delegation to international organizations: agency theory and World Bank environmental reform', *International Organization*, 57(2), pp. 241–76.
- Niemann, A. & Brand, A. (2008) 'The impact of European integration on domestic sport: The case of German football', *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 11(1), pp. 90-106.
- Niemann, A., Garcia, B. & Grant, W. (eds) (2011) *The transformation of European football: Towards the Europeanisation of the national game*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Niemann, A. & Huigens, J. (2011) 'The European Union's role in the G8: a principal-agent perspective', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18(3), pp. 420-442.
- Nye, J. (2008) 'Soft Power and Beijing Olympics'. [Online]. Available at: http://www.centerforpublicleadership.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=113:nye-soft-power-and-the-beijing-olympics&catid=36:cpl-blog [Accessed: 25 March 2015].
- Parrish, R. (2003) 'The politics of sports regulation in the European Union', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(2), pp. 246-62.
- Parrish, R. (2011) 'Social dialogue in European professional football', *European Law Journal*, 17(2), pp. 213–29.
- Pieth, M. (2014) *Reforming FIFA*. Zurich: Dike Verlag AG.
- Pollack, M.A. (1997) 'Delegation, agency, and agenda setting in the European Community', *International Organization*, 57(1), pp. 99-134.
- Pollack, M.A. (2002) 'Learning from the Americanists (again): theory and method in the study of delegation', *West European Politics*, 25(1), pp. 200-19.
- Pollack, M. (2007) *Principal-Agent analysis and international delegation: Red herrings, theoretical classification and empirical disputes*. (Bruges Political Research Paper No 2). Bruges: College of Europe.
- Rosenau, J. (1980) *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Ross, S. (1973) 'The economic theory of agency: The principal's problem', *American Economic Review*, 63, pp. 134-139.
- Scanlon, T. (2014) (ed.) *Sport in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shapiro, S. (2005) 'Agency theory', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31, pp. 263-284.

- Snidal, D. (1985) 'The game theory of international politics', *World Politics*, 38(1), pp. 25-57.
- Tallberg, J. (2003) *European governance and supranational institutions. Making states comply*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Walt, S. (2005) 'The Relationship Between Theory and Policy in International Relations', *Annual Review of Political Science* 8, pp. 23-48.
- Waterman, R. & Meier, K.J. (1998) 'Principal – Agent Models: An Expansion?', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 8(2), pp. 173 – 202.
- Weatherill, S. (2006) 'Anti-doping revisited – The demise of the rule of 'purely sporting interest'?', *European Competition Law Review*, 27(12), pp. 645-57.
- Wiener, A. & Diez, T. (2009) *European integration theory*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Weingast, B. & Moran, M. (1983) 'Bureaucratic discretion of congressional control? Regulatory policymaking by the Federal Trade Commission', *Journal of Political Economy*, 91(5), pp. 765-800.
- Wilson Nightingale, A. (2004) *Spectacles of Truth in Classical Greek Philosophy: Theoria in its Cultural Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. FORUM

The Aftermath of a Match-Fixing Case that Shook Two Nations: Insights into How Malta and Norway Are Seeking to Redeem Their Football

Dawn Aquilina & Angelo Chetcuti*

When in 2011 the Football Association of Norway (NFF) was notified by the Malta Football Association (MFA) that the UEFA EURO 2008 qualifier between their two national teams had been mentioned in a major match-fixing trial in Bochum, Germany, they did not hesitate to offer their full collaboration with the investigation. In the months that followed, nothing seemed amiss and business at the NFF resumed as usual, under the general impression that the case did not really concern them. Initially it was thought that the case only concerned Maltese national team players. Norwegian football was safe, but not for long!

Eventually, the final word on the case was given by a ruling from the Court of Arbitration for Sport, which confirmed that the match was fixed. It substantiated a ten-year suspension as originally imposed on a Maltese international by the UEFA Control and Disciplinary Body (UEFA.org, 2014).

Although no Norwegian involvement was found in this case, the perception that match-fixing had not pervaded Nordic football was dramatically shaken in the summer of 2012, when an Oslo-based newspaper – *Dagens Næringsliv* – ran a 13-page spread with an investigation of a number of match-fixing cases in Norwegian

* Dawn Aquilina is a Research Fellow at the Swiss Graduate Institute of Public Administration (IDHEAP), within the Faculty of Law, Criminal Justice and Public Administration at the University of Lausanne, e-mail correspondence: Dawn.Aquilina@unil.ch. Angelo Chetcuti is a guest lecturer at the Institute for Physical Education and Sport at the University of Malta and a member of the Executive Committee of the Malta FA. He works with the European Parliament, e-mail correspondence: angelochetcuti@gmail.com.

football. The piece took off from the national team case. The NFF were heavily criticised for not following up on the investigation and for not asking UEFA to share its findings from a 400 page confidential report compiled by the MFA. Not to mention, according to the newspaper, that the NFF had failed to inform the public about these developments.

Since then, much has been written and said about match-fixing. Stakeholders have begun to comprehend the magnitude of the problem, albeit at a slow pace. Norway and Malta had their own wake-up call. Others had their respective, although no less serious, experiences, which unfortunately we keep hearing of almost daily.

A Concerted Effort

Back in 2012, in our conclusion to a research paper “Match-fixing: the Case of Malta” presented at the Sport and EU conference in Lausanne, we stated:

“...the data that we were able to gather does provide a very useful insight into how one small football nation is tackling issues of match-fixing. Therefore, more effort and funding should be directed towards knowledge-building and sharing, by bringing closer all the stakeholders involved to provide an appropriate framework for guidance and action in this matter” (Aquilina & Chetcuti, 2014, p. 124).

Even the most cursory research into the numbers of the betting industry, particularly claims on the sheer extent of unlicensed betting, shows that match-fixing is not a problem that simply concerns sports authorities. Rather, it requires powers which only police and judicial authorities can exercise.

Growing Impetus in Malta

As we write, Maltese media are awash with headlines about the possible creation of a Task Force to combat match-fixing, a body that would be spearheaded by the MFA and which is expected to include, among others, representatives of the Police, the Malta Gaming Authority, and possibly the Financial Intelligence Analysis Unit – a body established under anti-money laundering legislation.

The recent media buzz was set off as a result of a hard-hitting newsletter distributed to a broad mailing list (which includes politicians, media outlets, and club administrators) by the MFA’s Integrity Officer. “Our football is infested by people who grade the game’s sporting spirit at the lowest grade, if any”, he claimed. His frustration was evident: “Apparently we have not managed to strongly impress or

alarm the authorities or, even more importantly the law enforcers, who, for their own reasons, keep on procrastinating”. Then, what was arguably the harshest charge: “[...] clubs finance their entire operation by manipulating matches, betting on them and the winnings going towards the club” (MFA, 2015).

These allegations – expressed in black on white under the MFA’s letterhead - were taken up initially by the sports media and soon after by the mainstream newsrooms. Football officials talked about the shocking amounts of money being spent on betting on Maltese football every year.² Within a couple of days, two Parliamentary Questions were tabled. One asked whether any investigations into corruption in sport were undertaken in the past year. The other asked whether Malta signed the above-mentioned Council of Europe Convention. The answer to both was negative.

At this stage, the MFA’s aim was partially reached: government and opposition MPs took up the issue, which flew up on the national agenda. During its Executive Committee meeting of 23 January, the MFA formally proposed the setting up of the said Task Force, which met informally for the first time a few days later.

The concerted effort called for is finally taking place. This approach has also been discussed in the context of an EU-funded project, “What national networks to fight against match-fixing”. Spearheaded by the *Institut de Relations Internationales et Strategiques* (IRIS), this program was co-financed by the European State Lotteries and Toto Association, and conducted in partnership with Sportaccord, ENGSO, Sport & Citizenship and the University of Salford (IRIS, 2014). One of the 21 national seminars organised took place in Malta in February 2014, gathering representatives from the gaming authority, sports authorities, law-enforcement and the betting sector.

The initiative achieved its first goal: mobilisation at a national level. Secondly, national stakeholders, and in particular law-enforcement and the betting sector, participated in the discussions. The MFA’s integrity officer provided an update on the ongoing disciplinary cases in this regard stressing that 11 persons had already been banned for life from Maltese football. All participants gave overwhelming support to education and information measures, including programmes targeting young people and even children. The MFA has already been moving in this direction. As part of its

² According to the General Secretary of the Malta FA, speaking on a TV sports programme, it is claimed that some €70 million were spent on betting on matches of the two top divisions in Malta during the season 2013/14.

“Say No to Match Fixing Tour”, informative lectures were delivered to 1,100 players and administrators in all of its 53 clubs, and it intends to take this initiative further in schools (Camilleri, 2013).

Updating legislation is equally crucial. In particular, legislation should provide for the protection of victims and whistle-blowers. One cause of disagreement is Malta’s position with respect to the Council of Europe Convention on the Manipulation of Sports Competitions, signed in September 2014. Norway was the first country to ratify it, whereas Malta is still not even amongst the signatories. The main bone of contention for Malta remains the definition of “illegal sports betting”. In Article 3, the Convention defines such betting as that “whose type or operator is not allowed under the applicable law of the jurisdiction where the consumer is located”. The key phrase here is “where the consumer is located”: Malta has long argued that the applicable law governing online gaming should be that of the country where the gaming operator is licensed. Only this way can Malta guarantee a stable regulatory environment for the numerous gaming companies it has licensed.

The sector contributes around 10% to the country’s GDP and remains constantly under fire from other EU member states that see proceeds emanating from their own citizens – punters betting their money online – being shifted (and taxed) elsewhere (Malta Today, 2015).

Beyond Malta’s need to protect its commercial interests, however, nothing stops its authorities from taking the necessary measures to still comply with the substantive principles of the Convention for the purposes of combating the manipulation of sport competitions. Judging by statements made by politicians and officials in public authorities, there seems to be complete agreement that, contrary to the problems mentioned above, Malta agrees with the underlying principles of the Convention (Maltese Parliament, 2015).

Norway: Best Practices

According to the report compiled by the directors of Nordic gambling operators, the same group of match fixers involved in the Norway vs Malta match had fixed a Premier League match (*Tippeligaen*) in 2008 (Norwegian Gaming and Foundation Authority *et al.*, 2013).

Dagens Næringsliv continued to publish damning reports on suspicious matches from the second-division (Level 3) played in July 2012, which resulted in seven people being charged with fraud and aggravated fraud – 5 former players and 2

punters who placed bets with the national Norwegian Lottery (Eurosport, 2014). This left the NFF with no other recourse but to spring into action.

First, they needed to take stock of the situation as it soon materialised that the corruption issues did not just rest with the lower national leagues, but that there were also strong indications that a Europa League match in August 2012 between Aalesund FK and the Albanian team Tirana was also fixed to the extent that Norsk Tipping (the national Norwegian lottery) voided all bets (Norwegian Gaming and Foundation Authority *et al.*, 2013).

The moment all these match-fixing cases came to light, the relevant authorities - including the NFF, the Norwegian Olympic and Paralympic Committee and Confederation of sports (NOC), the Norwegian Gaming and Foundation Authority, Norsk Tipping, the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, and the Ministry of Culture (which is responsible for gaming policy in Norway) – came together to discuss how best to deal with the situation. The NFF was instrumental in bringing all these stakeholders together and strived to develop a common national action plan. The policy document, entitled “National Action Plan against match-fixing in Sport 2013-2015”, was officially presented at a press conference headed by the Norwegian Ministry of Culture together with the UEFA’s Executive Board member, Michael Van Praag, on 11 December 2012.

The robust action plan outlined five following proposals in order to “prevent, detect and respond to match-fixing in sport.” The proposals put forward by each of the stakeholders encompassed wide-ranging aspects from raising awareness on match-fixing issues, prioritising efforts to change the existing attitudes towards match-fixing, enforcing the monitoring and regulating aspects of the gaming market, strengthening sporting regulations that deal with aspects of match-fixing and deepening the involvement of Norway in international cooperation against match-fixing (Norwegian Ministry of Culture, 2012).

On the awareness-raising front, the NFF launched a project – fully funded by UEFA via its Good Governance – to develop an e-learning tool which will facilitate educating volunteers, administrative personnel, coaches and players. They also set up a “Football and Gambling” webpage where a lot of useful data has been compiled on potential issues, ongoing cases and instructions for reporting suspicious actions (NFF, 2015a).

At the national level, Norsk Tipping has set itself the task of introducing a betting system that limits the pot size and also establishes a warning and monitoring system

to track both the sales of each commissioner and the sales and net payments for each betting outcome of a betting object. The Norwegian Gaming Authority looked further afield to strengthen its operations. In August 2012, the directors of the Nordic Gaming Authorities met in an attempt to establish a joint Nordic working-group in order to map out the extent of match-fixing in the Nordic region. By September 2013 a joint document (Norwegian Gaming and Foundation Authority *et al.*, 2013) was published outlining:

1. the risks of the occurrence of match-fixing in Nordic sports events;
2. the measures and controls that gambling operators have in place to prevent match-fixing and to respond to it;
3. the measures and controls that regulators have established;
4. an assessment of the risk of manipulation of totalisator betting; and
5. proposals on how regulators can work with sports and how gambling operators can contribute to prevent match-fixing.

The working group believes that a collaboration forum on a regional basis should be established to aid communication, develop notification procedures and clarify the responsibilities of each stakeholder. It has been concluded by this working group that Norway has made the most progress in this regard, given the rapidity in which it drafted and implemented the national action plan while also setting up a collaboration forum that coordinates regular meetings between the gaming authorities, the police and the sport organisations (*ibid.*).

On the European level, the Norwegian authorities have taken an active part in the work currently spearheaded by the Council of Europe. As suggested above, Norway was one of the first 15 states to sign the Convention on the Manipulation of Sport Competitions on 18 September 2014, and the first to ratify it.

Looking ahead, the NFF have already acknowledged in the national action plan that some of its regulations need updating. They have also introduced an ethical contract which all players have to sign. This contract focuses on a series of ethical challenges that football players can face in their sporting careers, and it also highlights some precautions in relation to match-fixing. All captains of the Premier League clubs were brought together to sign and kick-start this campaign, called “Captains Table” (NFF, 2015b).

Conclusion

Other nations dealing with similar cases can draw some important lessons from the Norway vs Malta-experience and its aftermath. There needs to be a concrete effort to collaborate with all major stakeholders – ideally this should develop into a strategy document (action plan) which clearly outlines the responsibilities and tasks of each of these stakeholders. Much then depends on each stakeholder’s level of proactivity.

Setting up a national platform as advocated by IRIS and the Convention could be a way forward. Otherwise, regular meetings should be held to share information and good practice. These should include opening up communication channels within a nation – for example, from the betting operators via the regulators to the sports event organisers when reporting suspicious betting activities. There should also be a free-flow of information across all integrity officers within football, an initiative that is currently funded by UEFA. The UEFA has facilitated a handful of meetings to this end, but given the extent and severity of some of the match-fixing cases that are being unearthed in football, it is clear that integrity officers need a much stronger network of professionals to support them in collating case evidence and in dealing with what are sometimes hardened criminals in order to be able to do their job effectively.

Awareness that match-fixing is not a scourge that can be tackled only by the football family is on the rise. The next step is to gauge the effectiveness of the concerted approach advocated above. There is hope that a more engaged stance would mitigate the pernicious impact of a decreased credibility of competition in sport.

References

- Aquilina, D., & Chetcuti, A. (2014) ‘Match-fixing: The case of Malta’, *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 6(1), pp. 107-128.
- Camilleri, V. (2013) ‘MFA step up fight against match-fixing’, *The Times of Malta*, 6 December [Online]. Available at: <http://www.timesofmalta.com/articles/view/20131206/football/MFA-step-up-fight-against-match-fixing.497787> [Accessed: 10 June 2014].
- Eurosport (2014) ‘Sept inculpations en Norvège dans une affaire de matches truqués’, 20 October [Online]. Available at: http://www.eurosport.fr/football/sept-inculpations-en-norvege-dans-une-affaire-de-matches-truques_sto4445090/story.shtml [Accessed: 24 January 2015].
- IRIS [Institut de Relations Internationales et Strategiques] (2014), *What national networks to fight against match-fixing?*, 10 June [Online]. Available at: http://www.iris-france.org/docs/kfm_docs/docs/obs-geostrategie-sport/Communique-Observatoire-sport-2014-06-10.pdf [Accessed: 27 January 2015].

- MFA [Malta Football Association] (2015), *Newsletter No. 35. From the Integrity Officer's Desk*, 5 January [Online]. Available at: <http://mfa.com.mt/downloads/9399/downloads.pdf> [Accessed: 10 January 2015].
- Malta Today (2015), *Sport manipulation treaty will harm gaming industry, Herrera warns*, 27 January [Online]. Available at: http://www.maltatoday.com.mt/business/business_news/48929/sport_manipulation_treaty_will_harm_gaming_industry_herrera_warns#.VMd2if54q8E [Accessed: 27 January 2015].
- Maltese Parliament (2015), *Parliamentary Question No. 13522 to the Minister of Education and Employment*, 14 January [Online]. Available at: <http://pq.gov.mt/PQWeb.nsf/7561f7daddf0609ac1257d1800311f18/c1257d2e0046dfa1c1257dd200300878!OpenDocument> [Accessed: 30 January 2015].
- NFF [Football Association of Norway] (2015a), *Football and Gambling* [Online]. Available at: http://www.fotball.no/nff/Regler_og_retningslinjer/Fotball-og-pengespill/ [Accessed: 20 January 2015].
- NFF [Football Association of Norway] (2015b), *The captains' positive ethical contract* [Online]. Available at: http://www.fotball.no/Landslag_og_toppfotball/Toppfotball/tippeligaen/2013/Kapteinene-signerte-etisk-kontrakt/ [Accessed: 20 January 2015].
- Norwegian Gaming and Foundation Authority, Swedish Gambling Authority & Finland's National Police Board, Gambling Administration (2013), *Match-fixing in the Nordic Countries*, September [Online]. Available at: <http://www.lotteriinspektionen.se/Global/nyhetsdokument/MATCH%20FIXING%20IN%20THE%20NORDIC%20COUNTRIES.PDF> [Accessed: 22 January 2015].
- Norwegian Ministry of Culture (2012), *National Action Plan against match-fixing in sport 2013-2015*, December [Online]. Available at: <http://www.idrett.no/english/Documents/National%20Action%20Plan%20against%20Match-fixing%20in%20Sport.pdf> [Accessed: 24 October 2014].
- UEFA.org (2014), *Disciplinary News: UEFA welcomes CAS Sammut decision* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.uefa.org/disciplinary/news/newsid=2111990.html> [Accessed: 27 January 2015].

The Beginnings and Development of European Sport Research at Universities: From Marginalisation to Fragmentation?

Karen Petry*

Introduction

Research relating to Europe and sport at universities has been developing continuously over the past few years. Researchers from sport, political, legal and economic-science institutions have begun to place the European unification process in the forefront of their research questions. This research deals with various facets, depending on the discipline-specific approach taken. At the beginning of the 1990s, systemising Europe-based sports research was still relatively easy due to the limited number of topics and persons involved. However, with the increasing differentiation of aspects relating to Europe, the situation became more complicated. The area of study moved from marginalisation to fragmentation, influenced by a variety of different issues related to present views of sport in Europe.

The Development of European Sport Research from 1989 to Today

In the late 1980s, research on the European dimension of sport was only carried out at a few universities. The Bologna Process as well as the “European Higher Education Area” were at that time far in the future. In 1989, researchers from France and Belgium founded the *European Network of Sport Science in Higher Education (ENSSHE)*. The idea behind the foundation of the network was, on the one hand, to promote mobility between sport departments in Europe –the ERASMUS Programme started in 1987 – and, on the other hand, to improve the recognition of university degrees in sport science (cf. Petry & Duffy, 2013). A “by-product” of this networking was the start of a period of cooperation on various research projects.

* Karen Petry is researcher at the Institute of European Sport Development and Leisure Studies at the German Sport University and Vice President of ENSSEE.

At roughly the same time, the European Commission attempted to set up a dialogue with sport organisations through the creation of the EU Sport Forum in 1991. From the beginning, university representatives held the posts of supervisors or consultants. The concentration on EU activities in sport expanded, however, when the *Coopers & Lybrand study* was published in 1995 on behalf of the Commission (Coopers & Lybrand, 1995). This was the first systematic analysis of the links and consequences of the European unification processes on sport.

The foundation of the Sport Unit in 1997 under the Directorate-General of Education and Culture, the establishment of an “Inter-Service Group” in 1999, and before that the Bosman case in 1995, are all only a few indications of the start of change in the mid-90s. The content pertaining to sport and the EU started to become differentiated and more European organisations were founded, not least thanks to the initiative of universities: the *European Association for Sport Management (EASM)* was established in 1993, and the *European College of Sport Science (ECSS)* as well as the *European Observatory on Sport Employment (EOSE)* were founded in 1995. Sport-related job employment markets research was then promoted by *ENSSHE* and *EOSE*. Within the Lifelong Learning Programme, these two organisations carried out large-scale studies on curriculum development, on the European Qualification Framework (EQF) and on job relevance of training programmes (EUROSEEN, AEHESIS). In particular the education of coaches and the new conception of the 8-Level System of training programmes are a concern of the *European Coaching Council (ECC)*, which is part of the *International Council for Coaching Excellence (ICCE)*. Universities also play a significant role in the *ECC* because they contribute to the education of coaches in many European countries. In addition, since the start of the millennium an increasing number of academic sub-disciplines have given themselves a European structure. One example of this is the *European Association of Sport Sociology (EASS)* which was founded in 2001. The *Association for the Study of Sport and the European Union (Sport&EU)*, which mainly acts as a forum for the exchange of all kind of research related to the European Union, was launched in 2005.³ The youngest existing European organisation with a clear-cut academic approach is the *European Sport Economic Association (ESEA)*, which was founded in 2010.

³ The *Sport&EU* Review was launched in 2009 in order to offer opportunities to publish results of recent research (especially PhD and post-graduate students). It could be interesting to further analyse the role of this Review as well as the yearly conferences (since 2006) in order to gain some kind of overview about the ongoing research in the European Union.

Content Design of Europe-Based Sport Research

In the attempt to develop a systematisation, three large academic question complexes could be identified: international comparative studies, studies on direct and indirect European sport policy and those relating to sport law. The latter discuss the problem of the introduction of an anti-doping law, the relationship between federation jurisdictions, aspects relating to administration law in cases of subsidy of sport, and finally the social insurance law and/or labour law of sport (cf. Mittag, 2010). The Bosman case of 1995, which was a catalyst for numerous legal, political and sport scientific analyses, is most certainly a milestone in research relating to Europe (cf. Dehesselles & Siebold, 2009).

International Comparative Studies

Comparative studies on European countries make up a significant part of the publications so far. From a German perspective, many important study results have been published, for example, “Sport for everyone?! Structural change of European sport systems in comparison: Germany, France, England” (Hartmann-Tews, 1996). In the publication “Sport Science in Germany and France“ by Gerhard Treutlein and Charles Pigeassou (1997), information on the education systems, sport systems, P.E. lessons and sport science in Germany and France was collected and summarised. The work of Helmut Digel on the national elite sport systems must also be mentioned. His studies started at the beginning of the 2000s and were presented in comparative form in 2006 (Digel *et al.*, 2006). Just recently, a monograph by Hallmann and Petry (2013) has significantly contributed to this discussion.

From a European perspective, the list of books and articles is even longer, which is why I only want to highlight the monographs by Houlihan and Green (2008) as well as Nicholson, Hoye and Houlihan (2010). In 2004, as part of the EU-financed project VOCASPORT, the working group at the University of Loughborough picked up on and continued to develop a typology and systematisation of sport systems (cf. Henry & Ko, 2008). With regard to the academic discourse on investigations into comparative sport participation of the population, the working group MEASURE (previously COMPASS) focused in particular on the methodological questions of comparative sport participation (Scheerder *et al.*, 2011).

Studies on Direct and Indirect European Sport Policy

In the meantime, there have been many sport-related studies on the dynamics of the European unification process. Initially these studies differentiated between a direct and an indirect sport policy of the European Union. The latter has been given much more emphasis (cf. Tokarski *et al.*, 2004; Tokarski *et al.*, 2009). Research dealt with

job market aspects, TV broadcasting rights, anti-doping policies, and the Bosman case and its consequences (cf. Mittag, 2010, p. 102).

The academic discourse from 2005 onwards was influenced by the “White Paper of Sport” as well as the “Pierre de Coubertin Action Plan” (published by the European Commission in 2007). The *Social Dialogue* with the sport movements has been in the centre of the Commission’s activities, e.g. with European sport federations. Accordingly, the tenders of the Preparatory Actions 2009 to 2012 contained the following topics: health-related activities, promotion of education and training in sport, sport for the disabled, the fight against doping, social inclusion, voluntary work and sport, and the development of sport for everyone.

In addition, the Commission constantly tendered studies from the mid-90s (so-called “invitations to tender” or “framework contracts”). In almost all of them, universities were more or less intensively involved as coordinators or partners. They were (and are) particularly involved in the area of health through various studies and projects, as well as in the development of the “EU Guidelines for Physical Activity“.

‘Footballism’: The Dominance of Football-Specific Research in Europe

Since the beginning of the 90s, football-specific European research has been continually extended (cf. Mittag, 2006). The European Commission had a specific interest in football, primarily professional football. Of course, this was due to the Bosman case and has been more broadly expressed later on in the “Independent Football Review” by José Louis Arnaut 2006 in which he points to the specific dangers of illegal betting, trading with players, corruption and racism in Europe.

The “Report on the future of professional football in Europe“, which was presented by the European Parliament in 2007, requests professional football clubs in particular to issue voluntary declarations and to initiate awareness-raising measures, including such that address violence in stadiums.

The list of football-related works published since the 90s is long, and I only want to cite the comprehensive book entitled “The Transformation of European Football: Towards the Europeanisation of the National Game“, published by Arne Niemann, Borja Garcia und Wyn Grant in 2011. The authors pick up on the process of Europeanisation through football, first described in 2004 (Head, 2004). The largest sport-related project in the current research framework programme of the EU (FP7) is a project called FREE (Football Research in an Enlarged Europe, 2012-2015). Nine

partners from eight European countries are participating in the project coordinated by the “Centre for European Integration“ at the *Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Commerciales d'Angers*. The presentation of the results, as well as the final conference, was organised in March 2015 in Brussels.

The UEFA set up a research grant scheme a few years ago with the aim of “delivering research-based data and therefore background information for certain decisions to the European football family” (UEFA, *n.d.*). Apart from training science issues, the major topics dealt with included job market and transfer systems, women’s football and the autonomy of sport, among others.

This interest must undoubtedly be judged taking into account the rather dominant role which football presently plays in the global sport context. One could justifiably have the impression then that European and international sport politics is based mainly on football research. Bliesner *et al.* justify this concentration on football (2006, p. 301) by the large group of football fans, accounting for the exposed rank in research. The footballism which dominates the whole European research community, however, represents a critical phenomenon because it is likely to result in a kind of monoculture. Such a one-sided and shortened perspective works against scientific diversity, which guarantees a certain openness towards other approaches.

Future Outlook

As shown, the academic discourse on the topics of European sports policy, the effects of the European unification process on sport, and analysis of the international comparison of sport systems have become central features of research and teaching at various universities in Europe. Colleges and universities have supervisory and consulting functions within the new working groups of the European Commission, the European Parliament and also the EU Sport Forum. The competition between universities and private research institutes or consulting companies for the award of academic studies is fierce. The European Commission handed over the evaluation of the projects carried out within the framework of the preparatory action between 2009 and 2011 to a consortium, which was headed by an Italian consulting company with headquarters in Bologna. Its partners were other companies, which meant that the field was ceded completely to privately financed research institutions. Just recently, the EACEA (Executive Agency of the European Commission) awarded a study on “Sport Qualifications in the EU Member States” to *PricewaterhouseCoopers* – despite the fact that a consortium of renowned universities, federations and European organisations had applied to carry out the study.

All in all, it is obvious that academic research on European sport policy requires further development, and that some kind of coordination structure could help give sport-related research more attention in the present discussion about both European politics as well as ongoing European unification.

References

- Bliesner, T. (2006), 'Sport und Hooligans', in Haag, H. & Strauß, B. (eds), *Themenfelder der Sportwissenschaft*, Schorndorf: Hofmann, pp. 289-304.
- Coopers & Lybrand (1995). *Der Einfluss der Tätigkeiten der Europäischen Union auf den Sport*. Brussels.
- Dehesselles, T. & Siebold, M. (2009), 'The legal framework based on EC/EU law', in Tokarski, W., Petry, K., Groll, M. & Mittag, J. (eds), *A Perfect Match? Sport and the European Union*. Oxford: Meyer & Meyer, pp. 109-145.
- Digel, H., Burk, V. & Fahrner, M. (2006), *Die Organisation des Hochleistungssports – ein internationaler Vergleich*, Schorndorf: Hofmann.
- Hallmann, K. & Petry, K. (eds) (2013), *Comparative sport development: systems, participation and public policy*, New York: Springer International Press.
- Hartmann-Tews, I. (1996), *Sport für alle?!* Schorndorf: Hofmann.
- Head, D. (2004), 'Europeanization through football. The cross-cultural impact of Jürgen Klinsmann and Sven-Göran Eriksson in England', *European Journal of the European Association for Sociology of Sport*, 1(1): 23-33.
- Henry, I. & Ko, L.-M. (2010), 'European Models of Sport: Governance, organisational change and sports policy in the EU', in Tokarski, W. & Petry, K. (eds), *Handbuch Sportpolitik*, Schorndorf: Hofmann, pp. 63-78.
- Houlihan, B. & Green, M. (eds) (2008), *Comparative Elite Sports Development*, London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Mittag, J. (2010), 'Die konstitutionelle Erfassung des Sports in der Europäischen Union', in Tokarski, W. & Petry, K. (eds), *Handbuch Sportpolitik*, Schorndorf: Hofmann, pp. 98-113.
- Mittag, J. (2006), 'Die Europäische Union und der Fußball. Die Europäisierung des Profifußballs zwischen Bosman- und Simutenkow-Urteil', in Mittag, J. & Nieland, J.-U. (eds), *Das Spiel mit dem Fußball. Interessen, Projektionen und Vereinnahmungen*, Essen: Klartext, pp. 155-176.
- Nicholson, R., Hoye, R. & Houlihan, B. (eds) (2011), *Participation in Sport: International Policy Perspective*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Niemann, A., Garcia, B. & Grant, W. (eds) (2011), *The Transformation of European Football: Towards the Europeanisation of the national game*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Petry, K. & Duffy, P. (2013), 'Challenges for the Sport Education and Training Sector and the role of the European Network of Sport Science, Education and Employment (ENSSEE)', *Sport & EU Review*, 5(1): 30-33.

- Scheerder, J., Vandermeerschen, H., van Tuyckom, C., Hoehman, R., Breedveld, K. & Vos, S. (2011), *Understanding the Game. Sport Participation in Europe*. Sport Policy & Management Report (SPM Report 10). Leuven.
- Siekman, R. & Soek, J. (eds) (2005), *The European Union and Sport: Legal and Policy Documents*. The Hague: Asser Press.
- Tokarski, W., Petry, K., Groll, M., Mittag, J. (2009), *A Perfect Match? Sport and the European Union*, Oxford: Meyer & Meyer Press
- Tokarski, W., Steinbach, D., Petry, K. & Jesse, B. (2004), *Two Players – One Goal? Sport in the European Union*, Oxford: Meyer & Meyer.
- Treutlein, G. & Pigeassou, C. (eds) (1997), *Sportwissenschaft in Deutschland und Frankreich. Entwicklungen und Tendenzen*, Hamburg: Czwalina.
- VOCASPORT Research Group (2004), *Vocational education and training in the field of sport in the European Union: situation, trends and outlook*, Lyon: European Observatoire of Sport and Employment.

4. BOOK REVIEW

Strategien gegen Rechtsextremismus im Fußballstadion [Strategies against Right-Wing Extremism in the Football Stadium]

**By Daniel Duben. Published by Peter Lang Edition, 2015,
Frankfurt/Main etc. (430 pp., €49.95, hardcover)**

Reviewed by Alexander Brand

Daniel Duben has written an important book which builds a bridge between the more political science-driven literature on right-wing political extremism and a sociology of sport which would be more focused on how activities of spectators and fans are laden with political implications. More than that, the primary aim of his PhD, which provides the basis for this book, is to use research and analysis as tools to critically reflect means and tools to combat the ongoing infiltration and growing presence of right-wing political actors and perspectives in football milieus, which seems to be a particularly pressing problem in Germany these days.

In his book, Daniel Duben starts out with a long and detailed review of the current literature on right-wing political extremism, its forms of appearance and explanations for the development and spread of right-wing political attitudes. He also reserves some space for reporting and dissecting strategies of combating right-wing extremism as a general, not necessarily sport-related phenomenon. Readers who are coming from the corners of sport sciences or sociology of sport might be tempted to skip these pages all too hastily. Yet, what they would miss is a sober, detailed and rich account of what different appearances such extremism might actually take, not least in the German case.

Hence, if the idea is to tailor strategies to an actually quite multifaceted problem, one better knows what would need to be taken into consideration as expressions of right-wing extremism. And even in the first part of the book, it becomes immediately clear that such extremism might resemble a sometimes strange and surprising blend of not only racism and anti-Semitism, but of xenophobic sentiments, homophobic attitudes, sexism, and even overreaching – whatever that may mean is to be defined –

nationalism or social Darwinism: things we might encounter on the terraces quite frequently and that might have become 'normalised' (*football is just like this... really?*).

Even more helpful is Duben's systematisation of strategies that aim to address and combat right-wing extremism in general (chap. 3). Here, one learns a lot about different ideas of how to intervene, about which actors should step in, and in what manner, and what generally informs such policy recommendation. Even though the book heavily focuses on the German debate and strategies pursued in Germany, my gut feeling is that this would also find an audience in the international context, not least if one is to compare different approaches (e.g. prevention, confrontation, mediation, exit-support work) and their prominence across different country contexts.

Equipped with such conceptual tools and general empirical knowledge, Duben then sets out to focus on football fans, right-wing attitudes among them and what makes such ideas appealing to this specific group of people. He portrays the German case as one characterised by an increasingly fragmented fan base (spectators, fans, Ultras, hooligans etc.), situated in the context of ongoing commercialisation as well as repudiations of such a transformation of 'traditional' football. Secondly, there is a seemingly growing gap between 'the' fans in general and public authorities such as the police. It is within such a conflictive context that right-wing political actors have sought to gain access to football fans and to popularise their agenda among them. Or, to put it the other way round, it seems that this particular context of football has allowed right-wing attitudes and perspectives to resonate with some, hardly all, supporters recently, at times in an almost 'popcultural' fashion.

The core of Duben's work centres on expert interviews he conducted with representatives of different key groups of actors (political actors, the police, clubs' reps and spokesmen of the German Football Association as well as the League, and civil society actors which include 'active fans' and leading staff of fan projects). It might be debatable whether it wouldn't have added even more leverage to the analysis if more than 13 such interviews had been conducted. Nevertheless, the material analysed here yields some interesting results. There seems to be almost unequivocal consensus among the different groups that some measures might be effective and hence should be supported, e.g. supporting anti-racism and anti-right wing work through the fan project and an unambiguous positioning of clubs/associations against such political extremism.

Below the surface of such a consensus, however, fault lines emerge. What about crowd surveillance during games, what about restricting the access of supporters to stadiums? Here, the police is clearly in favour, while the active fans are more hesitant (or even oppose this as an appropriate tool); clearly, one sees an emerging pattern which puts fans against the police, if only this is about their personal experiences and inclinations, not necessarily a joint combat against right-wing extremism. In general, it becomes obvious that those closest to the fan base would rather opt for bottom-up approaches in the context of fan initiatives and fan projects instead of demanding a general increase in surveillance, police presence and stewards. This could be taken as an indicator that heavy policing rather seems to push some fans to adopt a stance hostile towards public authorities, 'the state' and the police as a tangible representation of state power. At the same time, at least in the German case, one cannot fail to notice that anti-police slogans have been successfully hijacked by right-wing extremists lately. And here it comes full circle: more and more repressive policing might precisely be the wrong approach when one is to effectively prevent that football fans, especially younger ones, find a home far right to the political middle.

Much more could be said about the analysis of the expert interviews (what needs to be done, according to different stakeholders?) and the state of affairs concerning strategies to combat right-wing political extremism in football stadiums (what *has* actually been done so far?). Duben, in the remainder of his study contrasts these two dimensions, and discusses the manifold gaps, not least an implementation gap, and again offers much 'food for thought'. Instead of presenting two or three clear-cut and supposedly consensual recommendations, the value of the book in this regard is that it makes the reader aware of the fact that, indeed, much is already done by clubs, the football association and public authorities but it remains debatable whether these are the most appropriate and effective strategies.

There is much to be lauded about the book, yet one feels inclined to stress the single, though not ephemeral, flaw as well. It is a pity that all the analysis and strategy advice is only accessible to those familiar with the German language. This unduly restricts the readership and, at the same time, diminishes its potential impact on the academic debate on racism and right-wing political instrumentalisation of sports in general (football arguably being a most likely candidate here). One can only hope that the author brings himself to publish at least the essentials – as regards the analysis as well as policy recommendation – in English, maybe as essays or research articles in international journals.

5. SPORT & EU 10th ANNUAL CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

Sport & EU Conference: ESSCA School of Management, Angers, France, 25-26 June 2015

Thursday, 25 June (Conference Day 1)

9.00 Registration

9.30 Welcome

9.45-10.30 Keynote Speech (Plenary): *From Grayson to Richardson: What the hell has the common market (not) to do with sport?*
Özgehan Senyuva (Middle East Technical University, Ankara)
Borja García (Loughborough University)

10.30-11.00 Coffee Break

11.30-13.00 Parallel Sessions

Panel 1: Regulation of Sport in the EU (Chair: Adam Pendlebury)

- Eleanor Drywood (University of Liverpool): *Prohibition on the International Transfer of Minors from a Children's Rights Perspective: The Role of the EU*
- Vanja Smokvina (University of Rijeka) & Roberto Blanco Martins (University of Amsterdam): *The Work of Intermediaries. Or: Once upon a Time There Were FIFA Player's Agents...*
- Peter Coenen (Maastricht University): *A European Approach towards Football Related Disorder?*

Panel 2: Athletes' Careers in Europe (Chair: Antonella Forganni)

- Julia Koehler, Susanne Günther and André Schneider (Hochschule Mittweida): *Promoting Dual Careers of Student Top Athletes: An Innovative Online Learning and Management Approach*
- Orsolya Sadik-Rozsnyai (ESSCA School of Management): *A Cross-Cultural Study on Athlete Entrepreneurship in Europe*
- Rosarita Cuccoli (Sport&Citizenship Think Tank): *Communication Power and the Social Responsibility of Professional Athletes in Europe*

13.00-14.00 Lunch (mezzanine)

14.00-15.45 Parallel Sessions

Panel 3: Theorising Sport and the EU (Chair: David Ranc)

- Ninja Putzmann (German Sport University Cologne): *Sport Political Systems: Potentials and Limits of the Political System Theory for Sport Policy Analyses*
- Stefano Bastianon (University of Bergamo): *The Specificity of Sport in EU Law: A Concept in Search of Itself & a Policy at War with Itself*
- Till Müller-Schöll (German Sport University Cologne): *Does It Matter If You're Left or Right? Political Cleavages in European Sports Policy*
- Arnout Geeraert and Edith Drieskens (Leuven International and European Studies – LINES): *Exploring the EU's Actorness in International Sport*

Panel 4: Legal Approaches to Sports Regulation (Chair: An Vermeersch)

- Yann Hafner, Antonio Rigozzi and Marjolaine Viret (Université de Neuchâtel): *Dispute Resolution through Arbitration in Sport after Pechstein. Can Switzerland Still Make a Case for Its Legitimacy?*
- Jack Anderson (Queen's University, Belfast): *Concussion and Brain Injury in Contact Sport: Public Health, Sporting and Legal Implications*
- Cedric Vanleenhove and Jan de Bruyne (Ghent University): *"Tackling" the Enforcement of U.S. Punitive Damages Awards for Football Injuries in the EU*
- Antonella Forganni (ESSCA School of Management): *A Comparative Study of Legal Instruments in the Fight against Racism and Discrimination*

15.45-16.15 Coffee Break

16.15-17.15 Session

Panel 5: The State and Sport (Chair: Geoff Pearson)

- Thomas Könecke and Matthias Schubert (Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz): *No More Games in Europe? Implications of the Media Reaction to the Failed Munich 2022 Winter Olympic Bid*
- Andrea Cattaneo and Adam Pendlebury (Edge Hill University): *State Aid in Sport: The Role and Nature of Governing Bodies*

17.15-18.30 Plenary Roundtable on European Funding for Research on Sport

20.00 Dinner (in town)

Friday, 26 June (Conference Day 2)

9.30-11.00 Parallel Sessions

Panel 6: 20 Years after Bosman (Chair: Richard Parrish)

- Antoine Duval and Oskar van Maaren (Asser Institute, The Hague): *The Labour Status of Professional Football Players in Europe: Unity in Diversity?*
- Roberto Vallina Hoset and Alba Sellés (Lawyers at Roca Junyent SLP, Madrid): *Taekwondo, "a Turn of the Screw" in the Bosman Case Law*

Panel 7: Corporate Social Responsibility and Sport (Chair: Borja García)

- Jens Blumrodt (ESC Rennes School of Business): *Football Clubs' Brand Image and Purchase Intentions: A Comparative Study between French and German Spectators*
- Hande Öztürk (Lawyer, Istanbul): *Women's Involvement in Sports as A Cure to Match-fixing and Corruption*
- David Ranc and Albrecht Sonntag (ESSCA School of Management): *Racism and Discrimination in International Football: Findings from a Recent Qualitative Survey*

11.00-11.30 Coffee Break

11.30-12.30 Parallel Sessions

Panel 8: Discourse Analysis of Sports Policy (Chair: Jack Anderson)

- Matthias Schubert and Thomas Könecke (Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz): *The Discursive Construction of UEFA Financial Fair Play*
- Sabine Rusmane (Ventspils University College): *Regulations of German Federal Basketball League: Translation Problems of Sports Law Terminology and Their Solutions in Latvia*

Panel 9: Tradition and Postmodernity – Cultural Analysis of Sport in Europe (Chair: Eleanor Drywood)

- Daniel Ziesche (German Sport University Cologne) and Joachim Lammert (University of Leipzig): *Pandora in the Box? The 50+1 Rule in German Football from an Interdisciplinary Perspective*
- Ramon Llopis-Goig and Paula Laura Gonzalo (University of Valencia): *National and Postnational Dynamics in European Football. An Empirical Analysis Focused on Nine Countries*

12.30-13.30 Conclusion Roundtable: The Future of Sport in the EU

13.30-14.30 Lunch (mezzanine)

14.15 Taxi service for those who need to catch the 14.45-TGV

15.00-19.00 Social Event (for those who stay)

updates on: <http://www.sportandeu.com/events/sporteu-conferences/sporteu-conference-2015/programme/>

6. CONFERENCES AND EVENTS

XIII ENSSEE Forum 2015 in Rome, 9-11 September 2015: *Sport Education and Employment: Innovation throughout Europe and beyond*

hosted by the University of Rome "Foro Italico", the Italian University for Sport and Movement.

The main goal of the 2015 Forum of the **European Network of Sport Science, Education & Employment (ENSSEE)** is to bring together experts from institutions of higher education, sport federations as well as related specialists and stakeholders, to discuss new educational and training approaches in sport professions, based on learning outcomes and competencies, targeting trainees at different qualification levels, fostering partnership between education or training providers and the stakeholders, in search of the best match between the needs of the job market and the qualifications offered.

The ENSSEE Forum will coincide with the European Week of Sport (EwoS), recently announced by the European Commission, to be launched for the first time in 2015.

Main themes include:

- The EU common market and the recognition of sport professions
- The European Qualification Framework within the Sport & Physical Activity sector
- The EC support for international mobility in sport education & training
- The Lifelong Learning Program strategy in sport professions
- Sport and society: time for new sport professions

Further information: www.enssee2015rome.it

50th Anniversary World Congress of Sociology of Sport: *The Sociological Lens and the Well-being of Sport*

Location: Paris, France

Date: 9-12 June 2015

Organiser: International Sociology of Sport Association (ISSA)

Website: <http://www.issa2015.org/call-for-papers/>

20th Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science (ECSS): *Sustainable Sport*

Location: Malmö, Sweden

Date: 24-27 June 2015

Organiser: European College of Sport Science

Website: <http://ecss-congress.eu/2015/15/>

5th MathSport International Conference 2015

Location: Loughborough, UK

Date: 29 June-1 July 2015

Organiser: Loughborough University

Website: <http://www.mathsportinternational2015.com/>

International Conference: Sport and Diplomacy – Message, Mode, and Metaphor?

Location: London, UK

Date: 3-4 July 2015

Organiser: SOAS London

Website: <http://www.cisd.soas.ac.uk/news/sport-and-diplomacy-message-mode-and-metaphor,11768740>

14th European Congress of Sport Psychology (FEPSAC)

Location: Berne, Switzerland

Date: 14-19 July 2015

Organiser: European Federation of Sport Psychology

Website: <http://www.fepsac2015.ch/index.html>

6th International Conference on Sport and Society: *Sport in the Americas*

Location: Toronto, Canada

Date: 30-31 July 2015

Organiser: Sport & Society Knowledge Community

Website: <http://sportandsociety.com/the-conference/call-for-papers>

International Society for the History of Physical Education and Sport (ISHPES) Congress 2015

Location: Split, Croatia

Date: 18-22 August 2015

Organiser: ISHPES

Contact/Website: info@ishpes2015.com / <http://www.ishpes2015.com>

**12th Conference of the European Sociological Association,
*Panels by the Society and Sports Research Network***

Location: Prague, Czech Republic

Date: 25-28 August 2015

Organiser: European Sociological Association

Website: <http://esa12thconference.eu/rn28-society-and-sports>

British Society of Sports History Conference 2015

Location: Swansea University, UK

Date: 2-4 September 2015

Organiser: Department of History & Classics, Swansea University

Website: <http://www.sportinhistory.org/>

3rd Bi-Annual International Coaching Conference 2015

Location: Crewe, UK

Date: 9-10 September 2015

Organiser: CRiC, Manchester Metropolitan University & Sports Coaching Review

Further Information: <http://www.cesh-site.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/2015-Conference-First-Call-for-Papers-flyer.pdf>

**10th International Symposium on Computer Science in Sport
(ISCSS 2015)**

Location: Loughborough, UK

Date: 9-11 September 2015

Organiser: IACSS (International Association of Computer Science in Sport) & ISSP (International Society of Sport Psychology)

Website: <http://gradients.lboro.ac.uk/iacss2015/>

23rd EASM Conference: *Sport Management in the Digital Age*

Location: Dublin, Ireland

Date: 9-12 September 2015

Organiser: European Association for Sport Management

Website: <http://www.easm2015.com/>

***The World in Union: Rugby Past, Present and Future. A
Global Summit on Culture, Science and Business in Rugby
Union Football***

Location: Brighton, United Kingdom

Date: 10-12 September 2015

Organiser: Centre of Sport, Tourism and Leisure Studies (CoSTaLS) and the Centre for Sport and Exercise Science and Medicine (SESAME) at the University of Brighton in association with The World Rugby Museum

Website: www.brighton.ac.uk/sasm/theworldinunion

One-day Workshop: *Power and Corruption – Sporting Mega-Events, International Sports Organisations and the Future of Sport*

Location: Mansfield College, Oxford, UK **Date:** 23 September 2015

Organiser: Karl Spracklen (Leeds Beckett University), Rob Fisher

Contact/Website: megaevent1@inter-disciplinary.net / <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/probing-the-boundaries/persons/sport/courses-and-workshops/2015-2/power-and-corruption/>

International Conference *Violence, Discipline, and Leisure: Sport in Penal and Internment Camps*

Location: Cologne, Germany **Date:** 23-25 September 2015

Organiser: Universities of Bonn and Mainz, Germany

Website: <http://idrottsforum.org/call-for-papers-sport-in-penal-and-internment-camps-cologne-23-25-september-2015-deadline-31-july-2014/>

Space, Place and Sport / The Sport Project: Probing the Boundaries

Location: Mansfield College, Oxford, UK **Date:** 24-26 September 2015

Organiser: Karl Spracklen (Leeds Beckett University), Rob Fisher

Contact/Website: sport4@inter-disciplinary.net / www.inter-disciplinary.net/probing-the-boundaries/persons/sport/call-for-papers/

Symposium: *The Future of Cycling: Challenges and Possibilities*

Location: Cambridge, New Zealand **Date:** 1-2 October 2015

Organiser: University of Waikato and Home of Cycling

Contact: rolive@waikato.ac.nz

Midwest Popular Culture Association / Midwest American Culture Association Annual Conference, Panel: *Sport Culture*

Location: Cincinnati, OH, USA **Date:** 1- 4 October 2015

Contact / Website: bdettmar@adrian.edu / <http://www.mpcaaca.org/>

19th International CESH Congress: *Sport as Key Driver for Development*

Location: Florence, Italy **Date:** 22-24 October 2015

Organiser: European Committee for Sports History

Website: <http://www.cesh2015florence.it/>

Play the Game 2015, the 9th World Communication Conference on Sport and Society: *Global Sport: Reform or Revolution?*

Location: Aarhus, Denmark

Date: 25-29 October 2015

Organiser: Play the Game/Danish Institute for Sports Studies

Website: <http://playthegame.org/conferences/play-the-game-2015/>

Association of Researchers in Physical Activities and Sports (ACAPS), International Congress

Location: Nantes, France

Date: 26-28 October 2015

Organiser: Association of Researchers in Physical Activities and Sports

Contact/Website: contact-acaps2015@univ-nantes.fr / www.acaps2015.univ-nantes.fr

North American Society for the Sociology of Sport (NASSS), 36th Annual Conference: *Sports at/on the Borderlands: Translations, Transitions, and Transgressions*

Location: Santa Fe, NM, United States

Date: 4-7 November 2015

Organiser: NASSS

Website: <http://www.nasss.org/conference/2015-conference/>

1st Afro-European Conference on Physical Education and Sport

Location: Rabat, Morocco

Date: 12-15 November 2015

Organiser: International Federation of Physical Education & Moroccan Ministry of Youth and Sports

Website: <http://www.fiep2015rabat.com/welcome/>

International Congress on Sport Sciences Research and Technology Support (icSPORTS)

Location: Lisbon, Portugal

Date: 15-17 November 2015

Organiser: icSPORTS Secretariat

Contact/Website: icsports.secretariat@insticc.org / <http://www.icsports.org>

21st Sport Management Association of Australia and New Zealand (SMAANZ) Conference

Location: Hobart, Tasmania, New Zealand

Date: 25-27 November 2015

Website: <http://smaan2015.matgoggin.org>

12th Biennial Australian and New Zealand Association for Leisure Studies (ANZALS) Conference: *Leisure as a Human Right*

Location: Adelaide, Australia

Date: 9-11 December 2015

Organiser: ANZALS & University of South Australia

Website: <http://www.unisa.edu.au/Research/TourismLeisure/>

7th International Sport Business Symposium: *Youth Olympic Games – New Concept – Old Ideas?*

Location: Lillehammer, Norway

Date: 16 February 2016

Organiser: Norwegian School of Sport Sciences and Lillehammer University College

Website: http://www.sport.uni-mainz.de/Preuss/site_eng/f_olympia_16_yog_lillehammer.shtml

2016 Global Sport Business Association (GSBA) Conference

Location: Miami, FL, United States (Bahamas, aboard Royal Caribbean's *Majesty of the Seas*)

Date: 19-22 February 2016

Organiser: Global Sport Business Association

Contact/Website: GSBAssn@yahoo.com / www.GSBAssn.com

American Marketing Association (AMA) Winter Educators Conference

Location: Las Vegas, NV, United States

Date: 26-28 February 2016

Organiser: American Marketing Association

Website: <https://www.ama.org/events-training/Conferences/Pages/Winter-Marketing-Educators-Conference.aspx>

21st Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science

Location: Vienna, Austria

Date: 6-9 July 2016

Organisers: European College of Sport Science and University of Vienna

Website: <http://www.ecss-congress.eu/2016>

22nd Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science

Location: Bochum, Germany

Date: 5-8 July 2017

Organisers: European College of Sport Science and University Alliance Metropolis Ruhr: Ruhr University Bochum, Technical University Dortmund, University Duisburg-Essen

Website: <http://www.ecss-congress.eu/2017>

7. JOURNALS

2016 Special Issue of *Online Information Review*: ‘Texting, Tweeting and Playing: Sporting Mega Events in an Online Environment’

The 2016 Special Issue ‘Texting, Tweeting and Playing’ of *Online Information Review* seeks international submissions featuring case-based or empirical papers presenting new insights into the following (but not limited to) topics:

- The changing face of global online sport-consuming audiences
- Convergence of traditional and new media and fan experiences
- Fan-athlete interaction in the digital environment
- Social media and mediated participation in online platforms
- Imagined communities and fantasy sports
- Rhetorical investigation into sport online texts
- Sport, national identity and the new media
- Gender perspectives in online sports consumption

Guest Editors

- Dr [Yair Galily](#), Interdisciplinary Center, Herzliya, Israel
- Dr [Galen Clavio](#), Media School, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Please feel free to contact either Guest Editor if you have questions or queries about the issue or submissions.

Important Dates

- First submission papers due: 2 February 2016
- First round decisions made: 20 April 2016
- Revised manuscripts due: 1 June 2016
- Final decisions made: 1 July 2016
- Publication: OIR Vol 40, no 6 (2016)

Submissions

Every submission must spell out the implications of findings in the paper for online information and the online environment as distinct from implications just for sport and sports activities. (These implications should be mentioned in the introduction, discussion and conclusion sections of your paper.) Papers which focus on findings for specific sectors without adequate attention to the online environment will not be accepted.

There are several types of submissions that *OIR* prefers not to publish:

- Papers that require mathematics to develop, test or analyse concepts or findings (these require non-mathematical explanations for the readership of *OIR*)
- Questionnaire-based studies with low levels of novelty and advance on previous knowledge. Further, if convenience samples are used, their use needs to be convincingly argued.
- TAM or other standard model-based submissions applied in a formulaic way to a limited population and which do not significantly advance our knowledge of the topic.

Prospective authors should ensure their papers meet the Special Issue scope and must adhere to *OIR* [author guidelines](#).

For further information, please go to <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/products/journals/journals.htm?id=oir>

Journal of Sport and Tourism, Call for Papers – Special Issue on ‘The Big Questions for Active Sport Tourism Research’

The Journal of Sport & Tourism is approaching its 20th Anniversary Year. To mark this anniversary four special issues of the journal are planned over the next two years focusing on The Big Questions for research into sport and tourism. The first of these special issues focuses on the theme of active sport tourism.

Active sport tourism was proposed as a category of sport tourism to describe people travelling to participate in sport, as opposed to travelling to view sports. Much of the early work on active sport tourism was associated with golf and skiing, but in recent years with the growth of participatory sports events, studies on cycling, triathlon, and running have been added to the body of knowledge related to active sport tourism.

While the existing literature provides some knowledge about what active sport tourists do, there is less understanding of how active sport tourists make choices about what activities and destinations to choose, or about how different sport tourism activities interact within individuals’ sport tourism ‘careers’ or participation profiles. There is a need for diverse, international and theory driven perspectives on active sport tourism. Similarly, outside the extant areas of research focus, golf and skiing, the partnerships and alliances needed to develop active sport tourism products, many of which tend to be small-scale, are not clear. Further, sports tours that create hybrid experiences combining active sport tourism with passive spectator experiences at major sport events, such as tours to the Tour de France (e.g. Lamont & McKay, 2012), have not been widely examined. It is also unclear whether national, regional, local or individual commercial stakeholders are best placed to take the lead on active sport tourism product development and promotion.

Hence, the aims of this special issue are twofold:

- To expand theory driven understandings of active sport tourism by providing empirical insights on topics ranging from active sport tourists' experiences to active sport tourism delivery structures, opportunities and challenges, in a range of international sports contexts.
- To consider possibilities for the future of active sport tourism and the research of active sport tourism.

For this special issue we welcome submissions on these topics and others related to furthering our knowledge about active sport tourism. The Guest Editors also welcome approaches from authors who would like to discuss potential papers for this special issue.

Guest Editors

- Prof Heather Gibson, University of Florida, hgibson@hhp.ufl.edu
- Dr Matthew Lamont, Southern Cross University, matthew.lamont@scu.edu.au
- Dr Millicent Kennelly, Griffith University, m.kennelly@griffith.edu.au

Deadline for Submission

- 1 October 2015

Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport, Call for Papers – Special Issue on ‘The Americans with Disabilities Act 25th Anniversary: Assessing Opportunities, Challenges, & Progress’

To commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) the *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport* (JLAS) is inviting submissions for a Special Issue, provisionally titled “The Americans with Disabilities Act 25th Anniversary: Assessing Opportunities, Challenges, & Progress,” to be co-edited by Dr. John Grady (J.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sport and Entertainment Management, University of South Carolina & Member, Editorial Review Board, JLAS) and Anita M. Moorman (J.D., Professor of Sport Administration, University of Louisville & Member, Editorial Review Board, JLAS).

Guest Editors

- John Grady, J.D., Ph.D., University of South Carolina, jgrady@sc.edu
- Anita M. Moorman, J.D., University of Louisville, amm@louisville.edu

Please feel free to contact the co-editors of the special issue to discuss potential topics.

Important Dates

- Submission deadline: August 1, 2015
- Publication date: February 2016

Sport in Society, Call for Papers – Special Issue on ‘Research Methodologies and Sports Scholarship’

Sport in Society is calling for papers for a Special Issue on Research Methodologies and Sports Scholarship (to be published 2016). Deadline is the 1 September 2015.

For more information, please visit the journal's website <http://explore.tandfonline.com/cfp/pgas/fcss-cfp-research-methodologies-and-sports-scholarship>

Sport in Society, Call for Papers –Special Issue on ‘Healthy Stadia: The Current State of Play from Policy to Practice’

This special issue addresses the complex reality of the relationship between sport clubs, their stadia and health. Businesses have been challenged by government and the public to operate more ethically and sustainably. Sport has not been isolated from this pressure and in recent times we have seen sport shift towards tackling a range of social agendas. A significant interest has been in the role of stadium management. Specifically, sport stadia have begun to operationalise themselves as health promoting settings to deliver on health and wellbeing outcomes. The Healthy Stadia agenda, which has been spearheaded by the European Healthy Stadia Network, advocates a holistic approach to using sports clubs to improve the health of local communities and those who interact with stadia on both match-days and through auxiliary activities. Primary concerns include: healthier catering (Ireland and Watkins 2010), unhealthy sponsorship (Sherrif et al. 2009), sports-club and foundation-led community physical activity and health engagement (Hunt et al., 2014; Parnell & Richardson, 2014), smoke-free policies (Philpott and Sagar 2014) and more.

This special issue seeks to examine the relationship between sport clubs (both professional and amateur), stadia and health promotion through a collection of papers aligned to philosophical, political, environmental and practical interventions enabled through sport stadia settings to improve levels of health literacy and increase healthy behaviours. This will be achieved through the encouragement of articles and submissions that discuss applied, practical and empirical experiences of a range of authors and applied practitioners researching and working on the Healthy Stadia agenda (please see the article options below). We expect all contributions to be focused on sport-club-stadia specified health outcomes rather than broader sport-for-all or participation based interventions or initiatives. Contributions may also be related to events, mega-events (i.e. UEFA European Football Championships, Olympic and Para-Olympic Games or the World Rugby World Cup), or come from Leagues, National Governing Bodies or individual sports clubs (both professional and amateur).

Deadline: 30 September 2015

Link: <http://explore.tandfonline.com/cfp/pgas/fcss-healthy-stadia>

For any questions please contact Dr. Dan Parnell (D.Parnell@leedsbeckett.ac.uk).

International Sports Law Journal Call for Papers

The International Sports Law Journal (ISLJ), a peer-reviewed publication by Asser Press and Springer-Verlag, is accepting sports law-related articles, papers, comments and reviews for consideration for publishing both online and in hard-copy issues. See the journal's mission statement and submission guidelines: <http://www.springer.com/law/international/journal/40318>.

Rolling Call for Papers Journal of Amateur Sport (JAS)

We are excited to announce the release of the first issue of the Journal of Amateur Sport (JAS), the open access journal hosted in the Laboratory for the Study of Sport Management at the University of Kansas. Additionally, the rolling Call for Papers can be found at <http://www.jamsport.org>. Issue Two will be released in the fall of 2015 and finalised manuscripts can be viewed immediately on the JAS website. We hope you will consider submitting to JAS in the future.

European Sport Management Quarterly – latest Special Issue published!

European Sport Management Quarterly has published their latest special issue on 'Impacts and Strategic Outcomes from Non-mega Sport Events for Local Communities'. This special issue, guest edited by Marijke Taks, Laurence Chalip and B. Christine Green, covers a range of perspectives and impacts from a variety of non-mega sport events, including spectator and participant events, single-sport and multi-sport events, and one-day and multi-day events. **For a limited time, the featured article** 'Limited or lasting legacy? The effect of non-mega sport event attendance on participation' will be **free to access**. This article examines the legacy effect of 'non-mega' events on the sport participation levels of those who attend them.

International Review for the Sociology of Sport - Special Issue: 'Assessing the Trajectory and Challenges of the Sociology of Sport' published!

In celebration of the 50th anniversary of both the International Sociology of Sport Association and its journal the International Review for the Sociology of Sport, a special double issue of the IRSS entitled '50@50: Assessing the Trajectory and Challenges of the Sociology of Sport' has been published. The issue features 50 essays by noted scholars from around the world considering the trajectory, challenges, and future of the field with special attention to key debates and regional priorities in research. See <http://connection.sagepub.com/blog/sage-insight/2015/06/03/special-issue-assessing-the-trajectory-and-challenges-of-the-sociology-of-sport>

8. RESOURCES

North American Society for the Sociology of Sport: Barbara A. Brown Outstanding Student Paper Award

We would like to announce and encourage masters and doctoral students to consider submitting a paper for the NASSS Barbara A. Brown Outstanding Student Paper Award.

As expressed on the NASSS website at www.nasss.org this award was named in honor of the late Barbara Brown beginning in 1991 and is granted to the best master and doctoral student-authored, non-published paper submitted for consideration.

Below are the criteria for submission. Submissions are due Friday, August 7, 2015 and should be sent to the chair of Barbara A. Brown Outstanding Student Paper Award: Akilah Carter-Francique at arfrancique@hlkn.tamu.edu.

The guidelines for submissions are listed below:

- Papers should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages, including notes, tables, and bibliography.
- Authors should follow a consistent style (e.g., APA) throughout the paper.
- Authors should include a cover page with the title of the paper and their full contact information.
- Papers do not need to be submitted for presentation at the NASSS conference (though most are), but authors **MUST** be members of NASSS.
- Authors must be enrolled in a graduate program at the time their paper is submitted.
- Papers that have been accepted for publication are not eligible for the contest.
- The committee will accept one submission per author.
- In the event that a co-authored paper is selected as winner, the authors will share the prize.

Invitation to join new NCA Communication & Sport Division

The National Communication Association (NCA, U.S.) recently approved a new division for Communication & Sport. People can now sign up for the division in one of the following two ways:

- Current NCA members not yet wishing to renew their membership can email the NCA Membership Manager Justin Danowski (jdandowski@natcom.org) and

indicate their desire to switch one affiliation (or add one) to the Communication & Sport Division.

- NCA members due for renewal or potential new members to NCA can select Communication & Sport during the renewal (make sure to look under “C” for Communication & Sport, rather than “S” for just sport). People can join by going to: www.natcom.org/join.

Elections for the initial slate of officers will happen later this spring. Only affiliated members will be eligible to run and to vote. Questions can be directed to Andrew Billings (acbillings@ua.edu).

Call for Contributions, Session Proposal to the American Marketing Association Winter Educators Conference (February 2016)

The Sport & Special Event Special Interest Group (SIG) of the American Marketing Association (AMA) is soliciting short research abstracts for inclusion in a SIG special session proposal for presentation at the AMA Winter Educators Conference in Las Vegas, Feb. 26-28, 2016.

Abstracts should be limited to 500 words in length and be on any topic related to research or education in sports marketing, however abstracts related to the conference theme of ‘What Happens in Marketing, Stays Digital: Rethinking Marketing for Success in the Era of Unlimited Data’ are especially encouraged.

The deadline for submission to be considered as part of the special session proposal is June 30, 2015. The best composition of submitted abstracts will be compiled into the special session proposal and authors will be notified within 30 days of submission of their inclusion or not in the proposal. To submit your abstract or with questions, please contact SIG Chair Darin White (Darin.White@Samford.edu).

9. THE READING CORNER

Activism and the Olympics: Dissent at the Games in Vancouver and London

Boykoff, Jules

New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014

242 pp., ISBN: 9780813562018

An Illustrated History of Health and Fitness, from Pre-History to our Post-Modern World

Shephard, Roy J.

Heidelberg/New York: Springer, 2014

1077 pp., ISBN: 9783319116709

Asian American Athletes in Sport and Society

King, Richard C. (ed.)

London/New York: Routledge, 2014

194 pp., ISBN 9780415874915

A Sociology of Football in a Global Context

Cleland, Jamie

London/New York: Routledge, 2015

178 pp., ISBN 9780415855679

European Football and Collective Memory

Pyta, Wolfram / Havemann, Nils (eds.)

Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2015

224 pp., ISBN 9781137450159

Exploring Sports and Society: A Critical Introduction for Students

Spracklen, Karl

Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2014

272 pp., ISBN 9781137341594

Football and Migration: Perspectives, Places, Players

Elliott, Richard / Harris, John (eds.)

London/New York: Routledge, 2014

206 pp., ISBN 9780415739788

Health and Elite Sport: Is High Performance Sport a Healthy Pursuit?

Baker, Joe, *et al.* (eds.)
London/New York: Routledge, 2014
206 pp., ISBN 9780415708661

Inclusion and Exclusion in Competitive Sport

Patel, Seema
London/New York: Routledge, 2015
214 pp., ISBN 9781138025516

More Than Just Peloteros: Sport and U.S. Latino Community

Iber, Jorge (ed.)
Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Press
320 pp., ISBN: 9780896729087

Pierre Bourdieu and Physical Culture

lisahunter *et al.* (eds.)
London/New York: Routledge, 2014
200 pp., ISBN 9780415829694

Reframing Disability? Media, (Dis-)Empowerment, and Voice in the 2012 Paralympics

Jackson, Daniel, *et al.* (eds.)
London/New York: Routledge, 2015
270 pp., ISBN 9781138797239

Running across Europe: The Rise and Size of One of the Largest Sport Markets

Scheerder, Jeroen / Breedveld, Koen (eds.)
Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2015
304 pp., ISBN 9781137446367

Selling the Yellow Jersey: The Tour de France in the Global Era

Reed, Eric
Chicago: University of Chicago Press
280 pp., ISBN: 9780226206530

Spanish Football and Social Change: Sociological Investigations

Llopis-Goig, Ramón
Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2015
216 pp., ISBN 9781137467942

Sport and Nationalism in Latin/o America

Fernández L'Hoeste, Hector, *et al.* (eds.)

Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2015

324 pp., ISBN 9781137487186

Sport and Social Movements: From the Local to the Global

Harvey, Jean, *et al.*

London: Bloomsbury, 2015

178 pp., ISBN 978147423828

Sport and the Social Significance of Pleasure

Pringle, Richard, *et al.*

London/New York: Routledge, 2015

242 pp., ISBN 9780415885102

Sport Psychology in Sport and Exercise: Linking Theory to Practice

Knowles, Ann-Marie, *et al.*

Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2015

252 pp., ISBN 9781137306289

Testing for Athlete Citizenship: Regulating Doping and Sex in Sport

Henne, Kathryn E.

New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015

246 pp., ISBN: 9780813565903

Transnational Mobilities in Action Sport Cultures

Thorpe, Holly

Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave, 2014

332 pp., ISBN 9780230390737